

Minutes of the
Fourth Regular Meeting of the Thirty-Second Senate
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
December 10, 2012
12:00 P.M., Kettler G46

Agenda

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of November 12, 2012
3. Acceptance of the agenda – K. Pollock
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties
 - a. Indiana University – P. Dragnev
 - b. Purdue University – M. Nusbaumer
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – A. Downs
6. Committee reports requiring action
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document 12-3) – M. Dixon
 - b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-7) – M. Lipman
 - c. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD12-8) – M. Lipman
 - d. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-9) – M. Lipman
 - e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-10) – A. Argast
7. Question Time
 - a. (Senate Reference No. 12-9)
 - b. (Senate Reference No. 12-10)
8. New Business
9. Committee reports “for information only”
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Reference No. 12-11) – M. Lipman
10. The general good and welfare of the University
11. Adjournment*

*The meeting will adjourn or recess by 1:15 p.m.

Presiding Officer: A. Downs
Parliamentarian: J. Malanson
Sergeant-at-Arms: G. Steffen
Interim Secretary: M. Morgan

Attachment:

“Proposal to supersede SD 10-14 Faculty Workloads and Evaluation (SD 12-3)
“Proposal to ‘end’ current chancellor emeritus office” (SD 12-7)
“Faculty administrator compensation” (SD 12-8)
“Sabbaticals for administrators holding faculty rank” (SD 12-9)
“Change to the Audit Deadline” (SD 12-10)

No record of attendance.

Acta

1. Call to order: A. Downs called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.
2. Approval of the minutes of November 12, 2012: The minutes were approved as distributed.
3. Acceptance of the agenda:

K. Pollock moved to approve the agenda as distributed.

The agenda was approved as distributed.
4. Reports of the Speakers of the Faculties:
 - a. Indiana University:

M. Nusbaumer: Due to tape malfunction there is no report.
 - b. Purdue University:

P. Dragnev: Due to tape malfunction there is no report.
5. Report of the Presiding Officer – A. Downs:

A. Downs: Due to tape malfunction there is no report.
6. Committee reports requiring action:
 - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Document SD 12-3) – M. Dixon:

M. Dixon moved to approve Senate Document SD 12-3 (Faculty Workload Document).

Senate Document SD 12-3 was recommitted to the Faculty Affairs Committee.
 - b. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-7) – M. Lipman:

M. Lipman moved to approve Senate Document SD 12-7 (Proposal to “end” Current Chancellor Emeritus Office).

Senate Document SD 12-7 referred back to committee.

c. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-8) – M. Lipman:

M. Lipman moved to approve Senate Document SD 12-8 (Faculty Administrator Compensation).

Motion to approve passed by a voice vote.

d. University Resources Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-9) – M. Lipman:

M. Lipman moved to approve Senate Document SD 12-9 (Sabbaticals for Administrators Holding Faculty Rank).

Motion to approve passed by a voice vote.

e. Educational Policy Committee (Senate Document SD 12-10) – M. Lipman:

A. Argast moved to approve Senate Document SD 12-10 (Change to the Audit Deadline).

Motion to approve passed by a voice vote.

7. Question Time:

a. (Senate Reference No. 12-9):

Q: (For full question please see Senate Reference No. 12-9)

A. Downs: Moved to January

b. (Senate Reference No. 12-10):

Q: What are the numbers and percentages of employees from each major job category (tenure-track faculty, continuing lecturers, associate faculty, administrators, clerical and service) that have been eliminated at IPFW so far this year?

Michael Nusbaumer
Department of Sociology

S. Sarratore: Many such questions, the actual definition of terms is quite crucial to answering the question. Some of these positions have been kept open, frozen, but not eliminated. But I suspect, Mike that is not what you wished to know. I can tell you the faculty portion of this question. At this point, what I am prepared to tell you how many we had in this category last year, and how many we have this year.

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>
Tenure	319	317 (downturn of .6 percent)
Clinical faculty	24	20 (-16 percent)
Continuing Lectures	64	64
Visiting Faculty	23	27
LTL	450	432
Graduate Assistants	109	94 (-15 percent)

W. Branson: I can fill in some of the rest of the information. There are positions we are holding open, they have not been eliminated yet. When we start going over next year's budget we go through that process when we start actually striking lines through these budget things. But based on what we know today:

Admin and Professional: 326 (10.5 percent or 3.2 percent open)
 Clerical and Service: 342 (9 percent or 2.6 percent open)

8. New business: There was no new business.

9. Committee reports "for information only":

a. Faculty Affairs Committee (Senate Reference No. 12-11): – M. Dixon:

Senate Reference No. 12-11 (Faculty Workloads) was presented for information only.

