

**Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus  
Documentation Guidelines and Criteria for Preparing and  
Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers  
2007-2008**

# Table of Contents

<b>HIGHLIGHTS OF THE GUIDELINES .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
GUIDELINE YEAR.....	1
APPLICABLE FACULTY .....	1
UNIVERSITY AND CAMPUS GUIDELINES .....	1
CONNECTION TO MISSION .....	1
<b>DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PROMOTION AND TENURE.....</b>	<b>2</b>
TENURE .....	2
PROMOTION .....	3
<b>EVALUATION STANDARDS AND QUESTIONS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
QUESTIONS FOR FACULTY .....	3
<b>PROCEDURES AND QUALIFICATIONS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
SUBMISSION DEADLINES .....	4
RETURNED DOSSIERS .....	4
TIME IN RANK .....	4
AREAS OF EXCELLENCE.....	5
PEER REVIEW .....	5
COLLABORATION.....	6
INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK .....	6
INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK AND PUBLICATION .....	7
ADDITION OF MATERIALS/COMMENTS .....	7
RECONSIDERATION .....	7
<b>IUPUC REVIEWS AND NOTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
THE PRIMARY BOARDS.....	8
THE UNIT BOARD .....	9
<b>IUPUI CAMPUS LEVEL REVIEWS AND NOTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>CANDIDATE’S RESPONSIBILITIES .....</b>	<b>11</b>
SUMMARY OF CANDIDATE’S RESPONSIBILITIES .....	11
SUMMARY OF DIVISION HEAD’S RESPONSIBILITIES.....	13
<b>VICE CHANCELLOR AND DEAN’S RESPONSIBILITIES .....</b>	<b>14</b>
SUMMARY OF THE VICE CHANCELLOR AND DEAN RESPONSIBILITIES .....	14
<b>DOSSIER FORMAT .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>DOSSIER SECTIONS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
SECTION I. GENERAL SUMMARY OF DOSSIER CONTENT .....	15
SECTION II. CANDIDATE’S STATEMENT .....	16
SECTION III. TEACHING AND PERFORMANCE.....	17
SECTION IV. RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT .....	22
SECTION V. PROFESSIONAL AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE.....	24
SECTION VI AREAS NOT REQUIRING DOCUMENTATION .....	28
SECTION VII. APPENDICES .....	29
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>.....</b>

## Highlights of the Guidelines

1. These guidelines apply to all IUPUC Faculty, whether they are in Indiana or Purdue University schools, and apply to both promotion and tenure for tenure-track faculty and promotion for all other categories. As a campus unit, tenure of IUPUC appointees is specific to IUPUC. Thus, the tenure status of IUPUC appointees does not apply to IUPUI, PU, IUB or other university campuses and units. At this time, librarians at IUPUC seek promotion and tenure through Indiana University, and this process will not be discussed further in these guidelines. Probationary faculty may choose to use guidelines in effect when they began their appointment, but should designate this clearly when so doing.
2. External peer review of a candidate's overall record is important in establishing the merit of each case. For some cases, such as clinical faculty, the most appropriate form of peer review may be from other departments within IUPUI, and these circumstances can be described by the division head or Vice Chancellor and Dean. Letters requesting these reviews must be initiated in a standard way within each unit by the division head or Vice Chancellor and Dean or their designee, and not by the candidate, to promote objectivity and equity.
3. External peer reviewers of overall records should hold a higher rank than the candidate being reviewed and should not have a close relationship with the candidate. The division head or Vice Chancellor and Dean should describe the relationship between the candidate and the reviewer and provide information on the stature of the reviewer.
4. Candidates must indicate an area of excellence (teaching, research, or service as appropriate to their appointment) and document at least satisfactory performance in all other applicable areas, or create an argument for a balanced case, demonstrating excellent overall performance comparable to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others.
5. The candidate's statement is crucial to the understanding of the dossier. It should be reflective, clear, and concise (no more than 5 pages, in most cases). Page references to the curriculum vitae may be used to avoid restating information contained in that document.
6. Ongoing peer and student evaluations of teaching are important to documenting quality of teaching; for those candidates choosing teaching as their area of excellence, peer review external to the candidate's academic unit is required.
7. Student evaluation data should be summarized (in tables, when possible) and presented with contextual information on the method for collecting the information and comparative information with peers when available.
8. Information on the impact of the candidate's work is needed for all areas of excellence. Evidence of publication or other appropriate dissemination of scholarly work is required within any area of excellence chosen by the candidate.
9. Instructions for developing the curriculum vitae should be followed carefully, with close attention to designating work in the categories of teaching, research, or service, and noting integrated work as well as indicating which work was done in rank.
10. Division heads and/or the Vice Chancellor and Dean or their designees are responsible for providing information on the quality of the scholarly dissemination outlets used by the candidates and for ensuring that the review at the primary and unit levels and preparation of the dossier have proceeded according to these guidelines.

# Indiana University-Purdue University Columbus Documentation Guidelines and Criteria for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers 2007-2008

## **Overview**

Indiana University criteria for tenure and promotion for faculty and for librarians are outlined in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*, and the IUPUI Supplement to the Academic Handbook. IUPUC criteria for tenure and promotion are contained in this document, and should be used with the following guidelines to assist faculty in preparing and in submitting required documentation of accomplishments. These guidelines are reviewed and revised annually by the Vice Chancellor and Dean and the IUPUC Unit promotion and Tenure Board to reflect changes in the institution, to assist faculty in preparing dossiers, and to remain consistent with IUPUI guidelines. IUPUI guidelines are revised annually with the assistance of the IUPUI Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and other faculty bodies. However, the guidelines are issued by and are the responsibility of the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties. The purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that faculty understand the process and reviewers at the IUPUC campus and higher levels have the information they need to make discretionary judgments about individuals within a common, shared context reflective of campus expectations and University requirements. These guidelines interpret University policy for the benefit and assistance of faculty and thus are intended to be consistent with applicable University policy, but in the case of conflict University policies and procedures naturally govern. Changes reflect the evolving nature of the institution as well as the experience of the campus level reviewers, who identify ways of assisting faculty to enhance their dossiers and to prepare themselves for these important deliberations.

## **Guideline Year**

Because the guidelines change somewhat each year, untenured faculty preparing for tenure may wish to compare the current year's guidelines with those in effect at the time of initial appointment; untenured faculty may elect to follow the earlier guidelines and this should be indicated in the dossier. Most faculty, however, will find the current guidelines most useful. Effective Fall 2007, Candidates for promotion who are not also candidates for tenure are expected to use the current guidelines.

## **Applicable Faculty**

These guidelines apply to faculty who are subject to promotion and tenure consideration at IUPUC and at the IUPUI campus level, including all tenure-related appointments, clinical faculty, research faculty, and lecturers. They apply to faculty who hold appointments in Purdue schools at IUPUC.

Because Purdue University criteria are very similar to Indiana University criteria, the statements of criteria in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* and IUPUI Supplement to the Academic Handbook will be used to evaluate faculty in Purdue schools and programs. Purdue faculty should use the Purdue University cover sheet for their dossiers but complete all other campus-prescribed materials, including the dossier checklist, as stipulated in this document.

## **University and Campus Guidelines**

Candidates are evaluated according to University criteria as well as IUPUC requirements. The latter are specified in this document and state with reasonable specificity the standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the criteria for tenure and for promotion. These guidelines are intended to comply with the criteria of the University and are on file with the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties through the Office of Academic Policies, Procedures, and Documentation.

## **Connection to Mission**

Promotion and tenure considerations must recognize the diversity of the missions and the contexts of the campuses of the University and must not ignore the mission of the particular unit as defined in its statement of criteria and procedures. The individual's contributions to the mission of the division and campus are the basis of consideration. Some work, no matter how important or time-consuming for the individual faculty member, may not be given much weight (or even be considered at all) if it is not related to the mission of the unit and campus.

These guidelines outline campus procedures for evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure. Candidates should recognize that there are few universal standards, or even aspects, of faculty work that are common to all of the missions of the campus. However, there are broad dimensions of professional work that campus level committees and administrative officers will take into account when assessing whether or not a candidate's actual achievements—as documented by the dossier—warrant advancement.

### **Distinctions between Promotion and Tenure**

These guidelines should be used in preparing dossiers for both promotion and tenure. The criteria for promotion and tenure are not identical, but they are closely related. Ordinarily, tenure will not be awarded to faculty who are not also being recommended for promotion to associate professor (or who do not already hold this or a higher rank). Decisions regarding promotion and tenure may be made separately, however.

### ***Tenure***

At Indiana University, the faculty, librarians and Board of Trustees have embraced the following definition of the principle of tenure:

The principle of tenure imposes reciprocal responsibilities on the University as a body politic and on the faculty member and librarian. In order to meet its responsibilities to its students and to society, the University must attract and retain faculty and librarians of outstanding quality. To that end the University provides academic freedom and economic security, which are implicit in the principle of faculty and library tenure. The faculty members, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of teaching, research, service (*or creative activity*), and professional conduct. Librarians, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of professional service, research and creativity, and performance in the development of library services, and the communication of information and knowledge to others. Librarians who are candidates for tenure should excel in performance and be satisfactory in the other areas mentioned above.

*Indiana University Academic Handbook*

At IUPUC, the faculty have taken special note of the reciprocal responsibilities of individuals who hold tenure and of the institution—the collective faculty, administration and trustees—that recommends and awards tenure. The University works to ensure the safeguards to academic freedom by way of employment security, while the faculty member works to fulfill the commitment demonstrated during the probationary period with respect to continued growth and productivity. Faculty who do not continue their professional development to enable their unit to carry out its mission should not expect to continue their employment at IUPUC.

The University vouchsafes the best possible continuing environment of support for faculty work, just as the faculty member seeks to realize the best possibilities afforded by that environment. The University comprises itself as a community that embraces diverse intellectual and academic interests, within which community the faculty member locates a commensurate self-interest and to which community he or she is fully responsive. In short, in the tenure agreement, the institution expresses its commitment to the faculty member at a number of levels, and the faculty member, in turn, commits for the period of association with the University to bring to complete realization that demonstrable promise—as a scholar, teacher, and colleague—that earned her or him tenured status in the first place.

At the time of initial appointment, IUPUC faculty will be appointed to a specific IUPUC program for teaching, research and service. As a campus unit, tenure of IUPUC appointees is specific to IUPUC. Thus, the tenure status of IUPUC appointees does not apply to IUPUI, PU, IUB or other university campuses and units. Faculty who have tenure are expected to contribute in concrete, demonstrable ways to the continued development of IUPUC as an academic community. However, tenure is awarded at the campus level, not the program or division level. The safeguards of tenure are preserved at the campus level, and tenured faculty members thus accept a responsibility toward the campus and University.

As candidates for tenure prepare their dossiers for review by peers, they should bear in mind that awarding tenure thus marks the beginning of their responsibility to their colleagues and to the institution that bestows tenure. Tenure

is the occasion to renew a personal commitment to achieve the promise of the probationary period and to accept the responsibility of membership in the academic community of IUPUC.

### ***Promotion***

As faculty compile records of continued achievement in their respective fields of work, their accomplishments and level of expertise are deserving of recognition through promotion at key intervals. For probationary tenure-track faculty, promotion to the associate level is normally sought toward the end of the probationary period in conjunction with the tenure decision. Both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty may seek promotion in rank when their achievements warrant this recognition. The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* defines the standards for each rank.

