

IUPUI School of Education  
Faculty Affairs and Budgetary Affairs Committee (FABA)

Meeting Minutes

November 4, 2015  
ES 3138E

Present: Deb Keller, Craig Willey, Brendan Maxcy, Thu Suong Nguyen, Robin Hughes, Tammera Moore, Ky Shaw, Flip Robison, Sharice Breland

Committee chair Nguyen calls meeting to order at 3:06pm

I. Opening minutes

- a. Welcome Sharice Breland
  - i. Committee chair Nguyen welcomed staff member representative Sharice Breland.
- b. Discussion of Whiteness
  - i. Hughes wanted clarification on the vote by the faculty, she was under the impression that she was voting to have whiteness discussion at SOE faculty meetings, not all meetings where faculty are present. She asked about proper process to re-open the discussion about the vote. Nguyen clarified that at the most recent faculty meeting the vote was discussed again with language edits to the minutes, Willey agreed that the originator of the vote meant for all meetings where faculty are present but thought it was a point that needed to be revisited. Keller clarified that Jim Scheurich, who originated the vote, meant all meetings where faculty are present. Willey discussed the operational policies that allowed for some faculty to take control over program or practices without undergoing peer reviews or long term contract/promotion review, he addressed how whiteness and the approach that historical decisions should be honored despite deliberate non-diversification within the faculty and policies.
- c. Approval of minutes from October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2015 meeting
  - i. Robison moves that we approve the minutes from the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting with minor edits; Hughes seconded, Breland abstained
- d. Approval of November agenda
  - i. Willey moves to accept the agenda as is, Hughes seconded
  - ii. Unanimous vote in favor

II. Announcements

- a. Robert's Rules
  - i. Nguyen reviewed the importance and purpose of Robert's rules in meetings and the cheat sheet distributed in the meeting.
- b. Maintenance of FABA minutes, records, etc.
  - i. Nguyen requested to know how previous year's committee maintained minutes, policies, administrative decision, etc. Hughes relayed that she was unaware of a current archivist but there were preliminary discussions of transitioning Marj Hopper into that role; she wasn't aware of where those historical documents are currently stored and advised speaking with previous committee members or administrative faculty.

III. Old Business

- a. Proposed change to IUPUI SOE Policy 06.43 regarding promotion and long term contract
  - i. Discussion:

Nguyen clarified that the SOE policy as it stands currently doesn't require non-tenure tracked faculty (clinical faculty) to go up for promotion and long term contract, slightly in conflict with a campus level requirement, and otherwise not allowing for constructive advancement within positions. Keller wanted clarification on when this became a campus-level requirement. Nguyen clarified that according to the IUPUI Academic Handbook: individuals appointed as clinical faculty shall be given long-term contract after probationary period not longer than seven (7) years, which means that non-tenured track faculty are eligible for long term contract but that this does not speak to promotion; within the SOE it is desirable to have a more equitable policy for clinical faculty with regard to reviews and to adapt policy to reflect review process and requirements to pursue promotion and long term contract for all clinical faculty. Robison, who sits on the campus promotion and tenure committee, clarified that after the committees review of the policy their interpretation of the policy was that all clinical/non-tenured faculty aren't on an "up and out" policy, but rather on the assumption that at the time of review if the faculty member is not recommended for long term contract or promotion they will still continue to be in the department. Maxcy clarified that the campus-level policy requires a review by year 7 for non-tenure track Associated with granting Long term Contract and that the IUPUI SoE policy does not link the review for promotion and the review for long-term contract, unlike the IUB; SoE policy. Maxcy stated that we could revise the IUPUI SoE policy to link the granting of long-term contract with meeting the criteria for promotion from Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate. Willey added that theoretically it would make sense to support the development of a review process for clinical faculty but noted that he did not see a situation where a faculty member could be deemed as adequate within their position but not eligible for long term contract/promotion. Robison commented that while he has no defensible objection to implementing a review process for future clinical faculty, he wanted to respect the historical intentions that faculty was hired with. Maxcy concurred that a revised policy reflecting linkage between review for promotion and Long term contract, if adopted, should be applied to new hires.

