

IUPUI Faculty Affairs/Budgetary Affairs Committee
Recommendation Concerning use of IUPUI Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

On January 17, 2008 the IUPUI Faculty Affairs/Budgetary Affairs Committee received a charge from the Policy Council Agenda Committee to determine if the documents that are assembled for the IUPUI campus P&T Committee are sufficient for the School of Education P&T Committee to assess candidates. Our Committee has discussed this issue and we believe that P&T dossiers assembled according to IUPUI guidelines will provide appropriate documentation for the School P&T Committee to evaluate candidates for promotion and tenure. Therefore, we recommend that IUPUI candidates for promotion and/or tenure be approved to submit dossiers prepared according to the IUPUI guidelines.

The guidelines for preparing P&T dossiers for the IUPUI campus are available at the following web site:

<http://faa.iupui.edu/resources.asp?unit=FAA&subgroup=Promotion%20and%20Tenure>

Please note that these guidelines specify that the dossier should be divided into the following sections:

- I. General Summary
- II. Candidate's Statement
- III. Documentation of Teaching and Teaching Scholarship/Evidence of Performance
- IV. Documentation of Research or Creative Activity/Evaluation of Professional Development
- V. Documentation of Service/Evaluation of Service
- VI. Appendices

It is further recommended that the SOE P&T Committee be provided with a copy of the IUPUI guidelines to aid in understanding how these dossiers will be organized. The key differences between the IUB and IUPUI dossier guidelines are that the IUPUI Candidate's Statement should be no longer than 5 pages, sections III-V of the dossier should be no more than 50 pages, and the entire dossier should fit into a single file folder (excluding the appendices; these are not forwarded to the campus committee unless requested). The appendices are to include documentation for all assertions made in the Candidate's Statement as well as other supporting documentation for teaching, research, and service (e.g., journal articles, grant proposals, syllabi, and course evaluations). By preparing their dossiers according to IUPUI guidelines, faculty members at IUPUI could simply remove the appendices before sending the dossier to the IUPUI P&T Committee, thus avoiding the need to prepare two separate dossiers.

**Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
Dean of the Faculties' Guidelines
For Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers
2007-2008**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| <u>Introduction</u> | 4 |
| <u>Distinctions between Promotion and Tenure</u> | 4 |
| • <u>Tenure</u> | 4 |
| • <u>Promotion</u> | 5 |
| <u>Preparing Dossiers for Promotion and Tenure</u> | 5 |
| • <u>Faculty Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline</u> | 5 |
| • <u>Chair (or Chair Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline</u> | 6 |
| • <u>Dean (and Libraries Personnel Officers) Responsibilities</u> | 8 |
| <u>Dossier Format</u> | 9 |
| • <u>Section I: General Summary</u> | 9 |
| • <u>Section II: Candidate’s Statement</u> | 10 |
| • <u>Section III: Teaching and Performance</u> | 11 |
| • <u>Section IV: Research and Creative Activity</u> | 13 |
| • <u>Section V: Professional and University Service</u> | 13 |
| • <u>Section VI: Appendices</u> | 15 |
| <u>Institutional Procedures and Values</u> | 15 |
| • <u>Submission Deadlines</u> | 15 |
| • <u>Returned Dossiers</u> | 16 |
| • <u>Time in Rank</u> | 16 |
| • <u>Areas of Excellence</u> | 16 |
| • <u>Addition of Materials/Comments</u> | 17 |
| • <u>Reconsideration</u> | 18 |
| • <u>Campus Level Reviews and Notification</u> | 18 |
| • <u>Peer Review</u> | 18 |
| ○ <u>Ongoing Review</u> | 19 |
| ○ <u>External Assessment</u> | 19 |
| • <u>Joint and Adjunct Appointments</u> | 20 |
| • <u>Collaboration</u> | 20 |
| • <u>Entrepreneurial Work and Innovation</u> | 20 |
| • <u>Research and Creative Activity</u> | 20 |
| • <u>Interdisciplinary Work and Publication</u> | 20 |
| • <u>International Work and Publication</u> | 21 |
| • <u>Service</u> | 21 |
| <u>Appendices</u> | |
| • <u>Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories</u> | 22 |
| • <u>Documenting Teaching Performance</u> | 23 |
| • <u>Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance</u> | 24 |
| • <u>Documenting Research and Creative Activities in the Dossier</u> | 26 |
| • <u>Suggested Standards for Evaluating Research and Creative Activities</u> | 28 |
| • <u>Documenting Professional Service</u> | 29 |
| • <u>Suggested Standards for Evaluating Professional Service</u> | 30 |
| • <u>Documenting Performance in IUPUI Librarian Dossiers</u> | 31 |
| • <u>Faculty Promotion and Tenure Dossier Checklist</u> | 32 |
| • <u>Librarian Promotion and Tenure Dossier Checklist</u> | 34 |
| • <u>Faculty Routing and Action Form for Promotion and/or Tenure Review</u> | 35 |