### **Evaluation Standards and Questions**

Evaluation standards for faculty are based on several key questions that define the nature of academic work. While not by themselves definitions, the questions listed below may be helpful to candidates and individual reviewers as well as committees. These standards are derived from the work of Charles Glassick, Mary Huber and others in *Scholarship Assessed*, a companion to Ernest Boyer and Gene Rice's *Scholarship Reconsidered*.

As candidates for promotion and tenure consider the standards by which they will be judged, these aspects of faculty work will be considered in some form and to some degree. By assuming that most evaluators will be interested in these questions, candidates can prepare dossiers that will address them and thus enhance their prospects for a favorable review.

### ***Questions for Faculty***

The questions reviewers typically ask when assessing a faculty dossier include the following:

1. Does the work of the faculty member in teaching, research and professional service reflect well-defined purpose and clarity of goals? Are the goals consistent with the unit's stated mission? Are the goals and resulting work important?
2. Has the faculty member made adequate preparation to carry out the work, including continuing professional development beyond formal education? Does the faculty member demonstrate an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Has the faculty member secured the necessary resources for the work?
3. Has the faculty member used appropriate methods and procedures for the work, following methods that are regarded as valid and effective by disciplinary (or other appropriate professional) peers locally, nationally, and internationally? Are the methods applied effectively? Ethically? Has the faculty member modified methods and procedures in response to changing circumstances?
4. Has the work culminated in significant results or contributions to the discipline (or profession) or to the civic community in ways that are consistent with unit and campus mission and that can be recognized and evaluated by peers? *What is the impact of the work?*
5. Have the results of the work been disseminated in an effective and appropriate manner? In other words, how (and how well) has the faculty member communicated the results of teaching, research, and professional service to peers on campus and across the discipline nationally or internationally? Have peers assessed teaching or service through direct observation? Have results been published in peer-reviewed media, whether in print or electronic forms? Have results been presented at conferences or recognized with awards, all based on peer review? Have results been effectively communicated to community and non-academic audiences or stakeholders?
6. Finally, how has the faculty member demonstrated the ability to grow and develop leadership through critical self-assessment and reflection? Is there a strong prospect of continued professional development and leadership based on the candidate's own self-critique, understanding of past accomplishments, and vision of significant future work?

## Procedures and Qualifications

### *Submission Deadlines*

Dossiers are due to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties through the Office of Academic Policies, Procedures, and Documentation no later than **November 4, 2007**. If extenuating circumstances exist, a request for a time extension should be sent to the Dean of the Faculties for approval before this date. Under no circumstances will the deadline extend beyond **November 30, 2007**. Dossiers submitted late (i.e., after November 30, 2007) or not submitted in accord with these guidelines due to a department's or school's actions may be returned and consideration deferred until the following year.

### *Returned Dossiers*

Dossiers will immediately be checked to ensure that they are complete, that they are prepared in accord with these guidelines (or an appropriate earlier version of the guidelines), and that letters of evaluation (especially external letters) meet the expectations set forth in these guidelines. If there are deficiencies or concerns as a result of this administrative review, dossiers will be returned to the Vice Chancellor and Dean with a specific request for remedy and a date by which the dossier must be resubmitted (or corrected). Such requests will ordinarily be made within the first or second weeks of December so as to allow as much time as possible to address deficiencies.

Dossiers may also be returned as a result of reviews by primary readers or by committee action. Since these actions will occur after the deliberative process is underway, there may be limited—even insufficient—time to address problems. Accordingly, candidates, division heads and the Vice Chancellor and Dean are strongly encouraged to review dossiers to ensure that materials are in the proper format and order, that peer reviews of teaching, research, and professional service have been included, and that only required materials are forwarded.

If there is uncertainty about what may be required, candidates or division heads should confer with the IUPUI Assistant Dean of the Faculties as soon as possible.

### *Time in Rank*

In most instances, the work being assessed as the basis for tenure or promotion will have been completed either since initial appointment or the last promotion. While the probationary period for untenured faculty ordinarily is six years, special conditions may warrant earlier than normal consideration. There is no expected period between associate and full rank, although most associate professors seek full rank five to ten years after promotion to associate rank. Occasionally, the period under consideration may be ambiguous due to prior appointments at other institutions, the cumulative nature of some work that may build on earlier accomplishments, leaves that may have extended the probationary period, or earlier than normal consideration. Each case has special circumstances and the context for considering a candidate should guide the judgment of reviewers. Candidates and division heads should provide an explanation for any unusual conditions that they believe may affect the review of the candidates' dossiers.

Probationary candidates considered earlier than normal must present evidence of achievements comparable to those who have served the full period. Accordingly, earlier-than-normal cases may require special care to ensure equity of treatment.

In considering candidates for tenure, where there are questions about time in rank, reviewers are reminded that tenure assumes an extended period of productivity and improvement. The purpose of the probationary period is to give candidates for tenure an opportunity to demonstrate their capacity for sustained excellence and an ability to adapt to changing conditions of their disciplines and the institution. In some cases, consideration of work completed elsewhere or prior to appointment to a tenure-track position may be appropriate. Regardless, the dossiers must present clear evidence of the candidate's ability to contribute at the expected levels for the balance of his or her professional career.

### ***Areas of Excellence***

Appropriate areas of excellence have been designated for faculty in all categories. These are in the Appendices to this document. High expectations for performance within areas defined for each kind of appointment are universal across faculty titles; however, the nature of the work performed by faculty is different and the ways in which faculty will accomplish this work and document performance will vary, depending on the context of the work. Similarly, disciplinary expectations will influence the emphasis faculty place on different activities and types of accomplishments and the way in which they are documented.

In the case of tenure-track faculty, the evaluations of the Vice Chancellor and Dean and the division head, as well as the evaluations of the primary and school (often referred to as the unit board) boards, must address the area(s) the candidate advances as representing excellence: either teaching, research, scholarship or creative activity, or service. There may be more than one area of excellence, but there must be at least one identified unless, in exceptional cases, a candidate presents evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University over time. The area(s) of excellence should be identified on the routing sheet. Each evaluation should include a general assessment of each of the three categories (e.g., in terms of being excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory). While not required, many faculty can document excellence in more than one area. When an individual's record warrants such a claim, faculty and reviewers are encouraged to note such an accomplishment.

The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* requires that a candidate for promotion in a tenure-related classification excel in at least one area and be at least satisfactory in each of the other two; in some cases, faculty may present a record of excellent performance across all three areas sufficient to demonstrate comparable long-term benefits to the University. One definition of the balanced case is that it is a balance of strengths that is comparable to excellence in a single area.

Tenure requires performance commensurate with rank and evidence of continued service with distinction. Accordingly, candidates for tenure at the rank of assistant professor should understand that such a decision on tenure will be made separate from promotion in only very rare situations with documented circumstances that make clear the imminent attainment of promotion. In addition to having at least one area of excellence (or a balance of strengths in all three areas to be equivalent), all faculty in tenure-related ranks must be at least satisfactory in all areas of teaching, research, scholarship, or creative activity, and professional service to be eligible for tenure or promotion; a faculty member whose documented work in any one of these three areas is less than satisfactory will not be recommended for tenure or promotion. Faculty whose University service is not at least satisfactory may not be advanced for this reason as well.

Clinical faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching and service and satisfactory in the other area. Lecturers are required to be excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service.

### ***Peer Review***

The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and professional service is the bedrock on which promotion and tenure decisions are based. This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and service. At intervals where candidates seek tenure and/or promotion, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed. These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research, or service, and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

### ***Ongoing Review***

Traditionally, peer review of research, scholarship, and creative activity has been a standard feature of faculty work. Evaluation of work submitted to journals, juried shows, or other outlets for dissemination are considered the routine way to document the quality of this work. Expectations for peer review of teaching and professional service are comparatively recent, beginning with IUPUI's participation in a national project co-sponsored by several disciplinary associations, the Carnegie Endowment for Teaching and the American Association for Higher Education. Peer evaluation of teaching is now expected for all candidates with teaching as an area of performance and it is required for those whose advancement is based on excellence in teaching. In the absence of a clear reason, dossiers without peer evaluations may be returned as incomplete. Ongoing peer review need not occur every year, but there should be a record of sustained peer review over the interval since appointment or last promotion.

Ongoing peer review may be provided by local peers or national (international) peers or a combination. To be credible, peer reviewers must be identified in the context of their own expertise or competence to comment. These peer reviews should be requested at intervals by the division head and conducted in the standard way specified by the academic unit. The review should focus on the quality and impact of the work.

### ***External Assessment***

As IUPUC grows in complexity and as the nature of faculty work evolves, expectations for the form of external assessment of the overall record appropriate to each type of faculty appointment continue to be refined. Current expectations for external evaluation are summarized in a chart in the Appendices (see pp. ??-??). As a general expectation, external assessment (ordinarily in the form of a letter or verified email note) is expected of all candidates at all ranks. Ordinarily, six letters are expected. There are exceptions to these requirements, however, and when an exception is appropriate the reasons should be noted. Moreover, external letters need not come exclusively from peers external to IUPUC and IUPUI.

General expectations for external assessment vary with type of appointment. For advancement to full rank for tenure-related classifications, peer review external to the University is required. Peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal associations that could affect objective evaluation. For advancement to associate rank for tenure-track faculty, a blend of reviewers external to the University and discipline is acceptable. For lecturers whose teaching and professional service are the areas for evaluation, external peer review of the overall record is not required as long as there are a sufficient number of IUPUC peers outside the discipline to ensure an objective assessment of teaching or professional service. Clinical faculty seeking promotion to associate may use a blend of peers external to the discipline and external to IUPUC, but those seeking promotion to full professor must obtain peer review external to IUPUC.

Especially when excellence in teaching is a basis for advancement, it is important to provide documentation that will enable external reviewers to make informed judgments. IUPUC will seek external evaluation of course design and materials as part of the review of teaching accomplishments. This type of evaluation may be particularly helpful in considering materials prepared for use with new technologies (e.g., internet, multimedia, videos, computer simulations, data bases, software) or for judging the incorporation of service learning as a part of courses. Without documented results and without external peer review, candidates for advancement based on excellence in teaching should not expect to succeed.

When submitted to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties Office, all dossiers will be given an initial administrative review to assess whether or not the external assessment appears to meet the requirements of these guidelines. If the dossier appears to be deficient in some way, it will be returned with the expectation that the deficiency can be addressed before the campus-level review begins.

### ***Collaboration***

The work of the academy is often advanced through collaboration and joint work, especially in new or interdisciplinary areas where the expertise and experience of more than one colleague may be required. Not infrequently, results of this work—whether research, teaching, or professional service—are disseminated through joint publications. Collaborative work is valued, but candidates should make clear their individual role in such collective activity, preferably as related by other colleagues involved in the joint work.

### ***Interdisciplinary Work***

In the instance of interdisciplinary fields that transcend the intellectual authority of any single division, special arrangements for primary and unit board reviews may be necessary. The division that serves as administrative host for such a program should assume responsibility for preparing and transmitting files while making accommodations for participation of faculty from other divisions in a primary board and for an alternative unit board. The special or ad hoc arrangements should be stipulated in advance, be known to the candidate, the program administrators, and the division head of the host school. In instances where there is not agreement on procedures among the concerned parties, the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties will determine the process and procedures for reviewing candidates. While

unusual, special procedures for joint appointments or for work in interdisciplinary fields are appropriate and should not adversely affect a candidate's consideration for promotion or tenure.

