

MEMO

To: John Ross
President, IU Kokomo Faculty Senate

Christopher Darr
Secretary, IU Kokomo Faculty Senate

From: Ria Lukes
Chair, IUK All-Campus Promotion & Tenure Committee

Date: March 30, 2009

Re: 2008-2009 IU Kokomo All-Campus P&T Committee Report

The 2008-2009 IU Kokomo All-Campus Promotion & Tenure Committee met on five occasions during the period October 21, 2008 to December 1, 2008. During these meetings the committee reviewed P&T procedure, discussed and voted on five cases for tenure and/or promotion and prepared recommendation letters for candidate dossiers..

The committee's review of dossiers was guided by the criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*, the *IUK Academic Affairs Handbook*, and other documents that applied to particular cases (i.e. clinical rank and library faculty). Recommendation letters and progress reports were delivered to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on December 3, 2008.

The committee from the previous year had raised the question about placing a signature on each individual voting sheet. Through acclimation the committee chose to continue this practice.

Steve Sarratore, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, was present as an ex-officio member at the organizational meeting and dossier deliberation meetings. The Faculty Senate bylaws allow for the presence of the VCAA in P&T Committee meetings. The VCAA was only allowed to answer procedural questions and did not verbally participate in committee dossier deliberations.

President Ross, in conjunction with IT, created a shared drive specifically for P&T committee members. The Chair placed appropriate documents on the shared drive including past annual reports (that could be found in an electronic version), letter

templates and a roster of committee members. During the process draft letters for 2008-2009 candidates were posted. Those letters will be removed at the end of the academic year so they are not seen by the members of the next committee.

The previous committee had requested the Faculty Senate President address the following problem: [from 2007-2008 annual report]

“A procedural decision made, and documented in the All-Campus P&T Guidelines manual, on how to handle a promotion and/or tenure committee recommendation letter when one or more committee members refuse to sign the letter even though they were part of the review and discussion of the dossier, because they hold the minority opinion. The precedent followed for several years is that the recommendation letter is written to show the actual vote plus comments that supports the majority opinion. Should a dissenting letter be allowed in the dossier when a committee member strongly disagrees with the written statements of the majority opinion? This has question has been raised the last two times I have been chair. I have always stated that only one letter should be allowed, but it would be nice to have it as part of the procedure/guidelines.”

This issue was not resolved prior to the start of the committee work. At the organizational meeting the committee members decided to follow the precedent that the recommendation letter show the actual vote and that the comments be written in support of the majority opinion. During the committee deliberations this decision was called in to question by one committee member.

The IUK All-Campus Promotion & Tenure Committee held a meeting on February 17, 2009 to discuss a document in front of the University Faculty Council titled *Joint Faculty/Administrative P&T Committee Recommendation on Promotion & Tenure Procedures on Indiana University Campuses*. At the same time we discussed the concerns relating to the document titled *President's Memo on Notification of Promotion and Tenure Recommendations*. As a result of this meeting a document was drafted stating the committee members concern about the documents. The document was forwarded on February 20, 2009, to the Faculty Senate President, John Ross, and the University Faculty Council Representative, Karl Besel.

The document reads:

The All-Campus Promotion & Tenure Committee held a meeting on February 17, 2009 to discuss a document in front of the University Faculty Council titled *Joint Faculty/Administrative P&T Committee Recommendation on Promotion & Tenure Procedures on Indiana University Campuses*. At the same time we discussed the concerns relating to the document titled *President's Memo on Notification of Promotion and Tenure Recommendations*.

The committee members are aware that the President's memo was informational and not up for UFC vote, but found the memo to be very disturbing to the Kokomo campus. Ria Lukes told the committee that President McRobbie stated in the previous UFC meeting that this was not a change in procedure, but rather a formalized record of what is actually happening. The committee members contend that this does indeed change the actions of the campus chancellor and is not what the Kokomo campus had followed in the past. The Kokomo P&T calendar clearly states that the Chancellor notifies the candidate of the Chancellor's decision by March 15 *in writing*. This memo indicates that there is now a "super executive group" that works as an anonymous group—i.e. in case of a negative decision the candidate will not know if the negative decision came from the Chancellor, the Executive Vice President or the President. The Committee states that tenure is owned by the campus and it is essential that the Chancellor has an individual vote, and that the individual decision is sent in writing to the candidate. The Committee also states that it is essential in these potentially "life-changing" tenure decisions that the Chancellor be accountable for his/her recommendation. Committee members stated that if this executive group decision replaces the current procedure, there will be no transparency with P&T decisions at or above the level of the Chancellor, lending an atmosphere of secrecy that is undesirable. There was also concern about a presidential memo that changed the P&T process in mid-stream of the P&T annual process for this academic year. This break in written procedure could result in procedural concerns brought forward to the Faculty Board of Review.

In regards to the P&T procedural document that is up for UFC voting:

The committee members are also concerned that this has not been widely distributed and discussed at the Kokomo campus. There were numerous concerns about the document. The document will clearly negatively impact smaller campuses. The committee was not in disagreement with the entire document. However, the committee is requesting that Kokomo go on record asking for the document vote to be tabled and more time given for a thorough analysis. Some of this document will cause future hardship and should not be rushed. The joint group that developed this document has been active for over

a year. The committee members I think faculty groups deserve additional time to review and make reasonable recommendations.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Copy: Susan Hendricks
Kathryn Holcomb
Kasem Kasem
Nadene Keene
David Rink
Michael Tulley