Possible Agenda Committee Items for 2004-2005 PC

Faculty Affairs Committee
- This discussion has led to several questions about the role of clinical faculty that have emerged as the number of clinical faculty has grown within the School of Education. FAC will submit to Policy Council a summary of its discussions on clinical faculty merit review and a recommendation that Policy Council conduct a broad examination of the role of clinical faculty in the School of Education during the 2004-2005 academic year.
- At the request of the Dean's Office, the Faculty Affairs Committee has examined the issue of granting course release time to faculty for supervision of student teachers. The committee members discussed this issue during several meetings during the spring 2004 semester. FAC also received brief written input from the Committee on Teacher Education when they forwarded the issue to FAC for consideration. FAC is in the process of finalizing guidelines on faculty release time for student teacher supervision and will forward these guidelines to Policy Council in the near future.
- (Michele) Also discussion during PC meeting to examine whether or not the faculty work load policy is being implemented and whether or not chairs are using this policy to their discretion.

LRPC Recommendations
The LRPC takes the position that (1) there should be both effort and resources focused to remove barriers and reap more benefits of a core campus for both students and faculty, and that (2) the results of this investment should be reviewed after a designated period (e.g., 2 years).

IF the decision is to pursue the ideal/to realize the potential of a core campus arrangement, THEN the LRP offers a limited number of specific recommendations that we deem vital to this end. This is followed by a longer list of possible activities that might also move toward more authentic and effective operation of the core campus.

1. The dean should designate an individual whose prime responsibility is to foster and implement the core campus ideal.

   a. This should not be a permanent position, but one with a limited term, after which its efficacy should be evaluated.
   b. There should be significant released time associated with the position.
   c. There should be some resources associated with the position so that he/she can support the building of effective core campus functioning.
   d. This person should oversee the implementation of the short list of recommendations (2-8 below) and, as time permits, foster the secondary recommendations of the committee (see Table 1).

2. Begin to eliminate structural barriers of the core campus for students.
   a. Work to bring resolution to the current ambiguity concerning human subjects protocols, and communicate the resulting policy to all faculty, departments, and offices working with graduate education.
   b. Devise and implement a mechanism to eliminate payment of double fees by students enrolled on multiple campuses during a single semester.
   c. Convene a meeting of relevant staff and faculty to develop a protocol for facilitating cross-campus course authorizations.
   d. Clarify residency requirements and establish whether there are expectation for specific campus residency beyond the "core"

3. Begin to eliminate structural barriers of the core campus for faculty.
   a. In all discussions about promotion and tenure, highlight the composition of "primary committees" so that all candidates understand that their primary committee is likely to include members from both Bloomington and Indianapolis. (See http://www.indiana.edu/~soedean/primarycommitteemembership.html).

     b.   Modify the promotion and tenure process to better reflect different campus cultures and the reality that tenure is campus specific. One solution would be for IUPUI to have its own "unit committee" (which would also result in a Bloomington-only unit committee for candidates based at IUB). See comments from Promotion, Tenure, and Contracts Committee.

4. Develop a strategy to foster inter campus collaboration of staff from the Deans' suites. Staff from the Dean's offices in Bloomington and Indianapolis should meet regularly in person to coordinate (a) a master calendar [IUPUI + IUB], (b) search & screen activities (see 5 below), (c) promotion and tenure activities, and (d) general communication and coordination.

5. Revisit the composition of key and ancillary committees. Token representation on committees is not constructive when the committee agenda pertains to a single campus.
     a.   Review the mandate for IUPUI membership to consider different mechanisms for input/more authentic participation. For example, each committee could be expected to have a core campus element *or* parallel committees might function on each campus with periodic communication between chairs (along the lines of IUB's Teacher Education Council and IUPUI's Committee on Teacher Education.).
     b.   It may be appropriate to expand membership on some committees that do not currently have participants for both IUB *and* IUPUI.
     c.   It is vital to orient both chairs and ex officio members (and GA recorders or secretarial staff) about the importance of developing sensitivity to the core campus. (Additional recommendations for more effective committee functioning are included in #3 in Table 1 below).