- ii. Robison moves to present the proposal of change to IUPUI SOE Policy 06.43 regarding promotion and long term contract to the broader faculty, Willey seconded
  - iii. Unanimous vote in favor
- b. Merit Review Procedures
- i. Course releases
    - a. Robison moved to discuss the administrative procedures on course releases first, Maxcy seconded
    - b. Discussion:

Maxcy stated that what qualifies as service within the SOE is a murky area, at times service is compensated by offering faculty a course to accomplish the tasks but sometimes it's completed on contracted service load – 20% for Tenure track and 30% for Non Tenure track). The allocation of time policy was set up to clarify load requirements but what was anticipated was that the policy would begin to flesh out what service looked like within the SOE and how it can be accounted for. Maxcy suggested to have a set number of course releases for service allocated to program areas and allow programs to determine how to allocate those according to program needs and operations. Hughes wanted clarification on the process the program chairs would follow to allocate the

service hours. Maxcy responded that providing guidelines and requesting program rationale for service hours would help programs define how many releases are allocated to programs and for what duties. Robison agreed and added that bringing Pat Stites, the fiscal Officer, into the conversation sooner about costs would be beneficial. Robison also suggested a stipend should be considered where course releases were not feasible for individuals in those positions. Nguyen offered that conversations last year revolved around equity around course releases. This led to discussion of alternate forms of remuneration of some type (course release or other form of remuneration) for listed position. The discussion led to an amended motion:

- c. Robison moved to survey program leaders (chairs and coordinators) to provide an estimate of total number of course releases needed, allocation of specific roles, and a rationale for those course releases, to be provided to FABA by November 30 close of business, Maxcy seconded
  - d. Unanimous vote in favor
  - e. Maxcy moved to table the administrative procedures for allocated course releases discussion on course releases until next meeting [1:24:25]
- ii. Teaching load
- a. Maxcy moves that we adopt the administrative procedures for accounting for teaching load, Willey seconded
    - i. Discussion:

Maxcy proposed that discussion begin, but unanticipated that it would be tabled after brief discussion and sorting out of the procedures prior to the next meeting. Nguyen reiterated that last year's FABA committee agreed that some general (broad) guidelines at the university level exist but there is more to teaching loads than simply credit hours. Robison added that we are most familiar with the idea of teaching load and credit hours, instead of monitory or credit hour equivalent [relative value units]. Maxcy added that a benefit of using administrative procedures rather than policies is the flexibility in allowing it to evolve over multiple cycles. Keller voiced her concern that once student count is monitored it will overlap with merit review and cause issues.
  - b. Maxcy moved to table the discussion until the next meeting, Willey seconded
  - c. Unanimous vote in favor
- iii. Merit review
- a. Maxcy moved that we adopt the administrative procedures for [1:51:05]
    - i. Discussion:

Maxcy added that he doesn't think the merit review process is easy or clear, having sat on the committee for multiple cycles, and there are inevitably some arbitrary judgements about faculty's merit but that the committee would benefit from clarity regarding whether and how faculty are meeting expected teaching and service load. Maxcy noted that the intended purpose of these annual meeting is to inform people of their advancement towards promotion and to inform the administration about potential merit raises, with the campus priority focused more on the former while the SoE review has focused on the latter. Maxcy suggested we clarify and streamline guidelines and not make the great the

enemy of the good, and instead make a first pass at minimal guidelines regarding the process so the committee, administration and faculty understand what each are charged with.

- b. Maxcy moved that we table this until review, Keller seconded
- c. Unanimous vote in favor

c. Priorities Discussion

IV. New Business

a. Requests for sabbatical and professional leave

- i. Maxcy moved to expedite the committee's review of the sabbatical applications or applications for professional leave for the Current candidates so the application can proceed in the review process, Keller seconded

1. Discussion:

Maxcy suggested that moving forward there need to be procedures or processes that provides guidance to the EAD. Nguyen added that research needed to be done to see what the administrative procedures have been and moving forward this should be a standing agenda item during the month preceding a decision due date. For proposed administrative procedures, Nguyen thought it would be beneficial to add in a program-level discussion around sabbatical/professional leaves.

Robison concurred.

- ii. Unanimous vote in favor
- iii. Maxcy moved that FABA revisit the issues of administrative procedures around sabbatical and professional leaves and come up with administrative procedures during a later date, Willey seconded
- iv. Unanimous vote in favor
- v. Maxcy moved that FABA recommends that the proposed sabbaticals be moved forward based on merit but with recommendations that the EAD consult with the fiscal director and program chair regarding covering of load and fiscal implications, Willey seconded
  - 1. Discussion:

Keller wanted clarification on whether sabbatical and professional leave were rights. Maxcy stated that university clearly states that it is not a right
- vi. Unanimous vote in favor

b. Distance technology fee/On-line fee

V. Agenda for December 2, 2015 meeting

Nguyen clarified new agenda items to include: three tabled discussions items under merit review procedures, administrative procedures for sabbatical and professional leave, take up the remaining new business of distance technology fee/On-line fee

Willey moves to adjourn, Maxcy seconded

Meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.