

MEMO

To: Marilyn Kintzele
President, IUK Faculty Senate

Scott Jones
Secretary, IUK Faculty Senate

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

Date: April 30, 2008

Re: 2007-2008 IUK All-Campus P&T Committee Report

The 2007-2008 IUK All-Campus Promotion & Tenure Committee met on four occasions during the period October 29, 2007 to December 10, 2007. During these meetings the committee reviewed P&T procedure, discussed and voted on two cases for promotion to associate rank with tenure and two cases for promotion to senior lecturer. A discussion on a fifth case was suspended when the dossier was withdrawn from consideration.

The committee's review of dossiers was guided by the criteria for promotion and tenure set forth in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* and the *IUK Academic Affairs Handbook*. Recommendation letters and progress reports were delivered to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs on December 10, 2007.

Recommendation letter templates were revised and approved by the committee members.

The committee requests that the Faculty Senate President address the following items prior to the first meeting of the 2008-2009 IUK All-Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee meeting:

1. Investigate the history of the signed voting form the committee is required to use. What document has stated that individual voting sheets must be signed? Should the individual vote be anonymous?
2. Suggest that the Faculty Senate revise all documentation to reflect use of IU Kokomo rather than IUK. When the committee writes a recommendation letter IUK is still used since that is the official name of the Faculty Senate committee.

3. 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 in support of 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.
4. Request the department of Information Technology create a shared drive for the P&T Committee so that P&T procedural documents, such as sample letters, can be stored and shared. The Faculty Senate President should be the administrator of the file. The administrator will be responsible for changing access each year to current members of the P&T Committee.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments.

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