10. The general good and welfare of the University:

M. Lipman: I do want to report a little bit on what the committee has been doing, in particular that we have been working very hard with the administration and they are looking to close some serious gaps. One of the things that the committee wanted me especially to report on is what is going on in the physical plant. Jay Harris has come up with a master plan in regards to the physical plant and one of the things that the URPC wanted to do publicly is to tell what he is trying to do. There are potential cuts in services, there are potential changes in the way we are going to do business, for example, and these things are necessary. We support the fact he is doing a very conscientious job and taking it seriously. One of the things that happens here, of course, is that we have a policy. One of the things we are dealing with is that people are leaving and their positions are just not being filled. A classic example is a reduction in mail delivery due to someone leaving the position. So some things are less controllable than others. We did want to endorse the efforts here.

A. Downs: There are two other folks who would like to comment. Peter?

P. Iadicola: Last week we had a wonderful celebration of the 21st anniversary of the founding of the College of Arts and Sciences and a speaker, a professor, Cary Nelson, spoke to us about the issue of academic freedom. After leaving the follow up discussion, I began to realize that there has been serious erosion that the faculty is beginning to feel at this university as well as at other universities in the state of Indiana. And this has to do here

with two major policy changes that have occurred. One has to do with the General Education program and the state playing a larger role in defining what “general education is” for all the universities in the state of Indiana. The other is the dual-credit program which basically shifts teaching to the high schools. The issue of academic freedom is in part an issue of scholarship. It is also an issue of curriculum, the faculty controlled curriculum. We are losing control of the curriculum at this university and at other universities around the state, and we need to basically take a position on why that should not occur. The more we allow the erosion of this right the more we delete the quality of this institution and the curriculum, and the scholarship in which our faculty is engaged in. In the spring, I will be bringing forth a proposal in which we study specifically what are the actual limitations of the authority of the Indiana Commission of Higher Education and the legislature of the state of Indiana and the governor as it pertains to the curriculum of this university and the issue of academic freedom. It is something that we should all become very much aware of and realize that we are the faculty of these institutions and have a responsibility to basically save the curriculum and the academic freedom of the faculty who will follow us in the years to come.

A. Livschiz: I have nothing to say after this, but I would like clarification on the issues regarding the Faculty Workloads and Evaluation proposal. Was there anything actually in it that we changed?

M. Dixon: There was nothing that was revised in the first part, and the part that was revised the first time was just cutting the language, but everyone was happy with the old document.

A. Schwab: Bill Breening is having a retirement party today at 3:00, for those of you who know him; he has been around longer than the College of Arts and Sciences.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Marilyn Morgan
Interim Secretary of the Faculty

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee of Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Marcia Dixson, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: November 6, 2012

SUBJECT: Faculty Workload Document – Take 2

DISPOSITION: To the presiding officer for implementation

WHEREAS, there were significant concerns about SD 10-14 Faculty Workloads and Evaluation; and

WHEREAS, the bylaws of the senate state that “tenure, academic promotion, . . . academic responsibilities, standards of appointment, and Faculty morale are topics which fall within the area of responsibility of the [Faculty Affairs] Committee” (Senate Bylaws, 5.3.2); and

WHEREAS, there were inconsistencies between SD 10-14 Faculty Workloads and Evaluations and Promotion and Tenure Criteria, particular in regards to 2a) and b) allowing faculty to choose not to have a research release/expectation; and

WHEREAS, Purdue paid faculty have moved from 10 month to 9 month appointments; and

WHEREAS, no guidelines regarding faculty overload existed and this has become relevant to faculty in recent years;

BE IT RESOLVED, the Fort Wayne Senate approves the attached document to supersede SD 10-14 Faculty Workloads and Evaluation.

Workloads and Evaluation for Faculty with Professorial Rank

A faculty member of the professorial ranks is expected to be engaged in the processes of Scholarship, ~~(the acquisition, discovery, appraisal, dissemination of knowledge and creative endeavor)~~, Teaching, ~~(communication of this knowledge and the manner of its acquisition or discovery to their immediate community of students and scholars, to their profession, and to society at large, and making student learning possible)~~ or in the case of librarians, Performance of Librarianship duties, and Service. ~~to the institution (department, college, university), the profession, the community, the state, the nation and/or the world.~~ Faculty have responsibility for the shared governance of the university because the university is a collegial institution and administration exists to enforce the will of the professoriate.