### ***Interdisciplinary Work and Publication***

Interdisciplinary work is often novel and unfamiliar to peers accustomed only to assessing work within a discipline or profession. The same high standards of achievement and of documentation must apply to interdisciplinary work as to more familiar and conventional disciplinary work. Journals that publish interdisciplinary work may not be as well-recognized or widely-known to the reviewers as other journals, but these may be the most appropriate places to publish. Care must be taken to consider the nature and quality of journals or other media where interdisciplinary work appears. Holding formulaic expectations for work appearing in "top tier" journals is not likely to serve either institutional or individual interests well. Candidates should help their division heads to document and establish the quality of such journals—including those in electronic formats—but reviewers have a reciprocal obligation to evaluate the quality of the work on its merits and not solely on the reputation of the journal within a discipline. In some instances, external assessments of outlets for publication may be useful, and such information may be included within the dossier.

### ***Addition of Materials/Comments***

Additional materials submitted by candidates during the review process for inclusion in the dossier must be provided to all administrative officers, boards, and committees that have already assessed the dossier. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide these materials to the division head, Vice Chancellor and Dean, or the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties, depending on the level at which the dossier is being considered; in turn, these administrative officers will ensure that all prior reviewers have an opportunity to consider added materials. All prior reviewers have the right to comment on additional material, but these comments need to be forwarded through the same review process, beginning with the primary board. Comments are neither required nor expected. In the case of factual information (e.g., acceptance of a journal article listed as under review), these additions are routine and ordinarily require no comment.

In instances where a board, committee or administrative officer seeks additional information or material, this material must be provided to both the candidate and persons who have already reviewed the dossier, all of whom must have an opportunity to comment. It is the responsibility of the persons seeking additional materials to provide such material to all concerned parties. These comments then become a part of the dossier. Such additions must be made only when clearly necessary. Ordinarily there will be very little time allowed for comment, and concerned parties must act within specified deadlines.

### ***Reconsideration***

In instances where a candidate wishes to add materials that comment on the conclusions of recommendations of a review, this addition of materials constitutes a request for reconsideration. Indiana University policy allows for reconsideration under special circumstances for faculty being considered for tenure who receive a negative recommendation. This provision is intended to be applicable to tenure-track probationary faculty, and only where the University criteria for reconsideration is met. The "Policies Governing Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period" statement in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*. This policy states, in part

The faculty member ... who believes that a recommendation or a decision that he or she not be reappointed has resulted from inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information may offer corrections and request reconsideration at the level at which the decision not to recommend reappointment was first made.

The request for reconsideration must be made immediately after the faculty member receives notification of the negative recommendation. The period ordinarily occurs within two weeks and before the review at the next level is completed. Faculty who request reconsideration must provide corrected information or state the basis of inadequate consideration, not re-argue or defend the case. Reconsideration is not an appeals process but an opportunity to correct the record while review is still underway. Reconsideration should thus occur prior to the next stage of the review process so that the results of reconsideration can be taken into account before the dossier moves forward. A request for reconsideration is appropriate only at the level where a negative recommendation on tenure is first

given. Nothing in the act of requesting reconsideration or being reconsidered precludes a candidate's seeking a Faculty Board of Review as permitted by applicable University policy.

Under unusual circumstances, reconsideration of promotion decisions may be permitted with the approval of the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties. The procedures noted above will be followed in such a situation.

## **IUPUC Reviews and Notification**

### ***The Primary Boards***

Each year that a candidate within a division shall come up for a promotion, tenure, or reappointment review, the Vice Chancellor and Dean will establish a Primary Board with membership of five, comprised of tenured associate and full professors from the candidates' discipline. This committee must include five tenured faculty members (exclusive of the chair) holding rank equal to or higher than that to which the candidate seeks promotion, tenure, or reappointment. With the exception of Business, two of the Primary Committee members must be tenured at IUPUI in the candidate's discipline. If the IUPUC division does not have three such faculty members, tenured faculty members of appropriate rank will be selected from departments or divisions that closely match the candidate's discipline from regional campuses of Indiana University. For candidates seeking tenure or promotion to the rank of full professor, the primary Board shall be composed only of full professors, selected using the same process described above.

The Primary Board will meet throughout the year according to the schedule required for division promotion, tenure and reappointment recommendations provided by the Vice Chancellor and Dean.

The Primary Boards will consider for promotion, tenure, and reappointment all probationary faculty in accordance with University policy. It will also consider all appropriate faculty members who have been nominated for promotion and/or tenure. Nominations for promotion, tenure, and reappointment may be made to the Primary Board by formal motion by any Primary Board member, in writing by any faculty member, or in writing by the Vice Chancellor and Dean.

The initial basis for consideration by the Primary Board will be an updated faculty vita and a dossier containing materials the candidate believes will be relevant to a consideration of their professional qualifications. The Primary Board will provide the candidate with guidelines for preparation of the vita and dossier. The Primary Board may solicit other information as well.

All votes will be taken by secret ballot. The Board vote for each candidate will be forwarded to the Unit Board in the appropriate format. At least one area of excellence must be noted, except when the candidate seeks tenure and/or promotion on the basis of a balanced case, which requires excellent overall performance comparable to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others.

The division head, or their designee or designees, will be responsible for preparing and delivering to the Vice Chancellor and Dean all promotion, tenure, and reappointment recommendation documents in the form required by the most recent IUPUI *Academic Handbook Supplement* and the *IUPUC Documentation Guidelines and Criteria for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*. Documents that have not been properly prepared will be returned to the division by the Vice Chancellor and Dean. (Returned documents may be revised and resubmitted, but deadlines will not be extended to accommodate revision.) It is the responsibility of the division head to identify any conflicts between Indiana University, Purdue University, IUPUI, and IUPUC promotion processes that will affect their faculty, and to bring these conflicts to the attention of the Chair of the Unit Board and the Vice Chancellor and Dean as soon as possible. Conflicts *must* be resolved by the division head, the Chair of the Unit Board, the Vice Chancellor and Dean, and the Dean of Faculties (as necessary) prior to consideration by the Unit Board.

When the dossier goes to the next level, the division head will send a letter to the candidate informing him or her about the recommendations of the primary board along with copies of those recommendations.

When a division head chooses to seek promotion and/or tenure, the Vice Chancellor and Dean, or their designee, will assume all promotion, tenure, and reappointment duties for the division that would otherwise be handled by the division head until the promotion and tenure process for the division has been completed for the year.

### ***The Unit Board***

The Unit Board will be composed of five tenured associate and full professors with at least one member from each academic division that has tenured faculty. Three members will be elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty and two members will be appointed by the Vice Chancellor and Dean. The Vice Chancellor and Dean will appoint Board members from among the tenured faculty at IUPUC. If there are no tenured faculty in the candidate's division or not enough tenured faculty at IUPUC, the Vice Chancellor and Dean will appoint up to two tenured faculty members in the candidate's discipline from regional campuses of Indiana University. The term for each Unit Board member elected by the faculty will be two years. The term for each Unit Board member appointed by the Vice Chancellor and Dean will be one year, but the Vice Chancellor and Dean may reappoint members for a second year. This committee will elect its own Chair. The Vice Chancellor and Dean will sit on this Board without vote to provide administrative information.

The Unit Board will be formed at the beginning of the spring semester for a period of one year. The Vice Chancellor and Dean will call for a meeting and present the calendar of events for personnel action. At that meeting, the Board will elect a Chair. The Unit Board will consider all candidates for promotion presented to it in proper form by the Primary Boards. All Board members must attend all meetings during which candidates are reviewed and the dossier of each candidate must be complete and in the proper form at the time of presentation. After completion of the promotion, tenure, and reappointment process, the Chair of the Unit Board may call a meeting to discuss potential modifications to the IUPUC promotion, tenure, and reappointment process and to this document.

The Unit Board will also assist, at the request of the Vice Chancellor and Dean, in reconsidering negative reappointment decisions to ensure that faculty have been treated fairly.

The Primary Board of each division shall have the opportunity to discuss the standards used to evaluate whether candidates meet the criteria for promotion and tenure with the Chair of the Unit Board, the Vice Chancellor and Dean, and the Unit Board members, following the review of candidates by the Unit Board.

Further general procedures and rules of operation of this Board are as follows:

- (a) Meeting of the Board may proceed when all Board members and only Board members are present.
- (b) Files of all candidates for promotion and tenure shall be distributed by the Vice Chancellor and Dean and the Chair of the Unit Board to each member of the Unit Board at least two weeks in advance of the meeting at which candidates are to be considered. A copy of the most recent version of the *IUPUC Documentation Guidelines and Criteria for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* shall be distributed to each member of the Unit Board at the same time.
- (c) The Vice Chancellor and Dean shall be responsible for forwarding all promotion, tenure, and reappointment documents in the proper form from the Unit Board to the next level in the review process.

The following procedures and rules of operation apply to the meeting at which candidates for promotion and/or tenure are considered. The Chair is responsible for reminding the Board of each of these at the beginning of that meeting, and seeing that they are followed:

- (a) The sole rules governing the deliberations of the Board will be the version of the *IUPUC Documentation Guidelines and Criteria for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* distributed earlier (see item (b) above). *No other rules will apply.* (The purpose of this policy is to decouple discussion of the rules to be followed from discussion of the specific individuals to be considered. All relevant rules must be incorporated into the *Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* document *prior* to the discussion of candidates.)
- (b) The candidates to be considered are not in competition with each other: each candidate should be judged on their own merit.

- (c) IUPUC policy is that promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions are to be made substantively at the division level, where the faculty member's activities are best known and can best be evaluated. Thus the Primary Board's decisions must carry serious weight, with division representatives (to the Unit Board) being fully prepared to justify decisions in response to questions from the Unit Board. The Unit Board is responsible for verifying that stated division, campus, and University criteria have been met and that the evaluation procedure and decision of the Primary Board accurately reflects IUPUC criteria for promotion and tenure.
- (d) The dossier of each candidate must be complete at the time of presentation. Candidates should not be judged for mistakes and deficiencies in their dossiers before the Board has had the chance to discuss them. Mistakes and deficiencies naturally occur and naturally generate discussion. The goal of Board discussion should be to identify whether mistakes and deficiencies are inadvertent and can be corrected prior to the next level of review, or whether they are serious and adequate cause for a negative vote.
- (e) The general criteria for promotion and tenure to the rank of associate professor is a significant record of accomplishment and promise of continued professional growth and recognition; for promotion to the rank of full professor the candidate should be recognized as an authority in the appropriate field by external colleagues. IUPUC requires that for promotion to any rank, the candidate must perform well in the areas of teaching, research, and service, recognizing that the weighting will be different for each candidate. Promotion to any rank requires excellence in at least one (but not all) of the areas, except when balanced case is the basis for promotion. Poor or unsatisfactory performance in any area will preclude promotion or receipt of tenure.
- (f) Each member of this Board is expected to demonstrate respect for every candidate and every other member of the Board. It is essential that each candidate be treated fairly and measured against specific and explicitly stated criteria.
- (g) Consideration for promotion shall proceed in order, first those cases for promotion from associate to full professor, then those cases for promotion from assistant to associate professor, in alphabetical order by last name.
- (h) The discussion of each candidate will be preceded by a brief (approximately 5 minute) presentation of the candidate for promotion (and/or tenure) by a Board member. There is no time limit on the discussion of any candidate.
- (i) The Board Chair will relinquish the Chair to another Board member chosen by the Board during deliberations on all candidates from the division of the Chair.
- (j) A vote will be taken on each candidate by secret ballot immediately following the completion of the discussion of the candidate. When promotion and tenure are both being considered, promotion and tenure will be voted on simultaneously but as separate ballot items. The vote(s) on each candidate will be tallied only after all candidates for all ranks have been considered. After voting for the last candidate, ballots will be counted twice for each candidate, and the results announced at that time.
- (k) The Board must provide the Vice Chancellor and Dean with a written summary of its actions, including the vote count for each candidate considered and a summary of the Board discussion of each candidate, as soon as possible after the Board deliberations. The Vice Chancellor and Dean, in turn, must provide each candidate with a written summary of all recommended actions plus the vote count for that candidate only, before the end of the fall semester. In its written summary the Board must fully describe the discussion associated with a negative or split decision. (A commentary that is too sparse may raise doubts in the minds of those at subsequent levels of review as to the rationale behind the decision.) Written summaries for all candidates must be worded with input from the entire Unit Board *before* the Board adjourns, and it must be subsequently signed (after it is typed) by every member of the Board. To facilitate preparation of these reports, one member of the Board will be designated as note-taker for the discussion of each candidate.
- (l) For a candidate who is not recommended, it is the responsibility of the Vice Chancellor and Dean to discuss the action at the candidate's request.
- (m) The deliberations of the Board and the documents presented to the Board are confidential and not to be discussed by Board members with anyone not on the Board.
- (n) The Unit Committee will elect a representative to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee from among the members of the Unit Committee after all cases have been presented and all votes have been taken and results announced and recorded. The vote will be by secret ballot.