6. Develop a core campus recruitment protocol. Many respondents indicated that visiting both campuses during their initial interview played a crucial role in helping them develop a "core campus mindset" and to understand that there were colleagues, students, and opportunities in two very different locations. (And, naturally, they also learned early some of the challenges that accompany the opportunities!) Since the recruitment and selection of new colleagues is a central aspect of faculty work, it is important to "make the core campus work" during the search and screen process.
     a.   At a minimum, it is important to assure that both campuses are utilized in the recruitment process.
     b.   We should establish expectations regarding visits to both campuses.

7. Review all School, departmental, and committee list serves to assure full representation across the core campus.
     a.   All IUPUI faculty members should be on the departmental distribution lists/list servs of the relevant IUB department.
     b.   Each IUB chair (and other faculty members as they may express interest) should be included on IUPUI distribution list/listservs.

8. Review informational materials to assure mutual recognition and discussion of both common and unique opportunities.
     a.   It is vital to cross-reference faculty directories
     b.   Web pages should build relevant links beyond each campus' SOE "home page"

Promotion and Tenure Committee

In the context of the questions raised and issued posed during this year's deliberations, the Committee offers some gentle recommendations. Most are directed to department chairs and others helping candidates prepare the dossiers, though several address more basic questions of policy or practice.

1.   <u>Reporting the vote of the primary committee</u>. There is tremendous variability in how votes taken by primary committees are reported. For example, sometimes the number of tenured faculty who did not return ballots/were not present to vote is noted while in other cases it is not; sometimes a chair is noted as

abstaining, while other times he/she is not included in the count of those eligible to vote. We encourage all primary committees to report vote counts based on "those eligible to vote."

The following are *not* eligible to vote and so are not included in the primary committee count:
- Department chair [who contributes his/her vote and assessment in a separate letter]
- Other administrators who will review case and whose academic appointment might reside in the candidate's department.

Members of the SOE unit committee (aka "Promotion, Tenure, & Contracts Committee") typically refrain from voting in primary committees and instead exercise their vote in the unit committee; consequently, they are not typically counted among "those eligible to vote" on a particular primary case.

Individuals who do not exercise the opportunity to vote [failure to return ballot] should be noted and counted.

Abstentions should be recorded. Abstentions are interpreted as abstentions, not as disguised versions or a "yes" or "no" vote. Faculty are encouraged to cast informed ballots that express their position on a case. Simply saying one is 'not familiar' with the work of a colleague is not acceptable except under unusual circumstances.

Prior to presenting the case to the primary committee, chairs are encouraged to draw up and verify a list of primary committee members for every candidate. Virtually all primary committees will include members from both IUB and IUPUI. (See http://www.indiana.edu/~soedean/primarycommitteemembership.html)

2. Standard format for reporting course evaluations. Candidates are encouraged to devise some logical way of summarizing of course evaluation data in the dossier. It is neither helpful nor appropriate to include raw data (CEQs completed by individual respondents). Course evaluations should not simply be collected; they should be analyzed and reflected upon. Whether data is clustered by course, by level (grad v. undergraduate), or by academic year will depend on how the candidate is making his/her case. The committee encourages an inclusive summary of course evaluation data for *all* tenure cases *and* for those seeking promotion based on teaching excellence.

3. Clarify what types of evidence strengthen a dossier making a case based on teaching excellence. Though the School and University guidelines provide a general sense of evidence that might make a case for excellence in teaching, it seems helpful to clarify the content of a teaching dossier. The Committee encourages the following types of evidence:

- Candidate's philosophy of teaching or some clear reflection on pedagogical approach, student work, changes in syllabi across time, etc.
- External evaluations of syllabi and assignments [which reflects a logical requirement that these materials have been sent out for review]
- Student work, along with candidate feedback on that work/reflections on the assignment.
- External evaluations of teaching [to include, but not be limited to, observations by individuals who team teach with the candidate] and to include multiple observations [more than one class, more than one semester] accompanied by candidate reflection.
- A summary of course evaluations for the period under consideration. (This should be complete and represent all courses for which the candidate was responsible.) Candidate reflection on this data certainly would be appropriate. Comments solicited from a random sample of current/former students. (See 4 below)
- Teaching-related publications and some assessment of the impact of those publications

There *are* models for building a teaching case, and it would be helpful to disseminate these more broadly.