~~The IPFW faculty recognize that Scholarship, Teaching and Service are not mutually exclusive. Scholarship is a broad category incorporating activities from creative endeavor, disciplinary research (subject specific research), scholarship of teaching and learning (using a range of research methods, from reflection about classroom practices based on systematic observation to the application of research methods, for investigation of teaching and learning) and the scholarship of engagement (a scholarly agenda that incorporates community issues).~~

Within the trajectory of a faculty member's career or because of departmental needs, there may be times when it is desirable or necessary to vary the distribution of an individual's workload. The responsibility for workload assignment resides with the department chair or program director in reasonable consultation with the dean.

IPFW shall practice the following policy on faculty workloads and evaluation:

Workloads

The standard faculty teaching workload at IPFW *during the academic year* is the equivalent of ~~to~~ four three-hour lecture courses *per semester*. This equivalence shall be defined by each department in consultation with the appropriate dean and consistent with university policy. At the time of their initial appointment, unless otherwise provided in writing, tenure-track faculty will teach the equivalent of three three-hour lecture courses each semester and will receive the equivalent of one three-hour lecture course of released time for pursuit of scholarship. There is an expectation of service to department, college and university as part of shared governance of the university.

After the award of tenure and promotion, a faculty member shall continue with the equivalent of three three-hour lecture courses each semester, execution of a scholarly research program, and service to the institution.

If a workload adjustment is necessary or desirable, and a faculty teach four three-hour lecture courses in a semester, there remains an expectation of scholarly activity and service to the institution. However, the expectation of scholarly activity will be modified.

Changes in faculty teaching workload must occur through discussions between faculty and department chair in consultation with ~~the appropriate dean~~ *appropriate administrators*.

~~Summer Workload~~ Summer Teaching

~~Academic faculty are 9-month (Purdue benefited) or 10-month (IU benefited) appointments.~~

One three hour course during the summer semester is equivalent to one month effort during an academic year. ~~one-ninth of the standard academic year load.~~

12 Month Faculty

~~Faculty changing from a 9-month appointment to a 12-month appointment should receive salary commensurate with conversion from 9 to 12 months.~~

Overload

While overload assignments may be a good way to address short term needs in dynamic changes of curriculum, they should not be used as a substitute for new tenure-track lines. A faculty with research reduction ~~that~~ who accepts an overload assignment is expected to maintain the same level of research and service activity.

Evaluation

Each department should establish annual evaluation criteria for teaching, scholarship and service effectiveness consistent with department promotion and tenure criteria. The evaluation criteria should be filed with the appropriate dean and the OAA. The OAA shall make these documents publicly available on the OAA website.

Teaching, service and progress in scholarship shall be reflected in annual evaluation commentary and salary increments. Expectations for faculty shall be clearly articulated so that faculty know what is expected of them and how evaluation will take place.

Every effort should be made to equitably reflect and reward each faculty member's contribution to the university community.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Marcia Dixson, Chair
Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: February 26, 2013

SUBJECT: Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document

DISPOSITION: To the Executive Committee for inclusion in the next senate meeting

WHEREAS, There are three senate documents governing Promotion and Tenure criteria (SD 88-25, SD 94-3, and SD 05-12 [Librarians]) and one commentary (on SD 88-25);

WHEREAS, These documents are not wholly in agreement;

WHEREAS, Faculty Affairs Committee was asked to synthesize these documents into one document;

WHEREAS, once that was accomplished, feedback was solicited from faculty and incorporated into the new document,

BE IT RESOLVED, the Fort Wayne Senate approve the attached document, *IPFW Criteria for Tenure and Promotion* to supersede SD 88-25 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure, SD 94-3 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and SD 05-12 Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Librarians.

IPFW CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The most important decisions of the faculty of a university are in respect to the permanent composition of the faculty centered around tenure and promotion. With tenure, faculty receive the opportunity to teach, study, and serve for the duration of their professional career in a community which protects academic freedom, provides adequate material rewards, and encourages intellectual growth. The university, for its part, benefits from the confident and disciplined pursuit of excellence undertaken by tenured faculty.

Tenure is awarded on the basis of Teaching (communication of knowledge and the manner of its acquisition or discovery to the immediate community of students and scholars, the profession, and society at large, or in the case of librarians performance of librarianship duties; enabling student learning), Scholarship (the acquisition, discovery, appraisal and dissemination of knowledge and creative endeavor), and Service to the institution (including department, college and university), the profession, and the community at large.