- University Library Librarian Routing and Action Form for Promotion and/or Tenure Review.....36
- Professional School Libraries Librarian Routing and Action Form for Promotion and/or Tenure Review...37
- Curriculum Vitae Format for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers.....38
- Dean of the Faculties' Comments Regarding Outside Letters.....40
- Sample Letter to Request an External Evaluation.....42
- Sample Letter for External Recommendation to Full Rank Librarian.....43
- Candidate Review Form.....44
- Reviewer's Summary Evaluation.....45

Index.....47

INTRODUCTION

Promotion and tenure (P&T) are significant transitions in a faculty member's career, and often the sources of considerable anxiety. These guidelines are intended to decrease that anxiety by clarifying campus-level expectations and processes. Criteria for P&T for faculty and for librarians are outlined in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*. More specific criteria relating to librarians are contained in the *Library Faculty Handbook*. These University criteria for faculty and librarians are interpreted in each IUPUI school and department according to their respective disciplinary cultures; those interpretations are defined in school-level and department-level guidelines.

The principles that shape this document are as follows:

- The Dean of the Faculties Guidelines interprets University policy and criteria to assist in the preparation of P&T dossiers. The guidelines should prove useful in
 - helping faculty, chairs and deans understand their role and responsibilities in the P&T process;
 - ensuring that dossier evaluators on all review committees have the information they need to make judgments about individuals within a common, shared context reflective of campus expectations and University requirements.
- These guidelines apply to the following IUPUI appointees:
 - faculty and librarians who are subject to P&T consideration, including all tenure-related appointees, clinical faculty, research faculty, and lecturers, whether full-time, part-time, volunteer or adjunct.
 - faculty who hold appointments in Purdue schools at IUPUI, faculty based at medical centers, faculty based at IUPUC, and some faculty in other units for whom the primary place of work may not be Indianapolis.
- The guidelines are updated annually based on recommendations from the campus-level P&T committee and members of the Faculty Council Executive Committee. Changes respond to the evolving nature of the institution as well as the experience of the campus level reviewers, who often identify better ways of assisting faculty to prepare their dossiers for these important deliberations.
- Each school and library must have a document that states with reasonable specificity the standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- In accord with school policies, departments or divisions should also have such documents.
- These school and department documents must comply with the criteria of the University and be on file with the Dean of the Faculties through the Office of Faculty Appointments and Advancement (formerly the Office of Academic Policies, Procedures and Documentation or APPD).
- P&T considerations are based on the missions and the contexts of each candidate's department and school, as defined in each department's and school's statement of criteria and standards.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PROMOTION AND TENURE

These guidelines should be used in preparing dossiers for both promotion and tenure. The criteria for P&T are closely related, but not identical. While both are based on performance commensurate with rank, tenure requires documented evidence of the promise of continued achievement with distinction. While P&T recommendations are made separately, most tenure-probationary faculty are considered for both at the same time (unless they already hold a rank of associate or full professor), and, generally, a decision to award tenure is not made without simultaneous promotion in rank. In rare circumstances, however, decisions regarding P&T may be made separately.