4. <u>Student letters</u>. When a dossier includes letters from current or former students (and most will), it should also include a process description of who solicited letters and how students were selected. In is inappropriate to limit the pool to individuals nominated by the candidate.

5. <u>Dossier presentation</u>. Simply put, most dossiers are too big. Rather than presenting two file drawers' of material for review, candidates are encouraged to organize material into 2 or 3 large binders that are indexed to the promotion and tenure checklist.

6. <u>Multi-authored publications (including grant applications)</u>. When a vita includes collaborate and multi-authored works, then the dossier should indicate and verify the extent and nature of the contributions of various participants. There are various ways this might be done (e.g., having the candidate describe relative contributions and then inviting collaborators to verify; soliciting information for co-authors directly). While it is reasonable to report a % of effort, it may be more helpful to have some sense of the *nature* of each individual's contributions.

If a co-author is one of the candidate's students, special care should be taken to describe the *circumstances* of the collaboration (was it a master's project or dissertation? Was it an outgrowth of a class assignment?) as well as the *nature* of contributions.

7. <u>Candidate statements</u>. Candidates are encouraged to develop clear and thoughtful statements of 12-15 pages in length. (One statement this year was 30+ pages.) The chair (or his/her designee) should work with the candidate to develop the case and verify that the candidate's statement is in line with the evidence provided.

As candidates describe their research, they are encouraged to consider visual representations (concept maps, other visual schematics) that might help readers grasp of the connectedness of their program.

8. <u>Chair's letter</u>. The chair's letter is a critical item in a candidate's dossier. As they develop their letter, chairs are encouraged to:

- Clarify for those outside the department the context in which the candidate operates. This will likely include things that someone close to the situation may take for granted but which may be different than colleagues situated elsewhere in the institution (e.g., nature of practicum or internship responsibilities and expectations, place of candidate's courses in larger program, and the like).
- Include a clear statement re: any course buyout, stopping of the tenure clock, or changes from standard teaching load that occurred during the period under review.
- Address directly any negative information or problems that might be associated with the case (e.g., complaints in student letters, unsupportive external peer reviews, apparent lacunae in productivity, changes in focus, etc.)

9. <u>Differences across the core campus</u>. The Committee this year struggled with how to apply the SOE guidelines across "the core campus." We debated whether to take into account the campus context (especially vis-à-vis candidates at IUPUI) or whether our role was the uniform application of a standard to candidates from two *very* different environments with different missions, values, and expectations. The nature and magnitude of the differences raise natural questions of whether the current "unit committee" structure it is fair to candidates at IUPUI. Several members of the committee wondered whether it were time to consider a separate committee for IUPUI or a significant modification of the unit committee structure for candidates whose tenure is based in Indianapolis.

Committee on Teaching

Peer Evaluation of Teaching. One of the ongoing tasks of the COT has been to review what other universities have been doing regarding evaluating teaching on their campus. Because many universities, including the IUPUI campus, are now using some form of peer evaluation in addition to a standardized measure, the COT decided to explore this topic in some depth. Although no specific decisions have been reached, contact with various groups concerned with improving teaching (FACET, Scholarship on Teaching, Center for Professional Development at IUPUI) have been made and the procedures they are using are being studied.

Partnerships and Outreach

Based on the aims of the Task Force and the data we have gathered, we offer three major recommendations:
1. Make changes in the SOE's culture for public service,
2. Create a SOE office to foster partnerships and outreach, and
3. Create a Policy Council standing committee for partnerships and outreach.