The decision to grant tenure must depend in part on what has been achieved in teaching, scholarship, and service, and, to a greater degree, on what the candidate can reasonably be expected to achieve in these areas in the future. The granting of tenure then results from positive university action rather than a legal obligation or a reward; tenure can be acquired only as a result of positive action. In contrast to tenure, promotion in rank is more heavily dependent upon evidence of professional achievement. Considerations of promise of continued development and the candidate's contribution to the particular mission of her/his unit are also important, but less crucial. The application of criteria in promotion decisions provides evidence of the university's values and the seriousness with which they are applied. Promotions measure, reward, and inspire accomplishment.

Both promotion and tenure decisions are recognition of an engaged teacher committed to enhancing student learning, an engaged scholar committed to advancing his/her discipline and/or academia, and an engaged university citizen committed to faculty governance as well as professional and/or community service.

Favorable action shall result when the individual has demonstrated, in one area of endeavor, a level of excellence appropriate to the proposed rank and competence in the other two areas. Failure to promote may arise, however, from unsatisfactory performance in any area. Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon actual performance and the potential for continued professional growth.

Promotion and tenure criteria should be viewed as guidelines for faculty development and faculty workload. Each department will develop a promotion and tenure policy of its own, setting criteria for excellence and satisfactory achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service. The policy should define what the department means by "teaching," "scholarship," and "service" and list activities and achievements properly associated with those terms, along with quantitative and/or qualitative standards by which they may be judged.

The department policy should be consistent in content and criteria for quality with those governing promotion and tenure in comparable departments at other universities. The policy must also be consistent with applicable college, campus and Purdue University or Indiana University system criteria for promotion and tenure.

The IPFW faculty recognize that Teaching, Scholarship, and Service are not mutually exclusive. Scholarship is a broad category incorporating activities from disciplinary research, creative endeavor, scholarship of teaching and learning (using a range of research methods, from reflection about classroom practices based on systematic observation to the application of research methods for investigation of teaching and learning) and the scholarship of engagement (a research agenda that incorporates community issues). Faculty are expected to be engaged in scholarship, teaching, and service.

A. Criteria for Tenure in the Professorial Ranks

Tenure at any rank is based upon a record of engaged teaching, scholarship, and service at IPFW.

Exceptional circumstances for tenure without promotion as an assistant professor

The award of tenure at the end of the probationary period as an assistant professor is linked to promotion. Both Indiana and Purdue Universities recognize that in exceptional circumstances these decisions may not be made at the same time. A recommendation to award tenure without promotion is based upon evidence of:

1. a record of engaged teaching, scholarship and service,
2. the likelihood of promotion to associate professor in the near future, and
3. the unusual importance of the individual's contribution to the university.

Cases for tenure in these exceptional circumstances must address each of these points.

B. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Instructor

A tenured instructor who has established a record of excellence in teaching and continued satisfactory achievement in the other duties (as listed below) is eligible for promotion to Senior Instructor.

1. A high level of teaching performance (as attested to by such traditional measures of classroom instruction as student and peer evaluations, results of common examinations, review of classroom materials and student work, contributions to curricular development, and teaching awards).
2. A record of satisfactory achievement in service, particularly service related to teaching.
3. Other activities that support teaching, demonstrate a consistent pattern of professional growth, establish connections with professional peers in the region or nation, and maintain currency with pedagogic developments elsewhere (as attested to by such activities as the design and analysis of instructional innovations, presentations at conferences and workshops, or writing for publication).

C. Criteria for Promotion within the Professorial Ranks

1. Teaching or Librarianship

An engaged faculty member is one who displays a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads him/her to develop and strengthen course content as well as to improve student learning. IPFW faculty are expected to be engaged professors who demonstrate a significant commitment to the education of IPFW students.

If teaching is the primary basis for promotion to associate professor, the candidate should guide and inspire students and stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm. In addition to establishing a record of excellent teaching performance, a candidate for promotion to professor based on excellence in teaching should also have contributed to the general improvement of instruction. This may be manifested in many forms including, but not limited to, pedagogical publications, presentations, curricular developments, and scholarship that enhances student learning.

The equivalent to teaching for librarians is librarianship which must be their area of excellence. Therefore, librarians are expected to make contributions toward the library's and university's mission and/or goals and strive to improve performance and knowledge to provide quality services.

Evidence to support the documentation of teaching or librarianship should represent multiple measures.