Tenure

The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* statement on tenure emphasizes an implicit reciprocal commitment between tenured faculty members and the University. The University provides academic freedom and economic security; faculty members maintain high standards of excellence in their work. The University works to ensure safeguards to academic freedom through employment security, while the faculty member or librarian works to fulfill the commitment demonstrated during the probationary period with respect to continued growth and productivity.

- Tenure is based on a documented record of achievement that meets defined standards for the department, school, and campus, together with evidence and a plan that demonstrates that the level of achievement is likely to continue and grow. Tenure acknowledges achievement in light of its promise for the future.
- Tenure is local (i.e., campus specific), and faculty who have tenure are expected to contribute in concrete, demonstrable ways to the continued development of IUPUI as an academic community.
- Tenure is awarded at the campus level, not at the department or school level, even though tenure is specific to a unit.
- The safeguards of tenure are preserved at the campus level, and tenured faculty members thus accept a responsibility to the campus as well as toward the University.
- Some faculty members—most notably those in the School of Medicine—may be assigned to other campuses, yet their tenure is sited at IUPUI. Due to the unique mission of such programs, faculty members maintain their academic community through their association with the IUPUI campus and are subject to the policies and procedures of the IUPUI campus even if the principal site of their work is elsewhere. .

- 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 IUPUI.

Promotion

As faculty compile records of sustained achievement in their respective fields of work, their accomplishments and level of expertise deserve recognition through promotion at key intervals.

- Promotion is recognition of achievement.
- For probationary tenure-track faculty and librarians, 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, and each department and/or school interprets those standards in relation to the disciplinary culture.

PREPARING DOSSIERS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Preparation for P&T begins in the first year at IUPUI. Faculty, chairs, deans, and the Office of the Dean of the Faculties all have distinct and significant roles and responsibilities in the P&T process.

Faculty Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline

This timeline is based on the most common cycle of preparing dossiers for a tenure review in the sixth year, and may be modified following Indiana University policies and individual candidates' circumstances. However, much of the advice is applicable to faculty and librarians in all tracks and ranks.

Year 1 and 2:

- Create a collection system for evidence of activities in teaching (performance in the case of librarians), research and creative activity, and service. Collect and organize everything, ranging from syllabi to grant applications (whether successful or not) to results of committee work. In addition to being useful for annual reports, these early materials provide a basis for analysis of improvement.
- Preferably with the advice of the chair, identify a mentor who can guide you through the processes leading to P&T, and orient you to departmental expectations. Ideally, this person should be at the rank of associate or full professor.
- Collect, summarize, and analyze student evaluations every year. Areas where students indicate a problem provide excellent opportunities to document improvement from one semester to the next.
- Arrange peer reviews of your teaching. Problems that are identified in the review process provide excellent opportunities to document improvement from one peer review to the next.
- Identify your area(s) of excellence, bearing in mind that for P&T reviews you must also document at least satisfactory progress in the other area(s) and bearing in mind that each department/unit has defined expectations about appropriate area(s) of excellence.
- If grant funding is necessary for continued research productivity, become familiar with grant opportunities, both internal and external, and begin to explore all funding opportunities during the first semester. Research and Sponsored Programs provides helpful workshops and other research support for faculty. Write at least one major grant application.
- If scholarly publications are required, begin work on at least one manuscript. Think in terms of always having one manuscript in press, one manuscript under review, and one manuscript in progress throughout your tenure-probationary years.
- In consultation with your mentor, become familiar with campus resources available in the Consortium for Learning and Scholarship such as the Center for Teaching and Learning and the Center for Service and Learning. Take full advantage of the wide range of support available to faculty.
- Become familiar with the University, campus, school/unit, and department guidelines for P&T. Attend department and/or school/unit P&T workshops and the annual campus P&T workshop in March. Additionally, the Office for Women offers an annual P&T workshop that is open to all faculty at all stages of their academic careers.

