

Minutes for the Oct. 28, 2019 meeting of the BFC Faculty Affairs Committee

Members present: Israel Herrera, Jane McLeod, Karen Banks, Alan Bender, Kevin Fosnacht, Constance Cook Glen (for Paul Coats), Cody Kirkpatrick, Ted Miller, Cindy Smith, and Eliza Pavalko
Regrets: Alyce Fly and John Talbott

**Discussion of possible revisions to pages 10 and 11 of the BFC policy "Indiana University Bloomington Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion" <
<https://bfc.indiana.edu/doc/guidelines/PrinciplesPoliciesTenurePromotion.pdf> >**

Section on Tenure, Promotion and Performance Areas

Academic associate deans sent comments and questions regarding the following issues:

How difficult and unusual should it be to gain tenure or promotion based on a "balanced" case?

Relevant language from UFC policy ACA-38 < <https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-38-faculty-librarian-promotion/index.html> >: "In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university." That phrase "In exceptional cases" was added to the document in response.

Should the following section be modified, such as to state that contributions need to be "independent": "Granting tenure and/or promotion is a recognition that the faculty member will continue to achieve truly significant professional work in future years – original, innovative, influential, and consequential." Committee members decided that adding "independent" would not alter the meaning of the text.

Section on Teaching

Should "pedagogical leadership" be part of the criteria for evaluating the teaching of tenure-track faculty, as it currently is planned to be for evaluation of the teaching of senior lecturers?

What connotations are there for "pedagogical leadership"? Members noted that the term is used mainly in K-12 education, and is it used there mainly in the context of school principals?

Should "outstanding" be changed to "excellent" as the bar for the level of classroom teaching necessary to be judged "Very Good" and "Excellent" in Teaching?

Are the criteria for "Very Good" Teaching too stringent? Are the criteria for "Effective" Teaching too broad? Is it possible to be rated above "Effective" if one does not make significant contributions outside of the teaching of one's courses? As currently written, faculty members could not meet the standard for "very good" in teaching even if they were outstanding classroom instructors and had made important contributions to curriculum and instruction within their department. Committee members revised the text to clarify that contributions of national or international relevance were not necessary for a rating of "very good."

Could there be different definitions for cases based on Excellence in Research versus for balanced cases? The VPFAA argued strongly against allowing the evaluative criteria to be defined differently depending on the basis for tenure and promotion.

Could and should the two lists of broad instructional impact be pared and perhaps merged? Committee members agreed to remove the list from the “very good” section and, instead, refer to the list in the description of “excellent.”

Section on Service

What areas of service should be listed? Do they cover all relevant areas of service? The list was revised to be more all-encompassing.

Discussion of possible revisions to BL-ACA-A3 ("Bloomington Campus Policies For Non-Tenure-Track Instructional Appointments") < <https://vpfaa.indiana.edu/policies/bl-aca-a3-non-tenure-track-instructional-appointments/index.html> >

Some FAC members are interested in reviewing and revising that policy, especially toward exploring the possibility of having long-term contracts be five-years in length and rolling. Another possible revision could be to introduce new language about governance rights of NTT instructional faculty, such as language approved in a spring, 2019 BFC resolution < <https://bfc.indiana.edu/policies/statements-resolutions/recent/ntt-voting-rights.html> >.

Some FAC members are interested in the possibility of serving on an FAC subcommittee focused on proposing revisions to BL-ACA-A3.

Discussion of service of lecturers, senior lecturers, and teaching professors

Do some units currently expect service that is not directly in support of teaching?

Could most or all service expected of lecturers and senior lecturers in their units be construed as being in support of teaching?

What types of service are there, and which of those types could and should be recognized in what ways?

Could "service" and "research" be evaluative categories, but optional ones (for those units that wish to have them)? The VPFAA clarified that it is not possible to have optional areas of evaluation. All candidates within the same faculty position have to be evaluated according to the same areas.

Should UFC policy ACA-14 < <https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-14-classification-academic-appointments/index.html> > be revised, in terms of what it says about evaluative categories? Current language in that policy: "Lecturers/Teaching Professors may be assigned responsibility for teaching, and for research and service that supports teaching, in courses for which such assignments have been approved by the faculty of the academic unit."

Could this text be revised to read something like "service in support of the university's mission"? The VPFAA clarified that any such change would require UFC approval, and recommended consulting with the relevant members of the IUPUI faculty council.

There may be much to discuss and consider about the topic of service. What might be the best way to do so? The FAC will work toward creation of guidelines for promotion in the Teaching Professor/Lecturer and Clinical categories, such as those for tenure-track faculty in the "Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion" document.