### **IUPUI Campus Level Reviews and Notification**

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee uses a primary and secondary reader system. Readers use a summary report form (see Appendices) in advance of the meeting when a particular case is considered. All members of the

committee read the full dossier when there have been divided votes at earlier levels of review or when the primary or secondary reader makes such a request.

The Dean of the Faculties or a designee attends all meetings, listens to the discussion of each case, and reads the readers' reports. Subsequently, the Dean of the Faculties and Chancellor read each dossier, review all prior evaluations, and confer about a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees. In the case of Purdue faculty, recommendations regarding promotion are made to the President and Trustees of Purdue University. Promotion and tenure recommendations for Indiana University faculty and tenure recommendations for Purdue faculty are made to the President and Trustees of Indiana University. Faculty are notified when these recommendations are made. A formal subsequent notice of final action is provided to faculty after the Trustees act. In instances where a candidate is not being recommended for tenure or promotion, the memorandum informing candidates of this action will ordinarily be the only notice of a negative decision except that probationary faculty not recommended for tenure will also receive a notice of non-reappointment from the Chancellor.

### **Candidate's Responsibilities**

The dossier is a candidate's summary representation of work undertaken over a number of years as well as a case for advancing in rank and/or tenure status. Candidates should thus understand that it is their responsibility to collect, maintain, and summarize evidence of their accomplishments for all years prior to their tenure submission or promotion. Some evidence, such as student or peer reviews of teaching, critical appraisals of performances or exhibitions, or client assessments of service, may be available only at a moment in time. Faculty should take steps to ensure that such evidence is collected when it is available and in a form that can be evaluated months or years later; care should be taken to ensure that such assessments are unbiased and reflective of current practice in their fields.

The most important responsibility of the candidate is assembling a dossier that succinctly represents the impact of years of activity. Accordingly, the candidate's statement regarding teaching, research, and professional and university service is the single most important document created just for the dossier. Although brief, it provides the context for assessing individual achievements.

Candidates who are basing their candidacy on teaching or professional service should anticipate the need to collect evidence that can be evaluated by peers either during or some time after the actual event has occurred. Both peer and student evaluations are expected for all candidates for promotion or tenure who are to be judged in the area of teaching and **both are required** for candidates whose case is based on excellence in teaching. Accordingly, these evaluations must be collected over a period of years. While peer reviews may not be necessary every year, candidates should take prudent steps to provide a credible record of sustained achievement over time. In performance areas such as the visual arts or music, faculty documenting excellence in creative work also need to plan ahead when building a record of peer evaluation for future review. Faculty wishing to document excellence in professional services should also anticipate the need to collect ongoing peer review of their service activities. The evidence should focus on results (see question 4 in the section on "Evaluators' Questions") and candidates may need to anticipate the form in which results can be documented during the activity. The Center for Teaching and Learning and the Center for Service and Learning at IUPUI can provide advice and assistance to faculty who anticipate documenting excellence in these areas.

Although division or campus procedures allow for the addition of materials (e.g., external letters of evaluation must be provided by the division), candidates for tenure and promotion prepare their own dossiers and they are responsible for them. Candidates must provide information and materials necessary for the review process.

### **Summary of Candidate's Responsibilities**

- Collect, summarize, and maintain student evaluations [ongoing]
- Arrange, collect, and maintain peer reviews of teaching [ongoing]
- Present a record of sustained student and peer review of teaching during the appointment period or since last promotion [prior to the sixth-year review for tenure track promotion and tenure decisions; as needed for other advancement decisions]

- Present a statement (up to five pages) assessing the accomplishments of the candidate in teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activity, and professional and university service [by mid-year in the sixth year for tenure track decisions and as needed by others]
- Collect, represent, and maintain evidence of accomplishments in professional and university service, including letters of the impact of service from persons with the expertise and experience to evaluate such work and documents identifying a candidate's contributions to joint or collaborative work [ongoing]
- Contact the IUPUI Center for Teaching and Learning and/or the Center for Service and Learning for advice and assistance in documenting excellence in teaching and service respectively [as needed]
- Sign the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices, pp. ??-??) to indicate that the dossier has been reviewed by the candidate in the form that it will be reviewed by the primary board [at the point of submission of the dossier for review]

### **Division Head's Responsibilities**

Although candidates prepare their own dossiers, division heads or their equivalent (or their designees) should be available to assist candidates in organizing the materials and in making certain that dossiers are in the proper format for review at the various levels. The person reviewing a candidate's dossier to ensure that it is both complete and in proper order is required to sign a checklist (see Appendices, pp. ??-??); this reviewer should be the division head or designee.

Both ongoing peer review and external assessment of the overall record connected with promotion and tenure decisions are essential to the review process, and division heads are the individuals most responsible for the effectiveness and integrity of both types of peer evaluation. As faculty pursue their work, division heads should require that they seek ongoing peer review of their teaching, research, and service. Procedures for regular and systematic review should be in place within each academic unit and faculty should understand the expectations for their regular use of these procedures.

External assessment of the overall record comes into play when tenure and/or promotion are sought. Within the academy, we are most familiar with seeking external peer evaluations of research and creative activities. However, excellence in teaching or professional service similarly requires peer review by persons outside the local context who can place the individual's accomplishment within the larger academic and disciplinary context. The same expectations of rigorous peer review by qualified faculty hold for teaching and professional service as for research, scholarship or creative activity. Division heads should give special attention to identifying external evaluators from the academy who can assess the results of an individual's efforts in teaching or professional service.

Campus procedures ordinarily require that division heads (or designees) solicit external letters for peer evaluation; letters solicited or received directly by candidates seldom are considered to be of significance. Candidates should be consulted about persons selected to provide evaluations, but candidates do not decide who is contacted for external assessment. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that referees are objective and credible; persons closely associated with the candidate may not be perceived as being as objective as those who are not personally associated.

The division head—in cooperation with the primary board—should establish a standard protocol for soliciting external letters and apply it consistently and equitably to all candidates. The protocol should apply to letters external to the division but from IUPUC or IUPUI colleagues as well as to letters external to the campus and University. If candidates are asked to nominate potential external reviewers, this process should be applied to all candidates. If potential referees are screened to ask if they would provide a letter if asked, this same process must be applied to all. Sufficient numbers of external letters are required (at least six are expected) and the division head should seek to stay within a range; an excessive number of external letters is generally not useful. Regardless, all external letters solicited for the dossier must be included. The division protocol for soliciting external letters should be written, should be available to candidates, and should be incorporated into division procedures. See instructions and the sample letter in the Appendices (pp. ??-??) for use in soliciting comments from external peers. Similar letters adapted for peers internal to IUPUC or IUPUI should also be used. Also see the model letter in the Appendices, p. ??.

Division heads (or their designees) should also provide evidence for their evaluation of the candidate's University service, including specific contributions and outcomes, not merely membership or attendance.

Most importantly, division heads, or designees, provide candid advice to candidates throughout their probationary period to ensure that they have adequate documentation in each of the required areas for an effective dossier based on achievements. Division heads or their designees provide annual reviews for all faculty, and candidates for promotion or tenure should request and expect written statements.

Division heads should provide an analysis of the stature of journals, presses, editions, galleries, and other means of disseminating the results of the teaching, research, creative activity, or professional service for each candidate. This assessment is required. The stature may be reflected by the acceptance rates, the nature of peer review, or other measures and, whenever possible, these indices should be cited. Although the notation for each journal or other entity should be brief (ordinarily two or three sentences), special commentary may be required when faculty are working in interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary areas. Additionally, journals devoted to practice as well as theory development in teaching and professional service may not be as widely known or understood, even by colleagues within the same program or division, compared to scholarly journals. Special care should be taken in assessing the stature of such journals or presses. In recent years, electronic journals have emerged that may be comparable in quality and stature to print media. If there is any question about the quality of electronic publications, the division head should address this issue explicitly. In circumstances where publication occurs outside the usual disciplinary journals or presses, division heads may wish to seek an assessment of the stature of these publications from chairs or deans in other disciplines. In order to promote and encourage interdisciplinary research, teaching, and professional service, IUPUC and IUPUI encourage dissemination of results in appropriate media of high quality even when these outlets are unusual for the discipline. Peer review, therefore, is especially important. Whenever division heads are not the appropriate administrative officers to provide an assessment of the media of dissemination, the Vice Chancellor and Dean should arrange to include this information.

In some instances, a faculty member may be working in an interdisciplinary area directly relevant to the division's mission but sufficiently removed from the faculty's ordinary expertise or familiarity as to require an unusual procedure. In such an instance, the division head (or Vice Chancellor and Dean) may establish a special primary board including members from outside the division. Such a board should be composed in consultation with the duly constituted primary board and should be used only with the consent of the candidate. If a candidate wishes to accept peer review at the primary level by the established board, this wish must be honored.

Division heads must ensure that division procedures have been followed and that each candidate has been treated fairly and equitably. Minority reports from primary boards are not allowed, and if a division head receives a minority report the division head must request a restatement of the board's conclusions. Members of boards may disagree and divided votes are appropriate. In such instances, the basis or reason for the disagreement needs to be described in such a way that the full board accepts the description. The record of voting can speak for itself.

In their letters indicating their own recommendations on the candidate's case, division heads should focus on accomplishments of the candidate in rank. It is helpful to reviewers at other levels that the division head highlight critical benchmarks that are used for making judgments in the particular field and provide context for remarks that need explanation to those outside the discipline.

