

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes: **Tuesday, 10-27-15**
11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m., Whitewater 120

Present: Justin Carroll (Recorder for this meeting), Edwina Helton, Laverne Nishihara (Chair), Sue McFadden, Lori Dilworth (Recorder for a portion of this meeting)

On sabbatical Fall 2015: Hitesh Kathuria

The meeting began at 11:06 a.m.

Housekeeping

Daron Olson and Tonya Breymier agreed to swap minute taking responsibilities due to UFC conflict. However it was later discovered that Tonya had a conflict. Justin agreed to switch with Daron, and Daron will take minutes for December. The schedule for minute taking for the remainder of the meeting for Fall 2015 are as follows:

Tues., 10-27-15: Justin Carroll

Tues., 11-10-15: Tonya Breymier

Tues., 12-8-15: Daron Olson

Minutes of 9-8-15 meeting

These minutes were reviewed. In the Discussion: Bylaws Revision: Dean Procedures section the following sentence needs revision: “No Xschools have commented with questions or concerns regarding the revisions of the dean procedures, or the Bylaws revisions.” Xschools needs to be revised to read schools. Laverne noted the change. The minutes were approved as corrected by the committee.

Updates

In the Senate meeting on 11/4/15, Laverne will be presiding officer since Angie Cooksey will be attending a Quality Matters Conference. Sue will take the chair role for FAC. At Senate, FAC will be presenting the proposed Bylaws revision and the proposed Dean Review Procedure revision for voting.

John Applegate was on campus (meeting with the Agenda Committee) and shared with Laverne that EVP Michael Rushton was a good person to contact about policy. Once we have discussed information with Mr. Rushton, we can then ask any legal questions that are still lingering to the head of IU Legal Council.

Revisions to Promotion and Tenure Policy are decisions for all faculty. Proposed revisions ideally will be acceptable to a substantial majority of faculty in all schools. Laverne reminded us that compromises will need to be made.

All schools need to be given the opportunity to voice questions or concerns regarding the proposed changes to the Promotion and Tenure Policy starting the week of November 16th. Ask for a minimum of 20 minutes to field questions and take good notes regarding feedback from schools. Assignments:

Education – Lori

HSS – Justin
NSM – Laverne
Business – Sue
Nursing – Tonya (Laverne will contact Tonya to discuss this assignment)
Social Work – Edy (offer a face to face meeting)
Library – Sue (request a face to face meeting or meet via email if necessary)

PT Revisions

Three documents are being referred in the next section: the larger document, and two smaller related documents that focus on Section 5a, which Edy compiled and reduced per Daron's suggest during our last meeting.

Laverne brought our attention to page 7 of the larger document, the stricken section that begins: "The promotion and tenure." She suggested we run the stricken language related to the deans' role in assembling dossiers by Michael Rushton. There are lingering questions about the printed Academic Handbook [replaced by online University Policies] and the exact role of the deans. Has this role of the deans been eliminated from IU policy and procedure, or is it simply harder to find?

Then we moved to page 8 of the larger document, and focused on the first bold passage, "This process may include...." Laverne wonders if this should go to all of the schools and units. Our discussion focused on the need for a school or unit P & T Committee. We need to ask the faculty of the different schools and units if this is something they want or demand. Edy asked if having a school or unit P & T Committee was practiced by choice or if they were mandated. Laverne said she'd ask Mary Blakefield. If mandated, it would still need to be voted on by faculty as the procedure falls under faculty authority.

On page 8, changes may affect the bylaws. Need to explore further.

From the larger document, we moved to the shorter document created by Edy that collapsed the Teaching P & T criteria section. The committee as a whole thought the document was clear.

Formal vote: 5 – 0 for the changes.

We moved back to the larger document.

On pages 18, 19, changes were made to clarify the language of the larger document.

Next, we turned our attention to page 19, section D. Edy informed the committee that the issue of student evaluations and how many to include was a contentious issue. The committee debated the issues and we revolved to reject the changes made to the section and keep language that called for the inclusion of all of the student evaluations.

We stopped our work on page 22.