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 five faculty members.
- For tenure/associate professor decisions, when a candidate’s program operates on both campuses, 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). When a tenure/associate professor candidate’s program operates on only one campus, the primary committee should include all tenured associate and full professors from the home campus department (minimum of five members).
- For promotion to full professor, when a candidate’s program operates on both campuses, 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 a full professor candidate’s program operates on only one campus, the primary committee should include all full professors from the home campus department (minimum of five members).
- When the above guidelines result in fewer than five primary committee members, the University Dean or his/her designate, in consultation with the relevant
department chairs, should appoint an appropriate number of additional faculty members to serve on the committee.

- Faculty serving on the School of Education’s Promotion, Tenure and Contracts Committee should be allowed to participate in discussions, but should not vote, at the primary committee level; nor should they provide summaries of these discussions at the P & T Committee meetings.

**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. The primary committee chair should inform the committee whether the candidate has selected an area of excellence or a balanced case.
- The Primary committee should be allowed to review the entire dossier, including the external letters.
- 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. All ballots should include the text: “A positive recommendation for tenure/promotion should be given only when you have rated the candidate as: 1) Excellent in one area and at least Satisfactory in the other two areas; or 2) at least appreciably Better than Satisfactory in all three areas.”
- The candidate’s home campus department chairperson should prepare a brief report for the candidate’s dossier that also includes the number of faculty eligible to vote, the number who did not submit a ballot, the number of abstentions and the reasons given for those abstentions, and a tally of the overall recommendations and the ratings in each area.

**Format of Dossiers**

- Expand the dossier checklist should be revised to emphasize the importance of clearly indicating whether each publication or other product is to count primarily toward teaching, research, or service. If publications are multiply listed, the committee will use the first listing.
- Exemplary models of tenure and promotion cases should be selected and made 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**

- A procedure should be established for periodic review of the membership of the core campus Promotion, Tenure, and Contracts Committee. This review should take place on a regular basis (e.g., every five years) and should consider both the total number of Committee members and the balance of IUPUI and IUB
members. Input should be sought from faculty members (or their representatives) on both campuses as a basis for periodic adjustments to the Committee membership.

- 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.