### ***Summary of Division Head's Responsibilities***

- Provide candid advice throughout the probationary period and assist candidate in organizing the materials needed for the dossier [ongoing]
- Ensure that the dossier is in proper format and indicate your opinion as to its completeness and format by checking the appropriate box on the checklist [at the point of submission]
- Negotiate the list of internal/external peer reviewers with the candidate and (if appropriate) with the primary board [4 to 5 months before the dossier is to be submitted to the primary unit]
- Make the division protocol for soliciting letters from external peer reviewers available to the candidate [4 to 5 months before dossier is to be submitted]
- Solicit letters from peer reviewers external to the division and/or external to IUPUC or IUPUI using a standard protocol for the letter [3 to 4 months before the dossier is to be submitted]

- Provide an evaluation with supporting evidence of the candidate’s institutional citizenship, including specific contributions and outcomes that extend beyond mere membership and attendance [at submission]
- Provide an analysis of the stature of journals, presses, editions, galleries, and other means of disseminating the results of the teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activity, or professional service of the candidates, including the quality of electronic publications; division heads should seek the advice of chairs and deans in other disciplines when a candidate presents publications in journals outside the home discipline [at submission]
- Provide indications of professional or disciplinary benchmarks used in the field and relevant to the recommendations being made by the primary board and the division head [at submission]
- Compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate’s case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier [following review of the primary level]
- Send a letter to the candidate informing him or her about the recommendations of the primary board along with copies of those recommendations [when the dossier goes to the next level]
- Sign the routing sheet and ensure that the dossier is complete and in the proper format [before submitting to next level]
- Facilitate any exchanges between the unit board and the primary board that might be necessary during the primary and unit committee’s board’s deliberations [as needed]

### **Vice Chancellor and Dean’s Responsibilities**

The Vice Chancellor and Dean is responsible for ensuring that dossiers are complete and in proper order when they are forwarded to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties Office. The dossier checklist (pp. ??-??) should assist with this task. If the dossier is not in proper form and format when it reaches the Unit Board, the Vice Chancellor and Dean should ensure that the necessary corrections are made. Candidates must be informed of any materials added or changes made; at each stage of review, candidates and all previous reviewers must be provided an opportunity to comment on or to respond to such additions. The added information and the responses will then become a part of the dossier. The division head or designee must sign the “Routing and Action Form” (pp. ??-??) to certify that the dossier is complete and in proper form. Candidates should be informed in writing of the recommendation at each stage of review as soon as possible, but not later than the time when dossiers are forwarded for the next level of review.

When divergent evaluations of a dossier result in different recommendations on tenure, the unit board may wish to consult with the primary board and division head. The Vice Chancellor and Dean should ensure that such consultation, when necessary, has occurred before considering a case. The consultation should note the relative importance of criteria, principles, or evidence used in the evaluation that led to the contrary recommendation. The consultation must be noted in the unit board’s report, including notice of whether or not the vote of a board was changed as a result. When there are divergent evaluations with respect to promotion, the unit board should provide feedback to the primary board. Only the final vote of boards and administrators should be recorded on the transmittal form, however. As noted above with regard to the division head’s responsibility to ensure that there are not minority reports, the Vice Chancellor and Dean must similarly ensure that the unit board does not submit minority reports. The Vice Chancellor and Dean should also provide some sense of the standards that the candidate is expected to meet at IUPUC to help reviewers at other levels of the process understand the criteria for the judgment.

### ***Summary of the Vice Chancellor and Dean Responsibilities***

- Ensure that a copy of the IUPUC document on promotion and tenure related to its mission is on file with the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties [submit with every revision]
- Ensure that all dossiers are complete and in the proper format before sending them to the unit board [upon receipt of the dossiers]
- Facilitate any exchanges between the unit board and the primary board that might be necessary during the unit board’s deliberations [as needed]
- Ensure that no minority reports appear in the unit board’s report [upon receipt of the report]
- Instruct the unit board [ongoing]
- Provide a perspective for IUPUI campus and university reviewers on standards that candidates must meet at IUPUC [as needed]
- Compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate’s case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier [following review at the unit board level]

- Send a letter to the candidate announcing the results of the unit-level deliberation and including the recommendations themselves [when the dossier goes to the next level]
- Ensure that the dossier is complete and in proper format before sending it to the IUPUI campus level and, if not checked earlier, attest to the state of the dossier by completing the checklist [when school process is complete]

### **Dossier Format**

The dossier presents the evidence upon which promotion and tenure decisions are to be made. Dossiers are a succinct summary of accomplishments and they are expected to be focused and therefore brief. Length and volume are not viewed as measures by which decisions are made. In most cases, brevity is preferred and appreciated. Dossiers must be submitted to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties at the announced time in accord with specific instructions that may affect the format of the dossier. The same dossier is to be used for both tenure and promotion reviews.

Each section of the dossier should be separated, labeled, and stapled, and the entire dossier should be placed into a single file folder. Three-ring binders may be used only for supplementary materials retained by the division. Binders and other supplementary materials should not be forwarded to the Dean of the Faculties Office unless specifically requested. Dossiers may also be submitted on CD. The same expectations for organization of materials apply to this type of submission. All dossiers should be divided into the following sections:

#### **Faculty**

- I. General Summary of Dossier Content
- II. Candidate's statement
- III. Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Scholarship
- IV. Evaluation of Research or Creative Activity
- V. Evaluation of Professional Service
- VI. Appendices

### **Dossier Sections**

#### ***Section I. General Summary of Dossier Content***

In general, the dossier is prepared by the candidate in accord with the instructions provided. The dossier is owned by the candidate and any substantive changes in the dossier must be reviewed by the candidate. However, certain materials are added to the dossier by others. Before the review process begins, for example, outside letters will ordinarily be added by the division person designated to collect them. Unless explicitly protected by the candidate's having waived a right to access, anything included in the dossier must be accessible to the candidate.

Beginning with primary board reviews, evaluative material will be added to the dossier by each board, committee or administrator. Copies of the evaluative statements are to be sent to the candidate as the dossier is forwarded. The cumulative evaluations become part of the dossier. The candidate is not expected to respond to or comment on these evaluative comments. However, if other materials are introduced into the dossier and considered by one of the levels of review, then all previous reviewers, as well as the candidate, must receive copies. Earlier reviewers need not take any action as a consequence, but they must have an opportunity to reconsider their recommendations. Accordingly, the transmittal form asks that if any new materials are added to the dossier they also be sent to all prior reviewers and to the candidate. The Vice Chancellor and Dean is expected to certify that this condition has been met before dossiers are sent to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties. Annual reviews may be consulted by any of the reviewing bodies without violating the obligation to notify the candidate or earlier reviewers. Annual reviews will not be part of the dossier, even if they are consulted.

A. **Materials Provided by Initiating Unit.** The initiating unit should ascertain that the dossier includes the following:

1. Completed Checklist (see pp. ??-??).

2. Routing and Action Form (see pp. ??-??).
3. The written recommendation of the primary board, and the board's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, research, scholarship, or creative activity, and professional and University service. These should be evaluated in terms of excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. The statement should include an evaluation of the likelihood that the candidate will continue his or her activity in these three areas based on past performance and future plans. This evaluation should be signed and dated.
4. The division head's individual recommendation regarding tenure—and, where applicable, promotion—and a summary evaluation of the teaching, research or creative activity, professional service, and University citizenship.
5. The candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard format (see pp. ??-??).
6. Outside, or external, evaluations from persons contacted by the primary board chair (division head), unit board chair, Vice Chancellor and Dean, or designee.
7. A brief (two or three sentence) statement of the expertise of each external letter writer should be provided by the division (or the Vice Chancellor and Dean if she or he solicits the letters); these statements may be collected on a single sheet. If the letter writer is acquainted with the candidate personally, the nature of their professional relationship and work together should be noted and explained. Letters should be separated into categories, such as:
  - a. external and independent referees
  - b. former or current colleagues
  - c. mentors
  - d. internal letters (in those instances when internal letters may be substituted for external letters for lecturers and clinical faculty; see "External Assessment," p. 5)

**B. Materials Added at the IUPUC Campus (Unit) Level.** The Vice Chancellor and Dean is responsible for adding the following to the dossier:

1. The Unit Board's written recommendation and the Board's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, research, scholarship, or creative activity, professional service, and University service.
2. The Vice Chancellor and Dean's personal recommendation regarding tenure and, where applicable, promotion and a summary evaluation of the candidate's professional activities

### ***Section II. Candidate's Statement***

Candidates for tenure and promotion should prepare a statement that reflects their own assessments of accomplishments in teaching, research, scholarship, or creative activity, and professional and University service, and of prospects for continued development. Candidates for promotion should focus on their expected areas of performance; for clinical faculty and lecturers, teaching and service. The candidate's statement is a place for focused, reflective commentary and should not restate the curriculum vitae. Page numbers to that document may be used to refer to relevant details.

The candidate's statement should not exceed **five** pages in length.

The work of faculty is complex and involves many separate activities. However, all of these are related to learning, which is the essential mission of IUPUC and IUPUI as a shared commitment of students and faculty. In their work, faculty are engaged in learning as a form of scholarship which, in turn, comprises overlapping functions: teaching, discovery of new knowledge through research, scholarship, and creative activity, application of knowledge through service, and the integration of work across specializations and disciplines to develop a shared intellectual community. Faculty should be careful to provide clear and sufficient information about their individual roles in projects, publications, presentation, or grants.

Service to the University community through committees, Faculty Senate, task forces, or other activities that enhance the overall effectiveness of the campus and University is required. The form and extent of University service may vary according to division expectations, but candidates should explain the way in which they have contributed to the common good of the campus and University. They should also expect to be evaluated on the extent to which peers and colleagues assess this service to be satisfactory. Faculty who do not contribute to the University in ways and at levels deemed necessary by peers may not win promotion or tenure.

The candidate's statement should thus address the interrelated aspects of a whole, integral career. Few faculty make sharp distinctions among the various aspects of their work, and the statement should indicate how the candidate views the integration of these aspects, even while assessing the level of performance in each. Special attention should be given to faculty work that cuts across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.

Most reviewers will give primary attention to the impact or significance of the candidate's work. Accordingly, candidates should especially address their own assessment of the impact, significance or value of their work to their discipline or profession, to the unit and campus, and to society as a whole.

Candidates should also indicate the prospects for continued personal development in their defined areas of professional activity. Whenever possible, tenure-track faculty members should state specific plans for a research agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, and for continued participation through professional service to their profession, the campus, and the community. Faculty in non-tenure track appointments should focus on their respective areas of performance. A special note of encouragement to candidates for tenure is appropriate in that tenure represents the beginning point of a new relationship between the faculty member and the University. Tenure provides the faculty member with academic freedom and security while obligating the individual member to maintain high standards in teaching, research and other forms of professional development, service, and professional performance and conduct. Peer review at all levels requires an ability to evaluate the candidate's commitment to this standard of conduct after tenure has been awarded.

Faculty candidates whose area of excellence is based on accomplishments in professional service should give careful attention to documentation early in their career, understanding that external peer review is an essential aspect of evaluation for advancement. The application of criteria to professional service should be clear, and professional service must be clearly related to the mission of the University, campus, and division. Faculty who seek advancement based on excellence in professional service should be able to demonstrate that such service is, in fact, intellectual work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers.

Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work should also prepare for appropriate review by identifying peers whose work spans the areas of interest and are able to judge the quality of this work fairly. They should make every effort in their statements to describe their scholarship clearly and present the advantages of an interdisciplinary approach to the problems they are exploring. Because current areas of inquiry often demand the use of an interdisciplinary approach, this work is highly valuable and candidates should help reviewers to understand its significance.

In brief, the candidate's statement is an opportunity for reflection and integration. It is the one place where a candidate can speak directly to reviewers. The candidate's statement is very important, and brevity is as appreciated as clarity.

