

**IUB Faculty and Budgetary Affairs**  
**Standing Committee of the Policy Council**  
**Final Annual Report**  
**April 23, 2008**

**Chair:** Barbara Korth

**Active Members:** Jesse Goodman, Barbara Bichelmeyer, Phil Carspecken, John Bean, Jeff Anderson, Deb Lane, Brent Pieper

**Non-voting Members:** Pete Kloosterman and Bob Gonyea

**Activities:**

Advised the Dean on Faculty Issues

- Equity Review (1)
- Conversion from Clinical to Tenure-Line (1)

Piloted the Campus Faculty Annual Review System

The committee piloted the campus system which involved being trained, participating in, and providing feedback on the system. In general, though there were small problems (particularly regarding its application on MACs), the system would not require much of a transition from our current SOE system. The campus intends on making it possible for faculty to migrate data from the current SOE system to the faculty system. The system was relatively user-friendly and is compatible in terms of user experience to the current SOE system. We offered recommendations and have received feedback on the status of those recommendations.

Reviewed 2006-7 Promotion and Tenure Committee Concerns

The annual report of the 2006-2007 Promotion and Tenure Committee suggested that the FAC might be interested in two issues with potential policy implications surfaced in their work. Those two issues, simply put, involved (1) a level of inattentiveness in the construction of dossiers, producing errors and inconsistencies which made it difficult to appreciate the candidate's work and (2) discrepancies across/incommensurability of the work of people into clinical ranks which made their individual cases somewhat difficult to consistently assess.

With regard to the first issue, the committee found no policy implications. It was striking that this problem was so pronounced that the P&T Committee found it necessary to mention. There must be some way to encourage department chairs and faculty mentors to work more diligently and attentively to avoid errors and inconsistencies.

With regard to the second issue, the committee also found no need for policy resolutions. The identified problem can easily be attributed to the fact that several clinical faculty were hired before there were policies about the criteria for clinical faculty in terms of either hiring or promotion. With those policies in place now, there ought to be more continuity across the roles, responsibilities, and expectations of clinical faculty. The policy on the differentiation between clinical and tenure line ranks are clear enough now that the committee thought the most appropriate response to this issue would involve bringing practices in line with the now-existing policies.

#### Reviewed Policy on Clinical Promotions

During the 2006-2007 academic year, the new clinical promotion policies were tested out: One Clinical faculty was promoted from Associate to Full, one was promoted from Assistant to Associate and offered a long-term contract, one was offered a long-term contract. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the efficiency and effectiveness of those policies given it was our first opportunity to have feedback on the policies and given the above mentioned experiences of the P&T committee. The policies and procedures seem both effective and efficient and, thus, the committee found no reason to propose altering them.

#### Discussed Action on Negative Campus-level Tenure Decision

A letter from the committee was sent to the Provost in support of a grievance filed by a SOE faculty member denied tenure.

#### Reviewed Sabbatical Applications

Nine were reviewed, four required minor changes.

#### Developed Policies Regarding Research Scientist Ranks

The committee has been involved in this effort for two years now. The work has involved a series of interviews with Center Directors, coordinating various campus documents regarding Research Scientists and Research Associates, and then crafting draft documents and securing feedback on those documents from Center Directors and those serving at the Centers as Research Scientists. There is urgency to this policy need. For example, this year two people went up for promotion without any policies in place. A proposed policy has been sent to the Agenda Committee for Policy Council consideration at its April meeting. It is the strong opinion of the committee that this policy is timely and necessary and attends carefully to the various contentious and complicated issues involved. The proposed policy is attached.

A second, related, policy change has been proposed by the committee. We developed a policy related to moving Research Associates into Assistant Research Scientist position. Currently, there is not such policy, though it is needed. We would like to see this proposal brought before the Policy Council at its April meeting. The proposed policy is attached.

In conjunction with the discussion of policies regarding research scientist ranks, the committee has also asked the Agenda Committee to have Policy Council consider allowing research scientists to serve as voting members of policy council and its standing committees. The idea is not to require, but rather to allow as eligible, the participation of Research Scientists in the governance of the SOE.

#### Developed Policy Proposal Regarding the Voting Participation of Faculty who Hold Split-Appointments Across Academic Departments

We wish to resolve any confusion over voting rights and responsibilities for faculty who hold split appointments across academic departments. The proposed policy clarifies the committee's position on this issue. The guiding principle involved in our decision is the premise that voting in departments requires a certain level of understanding of departmental activities. Faculty who serve *at least* .50 FTE in a department are sufficiently engaged with the department to possess the kind of knowledge that would best serve the responsibilities of a vote. When a person is engaged in a department through an appointment less than .5 FTE, it is expected that the faculty member would not possess sufficient knowledge of the department's work to afford a responsible vote. The committee wants it noted that the voices and participation of all faculty members in the life of a department are important and should be encouraged and accepted. The proposed policy is attached.

#### Developed Policy Proposal Regarding the Placement of Unsolicited Letters in Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

The committee reviewed recommendations and advice on the issue of whether or not faculty ought to be permitted to add letters to the dossiers of P&T candidates. The committee is in favor of allowing such letters within certain constraints. The proposed policy articulates these conditions.

We understand that this proposal will not be presented to Policy Council until the next academic year, but it is our hope that the proposal can stand as guide should this particular issue arise prior to a Policy Council decision. The proposed policy is attached.