

**Responses to 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 five faculty members.**

**\*\*ELPS:** Yes. The faculty had no problems with the first three bullets, which as we understand it, coincide with current practice except that they specify a minimum size of five members of the primary committee. The fourth bullet spells out how that size is to be obtained when it does not naturally occur by combining the membership of the appropriate home department faculty and program area faculty at the other campus. We suggest that this bullet be revised to read:

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 core campus faculty members to serve on the committee.

- **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).**

**\*\*CEP:** Primary Committee. For some programs in the School it makes sense to include primary committee members from both campuses; in other areas there are few or no appropriate faculty members to serve in this capacity at the other campus. Why should we force membership across campuses in such a situation? This is especially problematic where only full professors are required for committee membership. Five seems like a good minimum. More is desirable, but it doesn't make sense to put people on the committee who don't know the candidate's work well and/or are not close stakeholders in the decision

- **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.**

**\*\*CEP:** The more complex and detailed we make these rules, the more difficult they will be to follow, and we'll end up with exception as the rule. On both campuses there is often some judgment required in deciding who are the immediate colleagues and who are the important stakeholders for each case. In most cases there have not been serious problems in figuring this out on a case by case basis. If there have been problem cases, let's examine those cases and try to solve the problem at that level.

- **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.**

**\*\*CEP:** Those faculty members who will have input at a higher level (School or University Committee, or administrator) do now exempt themselves from decision-making at the department level. We do not object to a rule about this, but it doesn't seem to have been a problem.

**\*\*ELPS:** The ELPS faculty strongly disagree with this recommendation. In fact, we propose that the text of that recommendation should be replaced by:

Faculty serving on the School of Education's Promotion, Tenure and Contracts

Committee are strongly encouraged to attend the primary committee meeting at which cases for promotion at tenure are considered in order to gather information that may be useful in the decisions of the School Committee. However, they may not vote at the primary committee level.

**\*\*C&I:** I think the language needs to be clearer and more specific. Faculty members who are on the School T&P meeting should either be allowed to attend departmental meetings or not. The present language of “However, if a P&T member has essential information” is too vague in that what one person considers essential information others may not

### **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.**

**\*\*CEP:** In CEP we do not vote separately in the three areas. Voting separately in the three criterion areas has some big problems. Some of the voters will not have clear evidence in their mind for each of the three categories. (Some voters study the dossier very carefully; others just scan it and vote on overall impression.) It is the Chairs' and the School P & T committee's job to sort out the details. Sometimes we tend to micro-manage procedures around here.

**\*\*ELPS:** The ELPS faculty are in favor of having ballots that include overall recommendations and ratings in each area. We do not think that faculty can be required to be consistent in their recommendations and ratings because such a requirement implies that ballots that are inconsistent will be invalidated. Instead, we agreed that the ballot should contain a statement that reminds the faculty of the policy to be added to the third bullet under the heading Primary Committee Process:

All ballots should include this text: “A positive overall recommendation requires a finding that the candidate is either:

- (1) excellent in one area and at least satisfactory in the other two or
- (2) at least meritorious in all three areas.”

The ELPS faculty strongly objected to the material included in the fourth bullet

under the heading Primary Committee Process. For the chair, who already prepares a letter, also to provide a summary of the primary committee discussion gives the chair an excessive voice in the deliberations over promotion and tenure. Moreover, the required explanations of inconsistencies in voting seem impossible to make. Instead, we suggest that this bullet be replaced:

The candidate's home campus department chairperson should prepare a brief report for the candidate's dossier indicating 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.

- **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.**

**\*\*ELPS:** The ELPS faculty did not understand the reason for the first sentence of the bullet under the heading Format of Dossiers and suggested that it should be omitted. The current criteria and checklists provide sufficient guidelines as to the candidates' classification of their publications; specifically, each candidate is to provide a list of all publications that indicates to which areas those publications apply. It is consistent with academic reality that the candidate may select more than one area as applicable to a particular publication. For example, a publication about teaching may be based on original research and is, therefore, relevant to both teaching and research. The ELPS faculty supports the remainder of this bullet.

### **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.**

**\*\*C&I:** I continue to feel uneasy about documents being put on websites – secure or otherwise. I would suggest that key documents be copied and bound similar to the 'digests' that are done for the Tenure Advisor Committee at the Dean of Faculties Office. For the digest, copies are made of the candidate's statement and vita, chair's letter, external letters, letters/reports from all committees (departmental and School) that have reviewed the case. While these can get a bit big, they are more secure than websites in that people don't copy them. Also, they remained in one room for people to read. I was on TAC last year and found this to be a quite workable system.

### **Additional Comments:**

**\*\*CEP:** There was some sentiment expressed in our department faculty meeting for initiating a discussion about the possibility of disengaging procedures and policies across the two campuses. Over the last 30 years hundreds of thousands of person hours have been invested by faculty and administrators on both campuses in trying to encourage and facilitate the various programs and the faculties on the two campuses to "work together." It is now clear that the conditions and pressures working against development of a close working relationship between campuses are much stronger than those encouraging and facilitating such a close interconnected relationship. Let's at least have some discussion about a different solution. Some faculty members and some programs do have close working relationships, and this should be allowed, encouraged and facilitated. But those relationships (both programmatic and policy) that continue to seem forced after all these years should not be continued. Who benefits?

**\*\*ELPS:** There is no comment on whether non-voting faculty (e.g., untenured faculty) should be included in departmental discussion of a case. It seems that this allows each department to decide who can attend departmental discussions and, if current practice continues, means that some departments would allow visitors into the discussion while others would not.

This is how the ELPS faculty interprets this omission. The current ELPS policy is to permit untenured faculty to attend these meetings if they so choose. The faculty are not bothered by any difference among departments because it is unlikely to affect the decisions that are made.

**\*\*ELPS:** The ELPS faculty suggested that the current policy of giving only the chair and the presenter of the case access to the outside letters solicited by the dean should be discontinued in favor of giving all those eligible to vote on the primary committee access to those letters.