### ***Section III. Teaching and Performance***

#### **A. Evaluation of Teaching**

IUPUC strives for excellence in teaching with a focus on student learning. Teaching occurs in many different ways, some of which are linked to the discipline and others to learning objectives, shared across all disciplines, especially those defined by the Principles for Undergraduate Learning. While recognizing the variety of teaching styles and methods, IUPUC requires at least satisfactory teaching by each faculty member for tenure and for advancement in rank. Lecturers are evaluated primarily on accomplishments in teaching and must be satisfactory in service; research is considered only as it supports teaching. However, it should be noted that in many disciplines, scholarly work is often an important aspect of remaining current and engaged in the field.

Such scholarship may be presented and evaluated in support of teaching excellence, but candidates should address this linkage in their candidate's statements.

This section should contain evidence of the candidate's performance and activities as a teacher. Evidence may be gathered at several levels, including the individual student, the individual classroom, the division, and the discipline nationally or internationally. Evidence submitted should present as complete a description as possible of the quality of the candidate's teaching as reflected in actual student learning. A tenure-track faculty case based principally on excellence in teaching should include evidence of impact at both the campus and national levels, most often through publications. External peer evaluations are necessary for excellence in these cases, and evaluators preparing these must have results to consider as well as descriptions of activities or teaching materials. Evidence regarding actual student learning is important, and most frequently it will be embedded in publications. Clinical faculty and lecturers should also show the ways in which their teaching is intellectual work and the ways in which they have disseminated the results of their inquiry into teaching in the field or synthesized the scholarship of the field as part of their teaching practice. Clinical faculty should be certain to clarify the nature of their instructional work when it is not in conventional classrooms or lecture environments. Teaching one-on-one, in electronic or distance formats, in laboratories, at sites, or through grand rounds may need explanation and elaboration.

In all cases, there must be evidence that teaching has been evaluated systematically. Generally, students can evaluate the effectiveness of classroom teaching, and peers are most effective in evaluating other teaching activities, including contributions to student learning outcomes and scholarly contributions to pedagogy.

Advising and student mentoring are special forms of teaching, and faculty who have developed competence in advising or who have been actively involved in mentoring students should document this work and report it in this part of the dossier. Both student and local institutional peer evaluations are important in documenting advising as an area of excellence.

It is important that the dossier section on teaching contain summary information. Results from evaluations by peers or students or information on student learning that is in numeric form should be in tabular fashion when possible. Conventions used for collecting and scoring student evaluations should be described, and norms for performance by peers included as a way of interpreting information. Narratives from peers or students should be summarized by others prior to use in the dossier. Support staff or other colleagues may be asked to highlight themes and illustrative quotes in advance of use. Comment forms, questionnaires, or other raw data should **not** be inserted in this section.

Candidates should provide the following information to document teaching and advising in Section III. They should feel free to address other points not identified below since this is not an exhaustive list:

1. **Information on the teaching load of the candidate should be reported** on the curriculum vitae using the recommended format. The teaching load of the candidate and an indication of whether it is greater or less than the average teaching load in the division should be reported. A large number of students taught is not of itself sufficient evidence of quality; teaching and student learning must be evaluated. Similarly, a small number of students taught does not reflect adversely if the circumstances are explained and if there is a sufficient threshold for evaluating the quality of the teaching. Please note that faculty may hold part-time appointments at any rank and in any classification. The expectations for teaching should be proportionate.
2. **Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers must be included.** Peer review of teaching is as important as peer review of research, scholarship, and creative activity. Local disciplinary peers can provide essential information and assessment based on observation of the classroom, studio, laboratory, or other learning environments, including those based on technology. It is much more difficult for external peers (i.e., external to IUPUC) to observe actual teaching, and thus local peers should prepare reports that can be considered by external peers along with other documented results of effectiveness. Such peer review is in addition to the external assessment of overall performance in the general section of the dossier, as discussed earlier. Evidence in the dossier

should be presented in the form of summary data from narratives, checklists, and other instruments used by peers to comment upon the quality of classroom performance and the quality of course design as expressed by the syllabus and other course materials reviewed by colleagues. Similar narrative or summary evidence of instruments may be submitted to document impact on student learning based on peer review of such indicators as student work (papers and projects), performance on standard exams, or personal experience with students in subsequent courses or institutions of higher learning. This evidence from peers may have resulted from in-person review or from review of materials in print or electronic form by those at a distance who teach in similar fields or use similar methods. Peer review of classroom instruction is most effective when it is based on multiple visits to classes and examination of materials; isolated observations are rarely convincing.

3. **Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students must be included.** Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years and compared to other faculty in the program or division, but they are valuable and expected documentation in any case. Only summaries should be included in dossiers; the summary should include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year and item, so as to establish trend lines where applicable. The summary should discuss individual results within a context for the program or division to enhance the usefulness of the information to outside readers. When norms are available for comparison to others in the program, division, campus, or discipline, these should be included. When results of scaled questionnaires are used, the values of the numeric ratings should be stated.
4. **Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching,** especially in peer-reviewed media, is expected. Such activities should be listed on the curriculum vitae. Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in teaching should have substantial peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theory base of knowledge about effective teaching and learning. In some instances and for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate's work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination. Candidates and division heads (or the Vice Chancellor and Dean) may wish to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may be better.
5. **Evidence that courses taught contribute to the overall student learning outcomes** specified by the unit and that students have met or exceeded course or curricular learning objectives should be provided. The role of the faculty member in assisting students to meet learning objectives should be documented and assessed in ways appropriate to the discipline and to the mission of the unit. This may be captured through peer review (#2 above) or through systematic assessment of student achievement or from standardized, nationally-normed profession-related tests and through the candidate's statement. Faculty who teach undergraduate students should also address how their courses and scholarship of teaching contribute to learning outcomes specified by their academic unit and the Principles of Undergraduate Learning in the statement they submit for this section. At the graduate and graduate professional levels, comparable assessment measures for student learning should be developed if they do not yet exist.
6. **Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students** leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable. This evidence can be provided by listing co-authored papers or joint conference publications on the curriculum vitae or by discussing the nature of the outcomes in the statement for this section.
7. **Evidence of the nature and quality of course and curriculum development and implementation** to enhance the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching is expected. Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning or other special techniques and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to talk about these aspects of course design (even experimental use), and how they conform to or extend principles of good practice. Course and curriculum development and implementation efforts not reported in the candidate's statement or in the curriculum vitae may be detailed in narrative fashion for this section. Evidence about student learning associated with these efforts can be part of the peer review (#2 above) or student evaluation evidence (#3 above), especially when reviewers have been asked to comment on these specific

innovations. Improvement in teaching for probationary faculty can be compelling when documentation demonstrates that the improvements can be sustained.

8. **The number of student graduate committees the candidate has served on or chaired and the evidence of the quality of results** as documented by student achievements should be provided, as appropriate. This information should be listed by the candidate in this section.
9. **Local, regional, or national teaching, advising or mentoring awards**, including information about their nature and significance should be listed. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae, but if explanatory details are needed, they may be included in the narrative for this section.
10. **Teaching or advising grants** (including training grants) received and their outcomes should be included. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae with outcomes information included in the narrative for this section.
11. **Leadership roles in professional associations in organizing conferences, in presenting papers at conferences related to teaching, advising or mentoring**, and in advancing other aspects of teaching should be included. These can be listed as professional service on the curriculum vitae, but if explanatory details are needed, they may be included in the narrative for this section.
12. **Evidence that the candidate has improved his or her teaching by active participation in educational projects and programs** such as those sponsored by the campus or the University or by the discipline, profession or other appropriate group may be listed. The candidate should provide details on the nature of these activities and their impact on teaching in this section.

**Important:** Faculty who are using technology, distributed education, problem-based learning, community-based learning, or other new techniques and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to report their activities and to document results. This is a period of notable change due to the rapid introduction of technology into teaching and learning. IUPUC and IUPUI are committed to the responsible use of these tools and techniques; accordingly, faculty members are invited to reflect on their use—even experimental use—of technology in teaching and how it has enhanced student learning. In addition, since retention of students is of considerable importance to IUPUC, faculty members involved in retention efforts should include a description of these activities where appropriate, along with any evidence that indicates the impact these activities have had on increasing retention, either in their own classrooms or in a broader division or campus setting.

Similarly, faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work are encouraged to describe the significance of bringing multiple disciplinary approaches to their area of interest. IUPUC recognizes that increasingly, cutting-edge work will be interdisciplinary in nature and thus especially supports such approaches.

NOTE: The full bibliography of publications relevant to teaching should be provided in the curriculum vitae as specified in the standard format. Refereed and non-refereed publications should be separated into distinct categories.

### **IUPUC Criteria for Teaching**

A candidate's teaching effectiveness must be documented, not merely asserted. At a minimum, candidates are expected to demonstrate their teaching effectiveness with evidence from student course evaluations and through peer review of teaching.

### **Satisfactory Performance**

Satisfactory performance in teaching is **evidenced by some or all of the following:**

- (a) Student course evaluations (both quantitative and qualitative) which are consistently favorable are mandatory.
- (b) A record demonstrating that a reasonable teaching load and a fair share of the unit's teaching responsibility has been carried.
- (c) Some form of peer evaluation is mandatory. Successive favorable peer evaluations of classroom performance are desirable.

- (d) New course development.
- (e) Significant revision and improvement of course materials.
- (f) Presentations related to teaching and learning within the University and at professional meetings.
- (g) Effective student advising as evidenced by student feedback and/or peer evaluation.
- (h) Demonstrated measurable student learning outcomes.
- (i) Internal and external grants in support of teaching and learning or scholarship of teaching and learning research.
- (j) Scholarly activity related to teaching and learning. This could include published materials pertaining to teaching – textbooks, manuals, journal articles, publication of course materials, etc.
- (k) Other evidence of a record demonstrating quality teaching.

### **Excellent Performance**

Excellent performance in teaching is **evidenced by some or all of the following:**

- (a) Student course evaluations (both quantitative and qualitative) which are consistently outstanding are mandatory.
- (b) A record demonstrating that a reasonable teaching load and a fair share of the unit's teaching responsibility has been carried. Performance must reflect a willingness and enthusiasm for contributing to the unit's teaching, and a substantial impact on both students and the unit's academic program.
- (c) Some form of peer evaluation demonstrating teaching excellence in courses over a period of several years is mandatory. Letters from external reviewers and colleagues are valuable support in this area. Successive peer evaluations attesting to continued classroom performance far above the unit average are recommended.
- (d) New course development
- (e) Significant revision and improvement of course materials. Peer evaluation of course materials is appropriate.
- (f) Presentations related to teaching and learning within the university and at professional meetings, particularly at meetings national and international in scope.
- (g) Effective advising as evidenced by student feedback or peer evaluation.
- (h) Demonstrated measurable student learning outcomes. Evidence from nationally normed exams, when available, is especially helpful. Evidence from department common final exams, when available, is also helpful. Evidence may also take the form of classroom assessment techniques designed to measure learning outcomes as a result of a particular course or courses.
- (i) Internal and external grants in support of teaching and learning or scholarship of teaching and learning research.
- (j) A record of scholarly activity related to teaching and learning. This should include a substantial list of published materials pertaining to teaching – textbooks, manuals, journal articles, publication of course materials, etc. – in refereed journals and respected presses, as well as a leadership role in regional and national educational projects and programs.
- (k) Local, regional, and/or national awards related to teaching, advising, or mentoring of students
- (l) Evidence of effective mentoring of other faculty members in the area of teaching
- (m) Documentation of creative activity as a teacher. Creativity should be documented, for example, by information on research in teaching and grant support for this activity, and by descriptions of major innovations in existing or new courses.
- (n) Documentation of improvements in teaching of the discipline. More than local or regional visibility is required. Evidence could consist of papers on subjects related to teaching presented to universities outside of the Midwest or to national and/or international meetings of professional societies.
- (o) A leadership role in mentoring students and, if applicable, participating on and chairing students' graduate committees. Mentoring of student research, which is presented at student or professional meetings and/or is published in scholarly outlets, is an example of effective mentoring.
- (p) National and/or international recognition of teaching excellence and leadership in higher education. Such recognition is expected to include regional, national, and/or international honors and awards for teaching excellence.

