

DRAFT FOR CONSIDERATION BY CAMPUSES
March 13, 2009

PRINCIPLES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

A. Faculty Review Committees for Tenure and Tenure-Track Faculty and Librarians

1. At least one-third of the members of each campus-wide faculty review committee should be faculty with Professor or Librarian rank.
2. Only faculty who ~~are have been awarded~~ tenured and ~~hold have~~ at least the rank being applied for ~~may associate rank should~~ serve on campus-wide tenure and promotion committees for tenure-eligible faculty cases.
3. All committee votes on all review committees should be reported as the number of yes-no-abstain votes. There should be no absentee voting or ballots on campus-wide review committees.
4. In deliberative stages of review (such as promotion and tenure committees and faculty meetings at which the candidate is formally evaluated), only those faculty members who fully participate in the deliberations should be eligible to vote on promotion and tenure. Only those faculty participating fully in the contemporaneous evaluation meeting and consequential discussions should be eligible to vote. Full participation may include This does not preclude committee members' participation through interactive technology such as video- or tele-conferencing. The faculty and administrator responsible for the initial consideration of the candidate's dossier may adopt a policy that permits individual exceptions to full participation for good cause. Such a policy must require, at a minimum, that the reason for absence be expressly stated, that participation would create undue hardship for the absent individual, and that the absence is approved by the department chair. The total number of absentee votes at each deliberative stage shall be recorded in the candidate's dossier.
5. On all review committees, each committee member, voting on or taking part in deliberations regarding a case, should have access to all the materials in the dossier.
6. An administrator may make a recommendation or vote only once on any given case.
7. A faculty member can participate in deliberations in only one level per candidate. He or she must recuse himself or herself from participating at any other level.
8. Each level of review is a critical component of the review process. Each level should have access to the previous levels' assessments.

9. Committee deliberations are confidential matters and should not be opened up, or communicated, to others outside the promotion and tenure process, except as required by law or university procedures.
10. At all levels of review, the recommendation and its rationale should be clearly communicated to both the candidate and subsequent levels of review. Recommendations should be clear and explicitly based on the dossier.
11. ~~Campuses should develop guidelines for the membership of evaluation committees at the unit, school, or college level that ensure appropriate representation, with consideration of such factors as tenure, and rank or seniority. The development of such guidelines may be delegated to units, schools, or colleges. However, the guidelines should be consistent, as appropriate, with the above points.~~

B. Dossier Preparation: Primary External Letters

1. Dossiers for faculty begin considered for ~~with~~ the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor are expected to have at least four external letters. Although the candidate's area of excellence, the rank to which a candidate aspires, and the characteristics of the candidate's discipline may factor into the type and number of peer reviews expected in a dossier, a minimum of four external letters may give sufficient evidence of the quality of a case while not giving undue weight to an individual review. External is defined as "not from the candidate's home campus."
2. External reviewers should give a credible review of the impact or quality of the candidate's work, avoiding the appearance of a conflict of interest. Normally, a reviewer would not have had a significant relationship with the candidate (such as thesis advisor, post doctoral mentor, co-author, former colleague or classmate) and be of rank or position comparable or senior to that sought by the candidate.
3. Exceptions to these ~~guidelines~~ principles are to be explained in the dossier by the candidate's supervisor.
4. Units and/or campuses will establish guidelines on external letters of review and other letters of support. Campus guidelines will be transmitted to the President and to the appropriate Executive Vice President's VP's-office each year and made readily available to prospective candidates by the academic affairs officer of each campus. These guidelines should also be given to the candidate and placed in the dossier.
5. Librarians will follow the guidelines in the Indiana University Libraries Handbook regarding letters of review or support.

C. Further Recommendations from the Joint P&T Committee

- 6.1. The designation of the area(s) of excellence will be by the candidate. Tenure candidates are urged to make this designation in consultation with senior members of their division or department.
- 7.2. Recommendations from each review committee should ~~include at least indicate whether performance is considered a rating of~~ “excellent”, “satisfactory”, or “unsatisfactory” in each ~~of the categories~~ category of teaching, research and service for faculty; or a rating of excellent, beyond satisfactory, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory in each category of performance, professional development and service for librarians.
- ~~3. It was noted by the committee that there is currently no process for a faculty member to file an appeal regarding a decision made above the campus level. The committee strongly endorses the idea of creating such a process.~~

C. Notification of Promotion and Tenure Recommendations

1. The appropriate chancellor or provost will report the outcome of executive review¹ for each candidate for promotion and tenure only as follows:
 - a. If executive review supports promotion and tenure, the president will forward the recommendation to the Board of Trustees, and the appropriate chancellor or provost will notify the candidate of the favorable recommendation *by letter² or as otherwise provided by campus policies*. The president will notify the candidate of the final decision of the Board of Trustees.
 - b. If executive review results in a negative recommendation for tenure, the chancellor or provost will notify the candidate of the negative recommendation *by letter or as otherwise provided by campus policies*. The candidate may then pursue the remedies, if any, available under university or campus policies.
2. The term “executive review”³ refers to review of promotion and tenure dossiers by a chancellor or the provost, by the executive vice president charged with managing dossiers from regional campuses, and by the president, as part of which the president will make a final decision in the form of a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Executive review occurs after the review and recommendations by the relevant campus faculty

¹ The timing is a change in the policy or practice of those campuses at which the chancellor notified a candidate of the campus decision before the campus decision was formally communicated to the executive vice president (if applicable) and president.

² This notification policy only affects the timing and core content (results of review). The form and remainder of the content are up to campus policy and practice.

³ The term “executive review” has no formal meaning in the P&T process; it is simply a collective term for review by the chancellor or provost, executive vice president, and president.

committees and academic administrators have been completed and transmitted to the appropriate chancellor or provost.

3. The president will not entertain requests for reconsideration of the results of executive review, except upon the positive recommendation of the appropriate chancellor or provost and of the executive vice president in appropriate cases.⁴
4. This notification procedure should not alter any other procedures or practices, nor does it affect any rights of review available to a candidate.

⁴ For example, a chancellor or provost may make such a recommendation to the President where campus grievance procedures have identified problems in the handling of a case that warrant re-examination of a negative tenure or promotion decision.