

JOINT FACULTY/ ADMINISTRATIVE P&T COMMITTEE

Recommendations on Promotion & Tenure Procedures on Indiana University Campuses

September 10 draft

Faculty Review Committees

1. At least one-third of each campus-wide faculty review committee should be faculty with Professor or Librarian rank.
 2. Only faculty who are tenured and have at least 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. Only those faculty participating fully in the contemporaneous evaluation meeting and consequential discussions should be eligible to vote. This does not preclude committee members' participation through interactive technology such as video- or tele-conferencing.
 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 in any given case.
 7. A faculty member can participate in deliberations in only one level per candidate. They must recuse themselves 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 to or communicated to others outside the promotion and tenure process, except as required by 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.
- (It was noted by the committee that there are currently no procedures for a faculty member to file a grievance regarding a decision made above the campus level. The committee strongly endorses the idea of creating one.)
11. Campuses should develop guidelines for 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.

Dossier Preparation: Primary 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 dossier while not giving undue weight to an individual review.

1. Dossiers for faculty with the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor are expected to have at least four external letters. 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 are to be explained in the dossier by the candidate's supervisor.
4. Units and/or campuses will establish guidelines on external letters or review and other letters of support. Campus guidelines will be transmitted to the appropriate EVP's office each year. These guidelines should also be given to the candidate to be placed in the dossier.
5. Librarians will follow the guidelines in the Indiana University Libraries Handbook regarding letters of review or support.