

Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, 3-19-19

11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

Whitewater 120

Meeting called to order: 11:05 a.m.

Present: Laverne Nishihara (Chair, HSS, '19), Jayne Rivas (Recorder; BUSE, '20), Christine Nemcik (HSS, '20), Wongun Goo (BUSE, '20), Parul Khurana (NSM, '19), Shelly Burns (NURS, '19)

Absent: Stephanie Whitehead (HSS, ex officio as UFC Rep.), and Susan Brudvig (BUSE, '20)

Minutes of 2-12-19 –The minutes were approved without corrections.

Post-Tenure Review proposed revision: Discussion

Proposed revision dated 3-18-19 (03 in Box folder)

Current Post-Tenure Review policy (04 in Box folder)

Related to section III - Guiding Principles:

- Laverne: Schools (then divisions) never came up with criteria for “unsatisfactory performance.” Do you have any suggestions on how schools should define criteria for “unsatisfactory performance”? Should FAC set a deadline for schools to provide the criteria or help to define the criteria? If FAC sets the criteria, they will be campus-wide criteria.
- Christine: if we let schools set the criteria, they would come out with very different kinds of criteria.
- Laverne: Schools may be come out with general criteria, or some schools may not come up with any criteria, but schools would need to accept the campus criteria.
- Parul: we may use the full professor guidelines instead of the Promotion and Tenure criteria. What is satisfactory for tenure can help to define “unsatisfactory performance.”
- Laverne: FAC can propose a definition of unsatisfactory performance according to what is already in place for promotion and tenure, lecturer, etc. However, the criteria for full professor may be too high a standard for associate professor.
- At this time, FAC suggests using the promotion and tenure criteria for satisfactory performance for purposes of the post-tenure review.

Related to section IV - Purpose of Post-Tenure Review:

- Laverne: Comments on first paragraph of page 4 are already noted as potentially objectionable. These comments may be not necessary if we stay with the Promotion and Tenure criteria. Misconduct is one reason for conducting post-tenure review if the misconduct is not enough to warrant immediate dismissal. A possible example is keeping alcoholic beverages in the office. We should check possible misconduct in the faculty code of ethics.

Related to section VI - The Post-Tenure Review Committee (PTRC):

- Laverne: it is expected that tenured professors should be teaching. If somehow they are not doing their job, then a supervisor must be able to start a post tenure review. However, we must be sure that authorities do not exceed their power. Clearly defining the PTRC's composition and responsibilities can help to balance this power.
- According to the 3-18-18 Revisions, the final decision on the post-tenure review committee rests with the Chief Academic Officer. FAC suggests that the school dean, equivalent supervisor, and annual review writers should not be eligible for the PTRC.
- Another suggestion: the PTRC should be elected by the senate.
- Having PTRC elected in the senate creates a confidentiality issue, and there will be an election every time a process starts. FAC decided against having elections for the PTRC.

Related to the section VII – Responsibilities of the PTRC:

- Currently PTRC sets the process and can terminate it if there is no basis for a post-tenure review. We must decide if FAC wants to continue working with the current categories for faculty members subject to review using the most recent revision (in blue) or start working with the IUPUI's post-tenure review policy (in red).
- Christine: IUPUI's policy is very clear. My concern is that the findings of the review process will be sent directly to the tenured professor under review instead of developing a plan of action. Can we mix IUPUI's policy with the plan of action we have currently in our proposed policy?
- Laverne: We can take out IUPUI's voluntary plan and put in the plan of action that we have for IUE. This is the rationale: Why would a person who is underperforming despite previous advice from annual reviews voluntarily follow a plan for improving?

We stopped here, but those are just the initial comments. This is just the start of the discussion.

Graduate Affairs Committee: Update and Discussion

Supporting document:

GAC rationale 190211 (06 in Box folder)

GAC School Unit Responses 190318 (05 in Box folder)

- Shelly: we did not have much discussion on GAC in the meeting of the Nursing school. We do have a strong voice that was a member of the committee, who said that GAC wants to stay as it is. Nursing has a graduate committee. We have an associate dean that has good communication with the committee, and the dean. We do not have communication issues as some of the ones discussed in FAC.
- Laverne summarized the pros and cons of GAC being a standing committee in the document named "GAC School Unit Responses 190318." We agreed that the main topics were in the document.
- If faculty know who is on GAC, communication can improve. It may be a disconnection with schools other than nursing, which may be causing GAC and faculty to not communicate well.
- The possibility of having a graduate office may affect the responsibilities of GAC. Although the creation of a graduate office is not an academic issue, faculty should be consulted. We must be allowed to offer recommendations.

- Laverne: we should notify GAC about the discussions. We must decide about what we want to communicate to them. It could be concerns or suggestions. My mention of discussions in Senate will be an information item. We can share the outcomes with GAC and the EVCAA; the office of the EVCAA houses GAC. We can share the outcomes with the faculty too. However, we must be aware that any reformulation of GAC will be linked to the possible new graduate office.
- Christine: Who would receive the communication, Senate or the committee?
- Laverne: we can do both. But before we release the outcomes, we should review the report. The GAC may decide to improve communication spontaneously or FAC may also set a deadline to incorporate those suggestions.
- Won: What would be the next step after releasing the outcomes?
- Laverne. We would report on the discussions. Any changes to GAC would need to await the possible formation of a graduate office. For the time being, FAC will have fulfilled the charge by discussing the issue.

Reviews of Administrators: Update and Discussion

Topics for EVCAA Survey Memo dated 2-27-19 (07 in Box folder)

- Update: EVCAA Michelle Malott said thank you for FAC's suggested topics for a survey that may be disseminated by the EVCAA. We fulfilled the task by providing topics for a survey about the EVCAA.

Possible FAC Updates at April 2 Faculty Senate meeting: Discussion

- Notify Senate that FAC has been discussing administrator reviews
- Notify Senate that Schools have discussed GAC

Meeting adjourned at 12:31 PM.