Report of the Ad Hoc Committee
to Review Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Charles Barman (co-chair), Larry Mikulecky,
Keith Morran (co-chair), Rob Toutkoushian, Enid Zimmerman

January 2005

The Ad Hoc Promotion and Tenure Committee was established due to a recommendation from the 2004 Promotion and Tenure Committee Report submitted in April, 2004 to the School of Education Policy Council.   The initial charge of this committee was to review promotion and tenure procedures for IUPUI. However, the committee members believe the following recommendations apply to both IU-B and IUPUI.

The Ad Hoc Committee focused its discussion on three main areas: (1) equity in how votes of the primary committee are reported, who has input into these decisions, and when that input occurs, (2) suggestions and guidelines for establishing who should make-up the primary committee when only a few qualified members exist, and (3) sharing promotion and tenure information between both campuses. The following are the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendations related to these areas.

Primary Committee Membership

- The primary committee should consist of a minimum of <u>five</u> faculty members.
- For tenure/associate professor decisions, the primary committee should include all tenured associate and full professors from the candidate's home campus department (minimum of three), plus a minimum of two tenured associate or full professors from the other campus (typically members of the candidate's program area or colleagues who are knowledgeable about the candidate's work).
- For promotion to full professor, the primary committee should include all full professors from the candidate's home campus department (minimum of three), plus a minimum of two full professors from the other campus (typically members of the candidate's program area or colleagues who are knowledgeable about the candidate's work).
- When the above guidelines result in fewer than five primary committee members, the University Dean or his/her designate should appoint an appropriate number of additional core campus faculty members to serve on the committee.
- Faculty serving on the School of Education's Promotion, Tenure and Contracts Committee should not participate in discussions or vote at the primary committee level. However, if a member of the P & T Committee has essential information about the candidate, this person should be allowed to provide information to the primary committee through oral or written communication formats.

Primary Committee Process

- One person from the primary committee should be appointed to present each candidate's case.
- A discussion on each criterion area (teaching, research and service) should take place prior to voting.
- Primary committee voting should include separate votes for the candidate's teaching, research, and service areas (categories include Excellent, Appreciably Better than Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory), plus a separate yes/no vote for tenure and/or promotion.
- The candidate's home campus department chairperson should prepare a brief report for the candidate's dossier that summarizes the primary committee's discussion, reports the voting results, and provides an explanation (to the extent possible) for abstentions or irregularities (e.g., a candidate who declares teaching as his/her area of excellence and receives one or more votes below excellent for teaching, yet also receives unanimous positive votes for tenure/promotion).

Format of Dossiers

- Expand the dossier checklist to include more specific guidelines for presentation of the candidate's materials (e.g., clearly indicate publications that count toward teaching, research, and service areas). Select exemplary models of tenure and promotion cases and make these available to all candidates and department chairs. Model dossiers could include the chair's letter, candidate's curriculum vita, candidate's statement, and an overview summarizing the candidate's teaching, research, and service.

Core Campus P & T Committee

- The sharing of dossiers between campuses limits the time each committee member can access documents. Therefore, it is proposed that a mechanism be created to make dossier materials more accessible. For example key documents in each dossier could be copied and made available on both campuses for committee members. Alternatively, a secure web site could be developed to make key documents from each candidate's dossier available to the P & T members 24/7. This information might include the candidate's vita, personal statement, external letters, and the chair's letter. As soon as the P & T committee votes on an individual case, this information would be destroyed.
- Sufficient secretarial or graduate assistant help should be provided to assist the committee with copying, maintaining a web site, etc.