

**Report of the
Promotion, Tenure & Contracts Committee**

Joyce Alexander, Charlie Barman, Ted Frick,
Larry Mikulecky, Charles Ridley, Tom Sexton,
Barbara Wilcox (chair), Barbara Wolf, and Enid Zimmerman

April 2004

The 2003-2004 Promotion, Tenure & Contracts committee considered seven cases. The breakdown of the cases is elaborated below.

CONSIDERATION

Tenure & promotion to Associate Professor	4
Promotion to Full Professor	3

CAMPUS

IUB	5
IUPUI	2

BASIS OF CASE (as per Candidate presentation)

Teaching	2
Research	4
Service	0
Balanced	1

The Trustees acted with considerable speed this year. We add our voice to Dean Gonzalez in congratulating Valarie Akerson, Jeff Anderson, Stacy Morrone, and Andrea Walton on the awarding of tenure and promotion to associate professor, and to Joanne Peng, Tom Schwen, and Russ Skiba on their promotion to full professor.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the context of the questions raised and issued posed during this year's deliberations, the Committee offers some gentle recommendations. Most are directed to department chairs and others helping candidates prepare the dossiers, though several address more basic questions of policy or practice.

1. Reporting the vote of the primary committee. There is tremendous variability in how votes taken by primary committees are reported. For example, sometimes the number of tenured faculty who did not return ballots/were not present to vote is noted while in other cases it is not; sometimes a chair is noted as abstaining, while other times he/she is not included in the count of those eligible to vote. We encourage all primary committees to report vote counts based on "those eligible to vote."

The following are *not* eligible to vote and so are not included in the primary committee count:

- Department chair [who contributes his/her vote and assessment in a separate letter]
- Other administrators who will review case and whose academic appointment might reside in the candidate's department.

Members of the SOE unit committee (aka "Promotion, Tenure, & Contracts Committee") typically refrain from voting in primary committees and instead exercise their vote in the unit committee; consequently, they are not typically counted among "those eligible to vote" on a particular primary case.

Individuals who do not exercise the opportunity to vote [failure to return ballot] should be noted and counted.

Abstentions should be recorded. Abstentions are interpreted as abstentions, not as disguised versions of a "yes" or "no" vote. Faculty are encouraged to cast informed ballots that express their position on a case. Simply saying one is 'not familiar' with the work of a colleague is not acceptable except under unusual circumstances.

Prior to presenting the case to the primary committee, chairs are encouraged to draw up and verify a list of primary committee members for every candidate. Virtually all primary committees will include members from both IUB and IUPUI. (See <http://www.indiana.edu/~soedean/primarycommitteemembership.html>)

2. Standard format for reporting course evaluations. Candidates are encouraged to devise some logical way of summarizing of course evaluation data in the dossier. It is neither helpful nor appropriate to include raw data (CEQs completed by individual respondents). Course evaluations should not simply be collected; they should be analyzed and reflected upon. Whether data is clustered by course, by level (grad v. undergraduate), or by academic year will depend on how the candidate is making his/her case. The committee encourages an inclusive summary of course evaluation data for *all* tenure cases *and* for those seeking promotion based on teaching excellence.

3. Clarify what types of evidence strengthen a dossier making a case based on teaching excellence. Though the School and University guidelines provide a general sense of evidence that might make a case for excellence in teaching, it seems helpful to clarify the content of a teaching dossier. The Committee encourages the following types of evidence:

- Candidate's philosophy of teaching or some clear reflection on pedagogical approach, student work, changes in syllabi across time, etc.
- External evaluations of syllabi and assignments [which reflects a logical requirement that these materials have been sent out for review]

- Student work, along with candidate feedback on that work/reflections on the assignment.
- External evaluations of teaching [to include, but not be limited to, observations by individuals who team teach with the candidate] and to include multiple observations [more than one class, more than one semester] accompanied by candidate reflection.
- A summary of course evaluations for the period under consideration. (This should be complete and represent all courses for which the candidate was responsible.) Candidate reflection on this data certainly would be appropriate. Comments solicited from a random sample of current/former students. (See 4 below)
- Teaching-related publications and some assessment of the impact of those publications

There *are* models for building a teaching case, and it would be helpful to disseminate these more broadly.

4. Student letters. When a dossier includes letters from current or former students (and most will), it should also include a process description of who solicited letters and how students were selected. It is inappropriate to limit the pool to individuals nominated by the candidate.

5. Dossier presentation. Simply put, most dossiers are too big. Rather than presenting two file drawers' of material for review, candidates are encouraged to organize material into 2 or 3 large binders that are indexed to the promotion and tenure checklist.

6. Multi-authored publications (including grant applications). When a vita includes collaborate and multi-authored works, then the dossier should indicate and verify the extent and nature of the contributions of various participants. There are various ways this might be done (e.g., having the candidate describe relative contributions and then inviting collaborators to verify; soliciting information for co-authors directly). While it is reasonable to report a % of effort, it may be more helpful to have some sense of the *nature* of each individual's contributions.

If a co-author is one of the candidate's students, special care should be taken to describe the *circumstances* of the collaboration (was it a master's project or dissertation? Was it an outgrowth of a class assignment?) as well as the *nature* of contributions.

7. Candidate statements. Candidates are encouraged to develop clear and thoughtful statements of 12-15 pages in length. (One statement this year was 30+ pages.) The chair (or his/her designee) should work with the candidate to develop the case and verify that the candidate's statement is in line with the evidence provided.

As candidates describe their research, they are encouraged to consider visual representations (concept maps, other visual schematics) that might help readers grasp of the connectedness of their program.

8. Chair's letter. The chair's letter is a critical item in a candidate's dossier. As they develop their letter, chairs are encouraged to:

- Clarify for those outside the department the context in which the candidate operates. This will likely include things that someone close to the situation may take for granted but which may be different than colleagues situated elsewhere in the institution (e.g., nature of practicum or internship responsibilities and expectations, place of candidate's courses in larger program, and the like).
- Include a clear statement re: any course buyout, stopping of the tenure clock, or changes from standard teaching load that occurred during the period under review.
- Address directly any negative information or problems that might be associated with the case (e.g., complaints in student letters, unsupportive external peer reviews, apparent lacunae in productivity, changes in focus, etc.)

9. Differences across the core campus. The Committee this year struggled with how to apply the SOE guidelines across "the core campus." We debated whether to take into account the campus context (especially vis-à-vis candidates at IUPUI) or whether our role was the uniform application of a standard to candidates from two *very* different environments with different missions, values, and expectations. The nature and magnitude of the differences raise natural questions of whether the current "unit committee" structure is fair to candidates at IUPUI. Several members of the committee wondered whether it were time to consider a separate committee for IUPUI or a significant modification of the unit committee structure for candidates whose tenure is based in Indianapolis.