- (q) Regional, national, and/or international offices or leadership roles in promoting teaching excellence in professional societies.
- (r) Innovative and effective use of technology to promote student learning.
- (s) Innovative and effective use of service learning to promote student learning.
- (t) Service on committees at the campus, regional, national and/or international level which promotes excellence in teaching and learning.
- (u) Other forms of evidence of a record demonstrating quality teaching.

#### ***Section IV. Research and Professional Development***

All tenure-related faculty at IUPUC must make contributions to the life of the University and their disciplines through research, scholarship, or creative activity. The terms “research,” “creative activity,” and “scholarship” are used as alternatives to reflect the variety and diversity of faculty work related to the discovery and dissemination of knowledge and its uses. The norms and expectations for this work are usually shaped by disciplines and professional fields with appropriate accommodations made for interdisciplinary work. For purposes of this document, the terms represent the same area of faculty work and are used interchangeably as appropriate to the individual candidate’s work.

All faculty must demonstrate continuing professional growth in research, scholarship, or creative activity and produce documentation of that growth. Peer review, both internal and external, of the contributions made by faculty is a cornerstone of evaluating growth and creativity. Although funded research is not a requirement for promotion and tenure at IUPUC, it is viewed favorably when assessing excellence or satisfactory performance.

##### **A. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity**

Research or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-related faculty at IUPUC. For these faculty, a threshold of documented satisfactory performance is required for tenure and for advancement in rank. Research can take many forms, especially on a campus where there is a variety of academic and professional disciplines. Applied research or scholarship that integrates various applications into improved practices, for example, can be as essential or as valuable as theoretical research. IUPUC recognizes and values the rich variety and diversity of research, scholarship, and creative activity in which its faculty engage, but this work of faculty must be directly related to their disciplines and to the mission of their units and IUPUC.

Peer review of research, scholarship, and creative activity is especially important. Considerable weight is given to the evaluations of internal and external peers. Activities and efforts in research or creative endeavors that have not undergone rigorous peer review—no matter how intense or extensive—are difficult to credit toward accomplishments in promotion and tenure deliberations. Some activities and projects require an extended period of time to mature and, in such circumstances, faculty engaged in this type of work should seek assistance from their division head or Vice Chancellor and Dean to ensure that there can be interim stages where results or documented progress can be assessed by local and national or international peers.

In instances where an individual faculty member within a division is working in an interdisciplinary area (especially a new or emerging area), the division head or Vice Chancellor and Dean may elect to compose a special primary board composed of members who are best able to evaluate the results and impact of work accomplished. The members of such a primary board should be identified in consultation with the established primary board and should be selected because of their relevant expertise.

Increasingly, research, scholarship, or creative activity involves collaboration. Many external awards are made to multiple investigators, results are published under the names of multiple authors, and work may be conducted in several laboratories or settings, including those at other institutions (and other nations). Some researchers or scholars involve colleagues elsewhere, including private industry, governmental organizations, and non-profit agencies. Such collaboration across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to this collaborative work, however. Their self-assessments must be confirmed by their collaborators or others in a position to evaluate the candidate’s effort and contributions, such as the division head or center director. Collaborators are well positioned to comment on the degree of participation of a colleague, but ordinarily they should not be enlisted

to review the quality or significance of the project itself or the results. In order to help reviewers outside the discipline to understand the importance placed on the order in which authors are listed in a publication notation, candidates should include descriptions of these conventions in their dossier.

Evidence in this section should contain:

1. **Identification and discussion of the three to five most significant publications** that reflect the candidate's major research accomplishments in rank should be highlighted. IUPUC places a higher value on quality and value of research than numbers of publications.
2. **Program or division assessment of the individual contributions of the candidate** who works with more than one author or collaborator must be included.
3. **Program or division evaluation of the stature of the journals in which the publications appeared, the museums or galleries showing creative work, or other venues for disseminating the results of research, scholarship, or creative activity** must be included. Whenever available, the acceptance rates (or other evidence of stature or quality) should be noted. (Please avoid abbreviations since reviewers outside the candidate's field are not likely to be familiar with abbreviations no matter how widely recognized they may be in the field.) In instances where a candidate is working in an interdisciplinary field and is publishing in journals or media not within the normal disciplinary journals, care should be taken to explain the nature, quality and role of the journals. If the published work is of demonstrably high quality, the fact that a journal is not (yet) highly ranked or even recognized within a discipline should not by itself be grounds for disqualifying the publications.
4. **Program or division assessment of the candidate's own description of a continuing program of research or creative activity** that will carry forward into the future must be included. The candidate's statement may contain the description, but it may also be included here as a separate, expanded description of future research. The program or division should assess the candidate's prospects for achieving the stated goals.
5. **Documentation of the quality of research or creative activity assessed by experts in the candidate's field** is required. Letters should be solicited by someone other than the candidate as specified above. Letters should be placed in "General Summary" section of the dossier.
6. **Where applicable, there should be an assessment of the candidate's contributions to interdisciplinary research**, including written evaluations from appropriate peers in research centers or other departments.

NOTE: The full bibliography of the candidate's research or creative activity should be provided in the curriculum vitae as specified in the standard format. Refereed and non-refereed publications should be separated into distinct categories. Publications should not be listed again in this narrative section. Candidates offering evidence of creative works (e.g., visual or performing arts, including drama, dance, creative writing, computer software, painting, video) should anticipate the need for external review and, in consultation with their division heads or the Vice Chancellor and Dean, arrange for external reviews or critiques wherever the creative works are displayed or performed or otherwise made accessible. Video records may be submitted as a part of the dossier only when directly relevant to documenting accomplishments

### **IUPUC Criteria for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity**

While recognizing that scholarly activity (like teaching) is, in part, an art – that excellent scholarly activity is not totally quantifiable, nor can it be narrowly defined – IUPUC has established the following criteria for scholarly activity to assist candidates in documenting their accomplishments in research, scholarship, and creative activity.

Evidence of scholarly activity varies among the disciplines. Published work is usually the primary evidence, although other evidence, such as distinguished performance in the arts or in professional areas, shall be considered in appropriate cases. Judgment of scholarly activity is based primarily on the quality and significance of an individual's contributions. Professional experience, competence, and accomplishments are considered particularly important in applied areas, especially insofar as they provide evidence of leadership and innovative contribution.

## **Satisfactory Performance**

Satisfactory performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity is **evidenced by some or all of the following**:

- (a) Publications, including peer reviewed journal articles, non-peer reviewed journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, and invited contributions.
- (b) Peer validated creative activity.
- (c) Some form of peer evaluation demonstrating satisfactory scholarly activity.
- (d) A record demonstrating continued development as a scholar.
- (e) Scholarly presentations at professional conferences.
- (f) Citations of the candidate's research in the literature.
- (g) Research grants or awards.
- (h) Proposals for research grants or awards.
- (i) Involvement in mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate research or scholarship.

## **Excellent Performance**

Excellent performance in research, scholarship, and creative activity is **evidenced by some or all of the following**:

- (a) Research or creative activity that has achieved recognition at a regional, national, or international level for its contributions to a particular field.
- (b) Publications that represent a substantial contribution to a field. The list of published materials need not be long, but must represent substantial work. These works may be published as peer reviewed journal articles, non-peer reviewed journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, and invited contributions. However, as indicated above, peer review is especially important for establishing the significance of scholarly activity.
- (c) Substantial creative activity as evaluated by peers.
- (d) Some form of peer evaluation demonstrating excellent scholarly or creative activity.
- (e) A record demonstrating continued development as a scholar.
- (f) Scholarly presentations at professional conferences.
- (g) Citations of the candidate's research in the literature.
- (h) Honors or awards recognizing excellence in scholarly or creative activity.
- (i) Research grants or awards.
- (j) Proposals for research grants or awards.
- (k) Substantive involvement in mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate research or scholarship.

## ***Section V. Professional and University Service***

Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups: the public (e.g., the community, clients, patients), the profession or discipline, and, less frequently, the campus and University. Satisfactory professional service is expected of each faculty member. The importance assigned to service in considering candidates for tenure or promotion will necessarily vary according to individual circumstances and the mission of the unit. Professional service, including professional service in the community and patient or client services, is characterized by those activities conducted on behalf of the University that apply the faculty member's disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge of interrelated fields to the needs of society. To be the basis for tenure or advancement in rank, professional service must be directly linked to the unit's and campus' mission; the quality and impact of professional service must be evaluated within this context. To be considered as the basis for advancement in rank or for tenure, professional service must be documented as intellectual work characterized by the following: (1) command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; (2) contributions to a body of

knowledge; (3) imagination, creativity and innovation; (4) application of ethical standards; (5) achievement of intentional outcomes; and (6) evidence of impact.

Peer review by peers within the University and by disciplinary peers at other universities is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service, as it is for teaching and research. While not peer review, evaluations of effectiveness by clients, patients, and other recipients of or participants in professional service activities may be critically important as evidence that can be summarized and assessed by disciplinary peers. Ordinarily, professional service to the community and to the profession or discipline is the basis for consideration in cases in which excellence in service is advanced for promotion or tenure. For lecturers, this service may be directed toward the academic unit, but must be characterized as intellectual work to be considered as professional service. For example, developing standards for the assessment of the portfolios of entering students may be appropriately classified as professional service, whereas serving on a search and screen committee would be University service. To serve as the basis for advancement in rank or tenure, University service must be directly linked to the mission of the unit and must be assessed as intellectual work with the same expectations for peer review as in teaching, research, and professional service to the community.

Excellence in professional service is ordinarily characterized by the dissemination of results and findings through appropriate publication, whether in print or electronic media. Not only do publications provide the most effective means of documenting results, but they make it possible to assess the significance of the results, the appropriateness of methodology, and the contributions to new knowledge by those who may be removed in time or location from the activities that led to the results. The journals, books, or web documents in which faculty publish the results of their service activities should be assessed and evaluated by division heads (or the Vice Chancellor and Dean) in the same manner as they are for research or teaching publications. Reviewers considering a dossier based on excellence in professional service will need some assistance in determining the quality of the media.

Faculty claiming excellence in service whose professional service consists primarily of patient or client service must document how their work exceeds normative levels of activity and is, in fact, excellent because it contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. In all cases, this work must have impact beyond the direct recipient of the service and the contribution must be documented through appropriate publications. Providing a repetitive service—no matter in what quantity or even at what level of proficiency—is not itself sufficient for excellence.

As with research, professional service may span traditional, disciplinary boundaries. In such instances, candidates and division heads or the Vice Chancellor and Dean may wish to develop appropriate procedures (e.g., a specially composed primary board) to ensure that the nature of interdisciplinary professional service is fully and adequately understood and assessed. Similarly, dissemination of results in interdisciplinary journals may require extra efforts to assess the actual quality of the work produced instead of relying on the reputation or acceptance rates of the journal as a substitute for evaluation.