2. Scholarship

An engaged faculty member is expected to establish a long-term program of scholarship. Scholarship is a broad category incorporating activities from disciplinary research, creative endeavor, scholarship of teaching and learning, or scholarship of engagement. This work should reach and be favorably acknowledged by an audience that extends beyond the campus. Faculty are expected to be current in their discipline and to share their expertise with peers at IPFW and other institutions.

If scholarship is the primary basis for promotion to associate professor, the candidate should have demonstrated substantial achievement beyond the terminal degree. If scholarship is the primary basis for promotion to professor, the candidate's work should have gained recognition at the national and/or international level.

Evidence to support the evaluation of scholarship should represent multiple measures.

3. Service

An engaged faculty member is expected to take an active role in the campus beyond teaching and scholarship or creative endeavor; they must participate in institutional service and are encouraged to contribute their expertise to the community, state, and nation and to participate in service to professional organizations. If service is the primary basis for promotion, it should represent a consistent and long-term pattern of important service activities or an extraordinary achievement of special value to the campus, community, or profession.

Individual members of the Faculty should provide evidence of service adequate to enable its fair assessment.

Policies should also take into account the possibility that certain service activities may overlap with activities in the other two areas.

To: IPFW Senate

From: Marc Lipman, Chair
University Resources Policy Committee

Date: November 20, 2012

Re: Faculty administrator compensation

Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

URPC recommends that the following resolution be approved by the Fort Wayne Senate:

WHEREAS, administrators holding faculty rank are in fact members of the faculty; and

WHEREAS, faculty holding administrative rank do not have tenure as administrators;

BE IT RESOLVED, that, administrators holding academic rank be paid both with suitable compensation which remains attached to the administrative position, and a normal faculty salary which is attached to the individual faculty member. In particular, no administrator holding faculty rank should be compensated solely as an administrator. This policy endorses current IPFW practice.

To: IPFW Senate

From: Marc Lipman, Chair
University Resources Policy Committee

Date: November 20, 2012

Re: Sabbaticals for administrators holding faculty rank

Disposition: To the Presiding Officer for Implementation

URPC recommends that the following resolution be approved by the Fort Wayne Senate:

WHEREAS, administrators who hold faculty rank are eligible for sabbatical leaves as faculty members; and,

WHEREAS, sabbaticals are, by definition, granted to advance IPFW's academic mission;

BE IT RESOLVED, that, administrators who hold faculty rank should henceforth follow the normal faculty process to be granted a sabbatical, and have the normal faculty obligations attached to taking a sabbatical.

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Educational Policy Committee
Anne Argast, Chair

DATE: Nov. 14, 2012

SUBJ: Change to the Audit Deadline

DISPOSITION: To the presiding officer for implementation

WHEREAS, changing course enrollment from credit to audit status is an important decision,

WHEREAS, a change from credit to audit status reduces the number of enrolled credits in a semester,

WHEREAS, a student on federal financial aid enrolled in fewer than 6 credits during a semester must begin repayment of loans,

WHEREAS, a student on federal financial aid who changes from credit to audit must repay the money provided by the financial aid to originally enroll in the course,

WHEREAS, the University is required to monitor changes in enrollment status and implement the rules governing federal loans,

WHEREAS, currently the University is not in full compliance with the law,

BE IT RESOLVED, that Academic Regulation 3.8.4: Change of auditing option be amended as indicated below:

Old

3.8.4: Change of auditing option. A student may alternate between audit and credit status during an academic session. A change from audit to credit or credit to audit may occur only during the first six weeks. Changes of auditing status require the signature or written acknowledgment from the course instructor and academic advisor next to the appropriate notation on the schedule-revision form.

New

3.8.4: Change of auditing option. A student may alternate between audit and credit status during an academic session. A change from audit to credit or credit to audit may occur only during the first six weeks. The regular audit deadline is the Friday ending the first week of class. The late

audit deadline is the Friday ending the sixth week of class. Approval of a regular change of auditing status in the first week of class requires a signature or written acknowledgment from the student's advisor and a representative from the Financial Aid Office (when applicable). Approval of a late change in auditing status during weeks two through six requires a signature or written acknowledgment from the course instructor, academic advisor and a representative from the Financial Aid Office (when applicable).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that appropriate session-equivalent deadlines be used for the summer sessions,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Office of the Registrar and the Financial Aid Office be asked to develop appropriate forms and implement as soon as practical procedures for administering the new deadlines to change Audit status.