In documenting excellence in professional service, faculty must be alert to the need to collect information (and even evidence) at the time services are provided so that it can be assessed and used later to demonstrate results. If a faculty member realizes after a service event is concluded that data, descriptions, recipient satisfaction surveys, or other such transitory pieces of documentation are needed for a dossier, they can rarely be recovered. The IUPUI Center for Service and Learning can provide advice and technical assistance in collecting information that can later be used to create a record of accomplishment, but faculty should seek such assistance before completing (often before beginning) a service activity.

The distinction between professional service and service to the University requires some elaboration. Faculty service to the University through committees and administration is important and required. The community of scholars depends on the mutual responsibility of individuals to support and develop the institution that sustains them. Service must be a factor in these considerations because unsatisfactory service to the University may preclude tenure and promotion. However, without additional significant accomplishments that are related to the practice of the candidate's discipline or profession and professional service to the community, both of which can be evaluated by peers, University service is rarely appropriate for either advancement in rank or tenure. Administrative service that uses disciplinary expertise for innovative or successful achievements reviewed by peers may be offered

as evidence of achievement of professional service when such work has been planned and stipulated in advance and when it is derived from the mission of the unit. Faculty appointed in the clinical ranks advance through the excellence of their professional service or teaching, and lecturers advance through excellence in teaching, but must be satisfactory in professional service.

This section should minimally include the following items:

- A. Description of the candidate's professional service activities. Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care. Those activities which are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected of the faculty as a normal distribution of effort. For all faculty, committee service or voluntary service should ordinarily not be included unless it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work. Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as intellectual work as described above:
1. **Evidence of the significance and impact of the professional service** should be provided through tangible results that can be assessed in the context of unit and campus mission.
  2. **Evidence of the candidate's individual contributions**, especially when the professional service is collaborative in nature; specific contributions of the candidate should be noted.
  3. **Evidence of leadership** in providing professional service, especially when there is a collaborative environment, including contributions that build consensus, help others (including patients or clients) complete required assignments, and reflect the best practices and standards of the discipline; evidence of increasing levels of responsibility and sustained contributions are important.
  4. **Evidence of effective dissemination of results** that establishes the intellectual contributions and advances the knowledge base of the discipline or field is expected. When professional development is the specified area for excellence, this dissemination will most likely occur through peer refereed publications. Special care may be required when the professional service is in an interdisciplinary field and publication is in journals outside the discipline. Faculty working in interdisciplinary fields should not be disadvantaged solely because the journals are not well known. Instead, the program or division should take steps to assess the actual work instead of relying on the reputation of the journal.

NOTE: The full bibliography of publications relevant to professional service should be provided in the curriculum vitae as specified in the standard format. Refereed and non-refereed publications should be separated into distinct categories. Publications should not be listed again in this section.

5. **Evidence of effective dissemination of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or service recipients** in reports and other documents that are designed appropriately to make the results understood and useful; while these reports may not be peer reviewed as a part of the publication and dissemination process, they should be evaluated by disciplinary peers as a part of the advancement review process.
- B. Evaluation of the quality of the candidate's professional service activities by the division head and colleagues or associates, including external peer evaluation when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure.
1. **External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service**, including refereed and non-refereed publications, should be a primary part of the evidence presented when professional service is an area of excellence. While some peers may come from the practice community, a majority should be academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area(s) of professional service. Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
  2. **Peer evaluation should include assessments from local faculty colleagues** who are best able to place the quality of professional service within a context of program or division or interdisciplinary standards, including an understanding of quality as a function of the quantity of service and disciplinary or interdisciplinary norms.

3. **Evaluation by clients, patients or service recipients** is important, just as student evaluations are important as one aspect of assessing teaching. Faculty should arrange for timely evaluations by recipients and determine appropriate ways to use this information. Client evaluations, however, may not substitute for peer evaluations.

- C. When professional service is highly repetitive, as is often the case in patient care, candidates should explain the nature of the activities. Quantity of patient service ordinarily is not a sufficient factor in promotion or tenure, although it is expected to be high to support an area of excellence.

### **University Service**

Contributions to the vitality of the academic community through committee service and participation in faculty governance are expected of all faculty, including clinical as well as tenure-related ranks. Unsatisfactory University service can be the basis for denying tenure or promotion. The University is a special community that has set itself apart from most other social institutions. IUPUC, IUPUI, and Indiana and Purdue Universities depend on faculty exercising responsibility for the whole institution, not only their own particular interests. All faculty are expected to serve the academic community as citizens. IUPUC values service to the University and civic engagement in the name of the University. However, mere participation is not satisfactory grounds for advancement or tenure. Candidates who seek advancement based on service to the University must demonstrate that they have applied their professional expertise to the work of the institution in a manner that can be assessed and valued by peers as a means of advancing the discipline or interdisciplinary field and/or the mission of IUPUC. To be considered as a basis for promotion or tenure, University service must therefore be documented as intellectual work. Accordingly, service to the institution that is presented as professional service must significantly differ in type than that expected for academic citizenship.

Ordinarily, faculty document University service by reporting such service as a part of the curriculum vitae when the service is at least satisfactory. Not all service activities are equal and some may require extensive time commitments and may address principles or issues fundamental to the continued effectiveness of the campus. These special roles need to be recognized and differentiated from usual committee service. The primary board, division head, unit board, and Vice Chancellor and Dean are best able to assess the degree of performance of university service. Faculty are encouraged to report all service activities in the curriculum vitae and to further elaborate in their dossiers on significant service activities that they believe make greater contributions to the campus than satisfactory University service.

If University service is deemed inadequate or unsatisfactory, this fact should be noted and an evaluation based on the documented record of performance should be included in the dossier when it is forwarded to the IUPUI campus level for review. If inadequate or unsatisfactory service is likely to be a factor in a candidate's success, the candidate must be informed and be provided an opportunity to respond prior to a final recommendation at the primary and unit levels.

### **IUPUC Criteria for Professional and University Service**

Service, like teaching and research, is evaluated in terms of quality and impact. In describing significant service activities in the dossier, candidates should describe their contributions to the service activity and the impact of the service on the discipline, campus, University, community, or society. Candidates should also document, when appropriate, how service activities could be characterized as intellectual work, as described above.

### **Satisfactory Performance**

Each faculty member must perform their fair share of service to their academic program, division, and the IUPUC campus. This will typically include membership in campus committees, as well as occasionally chairing a committee. Other typical service, depending on the program, may include student advising and recruiting, and occasional administrative responsibility for a Program or special event. In other words, in order to claim satisfactory performance the candidate must demonstrate that he/she has been an active participant in service of the academic program, division, or campus. Satisfactory performance in service is **evidenced by some or all of the following:**

- (a) Academic advising.

- (b) Writing letters of recommendation for students and colleagues.
- (c) Membership and active participation on Faculty Senate or University committees.
- (d) Membership on special task forces.
- (e) Occasional leadership roles on committees and task forces.
- (f) Representing IUPUC at open houses, new student orientations, and High School Career Counselors' meetings at IUPUC.
- (g) Disciplinary presentations at area schools, organizations, and brown bag lectures.
- (h) Membership and occasional leadership on University committees and councils.
- (i) Regular or occasional administrative responsibilities for an academic program, a division, or the campus.
- (j) An active role in student-related activities such as recruiting and counseling.
- (k) Service to business and industry.
- (l) Professional service to the community.
- (m) Service to local, state and other governmental offices or agencies.
- (n) Service to professional societies, such as committee memberships or the organization of meetings and conferences.
- (o) Service to the academic discipline by serving as a reviewer for a professional journal.
- (p) Service to the academic discipline by serving as a reviewer for grant proposals.

### **Excellent Performance**

Excellent performance goes beyond satisfactory performance in impact and calls for a contribution that is unique. To qualify for excellent performance the candidate must give evidence of considerable influence at the program, division, campus, or University levels, and must have clear visibility in state, regional, or national circles. Excellent performance in service is **evidenced by some or all of the following**:

- (a) Frequent leadership roles on Faculty Senate committees and task forces at IUPUC.
- (b) Significant contributions to committees at IUPUI or University levels.
- (c) Sustained leadership or administrative responsibilities for an academic program or division.
- (d) A major role in student-related activities such as recruiting, retention, and counseling.
- (e) Frequent initiatives in the development of new academic programs and special events.
- (f) Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations. This might include grant review.
- (g) Initiative and leadership in professional service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies.
- (h) Close and active service relationships with business and industry, perhaps in the form of the initiation and administration of economic development or research partnerships with the private sector.
- (i) Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at a regional or national level.
- (j) Service to an academic discipline in terms of the editorship of a professional journal.

### **Section VI Areas Not Requiring Documentation**

Special note should be made of areas that do not require documentation in promotion and tenure decisions, but are vital to the well-being of IUPUC and the accomplishment of its mission. Although these are not documented, they are part of the "culture of expectations" on this campus. These are collegiality and voluntary and community service.

#### **Collegiality**

In the sense that IUPUC is a community of scholars, collegiality enables faculty to pursue a common mission while disagreeing on many issues, procedures, and policies as well as intellectual perspectives, methodologies, and even facts. Collegiality is characterized by mutual respect, tolerance, and civility even when opposing views are strongly held and passionately defended. There is more than a casual connection between the verb "profess" and the noun "professor." Faculty are expected to lead students toward knowledge by exercising their expertise and by advocating ways of learning.

The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* provides detailed guidance to faculty and other academic appointees in the "Code of Academic Ethics." In particular, the "Code" defines relations with colleagues: "As colleagues,

academic personnel have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Such persons respect and defend the free inquiry of their associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, they show due respect for the opinions of others. They acknowledge their academic debts and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. They accept their share of responsibility for the governance of the University.” (p. 47-48)

It is important to make a distinction between meeting the responsibilities of University service, on the one hand, and getting along with or being liked by colleagues, on the other. Failure to meet the requirements of the responsibility for contributing to the work and governance of the University may well be grounds for denying promotion or tenure. But collegiality as construed to mean the way one colleague chooses to relate to another is not a criterion for promotion or tenure. University teaching, research and service and collegiality are related and both are important. They are not the same thing.

### ***Voluntary and Community Service***

Voluntary service in the community is expected as a condition of maintaining a democratic society but it is not a condition of employment or a factor in promotion or tenure except to the extent that voluntary service is also professional service and expected in accord with the mission of the unit. IUPUC is a campus extensively engaged with its community and many forms of voluntary service rely on this connection between the University and its community. Nonetheless, voluntary service that is distinct from professional service to the community is not a requirement for tenure or advancement in rank and it should not be reported or evaluated as a part of a dossier for promotion and tenure. Understandably, there will be instances where this distinction between voluntary service in the community and mission-related professional service or even service to the University can blur; there are overlapping activities and what is professional service for one IUPUC colleague may be voluntary service for another. The context and the assignment of faculty to mission-related professional service should be the basis for determining what is reported in a dossier and what is excluded. Division heads and the Vice Chancellor and Dean can be very helpful in making these distinctions and in explaining how a service activity may be consistent with and related to the unit’s mission. Any service that is to be considered in promotion or tenure must be intellectual work and it must be peer-reviewed with the same rigor as teaching and research. Annual reports provide a good occasion for documenting voluntary service. Faculty members are encouraged to report these activities through their annual reports instead of the promotion and tenure dossier.

## ***Section VII. Appendices***

### **A. Faculty: Annual Reviews**

Annual reviews should not be included in the dossiers of faculty. If the reviews are necessary for a board or committee's consideration they may be requested by the board or committee at the time of the review. Annual reviews, if considered, do not constitute new material since they are part of a candidate's cumulative record. They may be reviewed at any level without obligation to notify earlier reviewers or the candidate.