Year 3:

- This is the year of the three-year review, which provides an opportunity for faculty, departments, and schools/units to take stock of the progress of tenure-probationary faculty toward P&T.
- Continue all the above activities, but now begin to analyze your work in terms of improvement and achievement in relation to department criteria, University criteria, and the Dean of the Faculties guidelines.
- Your personal statement for the three-year review also provides an opportunity to reflect not only on your work, but also on the focus that is emerging in your work. This focus will provide the coherence to your work that should shape your efforts between now and the time of your candidacy for P&T.
- Analyze teaching evaluations to identify key themes and how they point to teaching achievements or areas for further attention.

- Analyze peer reviews to determine again how you might improve student learning in your classes.
- Analyze your grant and publication record in relation to department norms and expectations.
- You will receive feedback on your three-year review from your primary committee, your chair, and your dean. Incorporate that advice into a plan to present a compelling case for P&T in your sixth year. Follow the advice you are given. Work closely with your mentor and your chair, and seek out appropriate supports at the campus level in developing your plan.

Year 4:

- This is the year to ensure that you are on track with a sufficient number of publications and grants as defined by your department. Maintain close contact with your chair and your mentor to identify areas of support to help you progress along that track.
- Arrange for another peer review of your teaching. You might consider inviting someone external to your department in order to gain additional perspective.
- Address any problems identified in the three-year review.

Year 5:

- This is the year you begin to prepare your dossier. If you have kept records right from the start of your academic career, you should be in excellent shape to analyze your progress and to present your case.
- Be sure to attend the workshops on P&T this year in your department and school as well as at the campus level. Your perceptions and understanding will be different from what they were your first year at IUPUI, and your needs more focused, so you will probably get much more immediately useful information at these workshops.
- Aim to complete your dossier a month or two before it is due, especially your Candidate's Statement, so that your mentor and other colleagues can provide you with helpful feedback.
- If you have identified an area of excellence, be sure that your dossier not only makes your case for excellence in your chosen area, but also provides substantive evidence for at least satisfactory performance in the other two areas.
- Your dossier will be due in your department either at the end of this academic year or at the beginning of your sixth academic year. This varies from department to department, so make sure that you know the timeline.
- Make sure you complete and sign the routing sheet.

Year 6:

- Take a breather, and then begin your next phase of scholarly work.
- You will be notified at each stage of your dossier's consideration.
- Be familiar with your options if you have concerns about the evaluation of your dossier at any stage. These policies and procedures are outlined in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*.

Chair (or Chair Designee) Responsibilities and Timeline

(In bi-campus or multi-campus schools, the associate dean responsible for the program at IUPUI may fulfill this role)

While candidates are responsible for documenting that they have met the standards and expectations for P&T, the chair is responsible for providing support and guidance throughout the process, and for administrative and procedural tasks. In general, chairs need to:

- Prepare a written description of the department's expectations for excellence in each area (teaching [performance for librarians], research and creative activity [performance for artists], and service) for tenure or promotion to associate professor and full professor.
- Develop a system of departmental peer review of teaching that ensures that each new faculty member has several opportunities for peer review prior to their candidacy for P&T.
- Provide candid advice throughout the probationary period and assist candidate in organizing the materials needed for the dossier.

Year 1 and 2 of faculty appointment:

- Ensure that each new faculty member has a mentor who is tenured and at a rank higher than the new faculty member, if possible.
- Meet individually with each new faculty member to inform him or her about departmental expectations for P&T. Provide new faculty members with a copy of the departmental expectations.
- Ensure that each new faculty member is invited to either the department and/or school P&T workshop, and encourage attendance at campus-level P&T workshops.
- Encourage new faculty to become acquainted with the Consortium for Learning and Scholarship (especially the Center for Service and Learning and the Center for Teaching and Learning) and Research and Sponsored Programs.
- Provide guidance for faculty annual reporting procedures.

- Provide a written annual review that addresses frankly the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, with suggestions about how to address the weaknesses.
- Provide guidance for the faculty member to select area(s) of excellence appropriate to the department's expectations.

Year 3 of faculty appointment:

- Ensure that each tenure-probationary faculty member understands the function of the three-year review.
- Ensure that the three-year review is carried out following IUPUI Faculty Council policy and procedures (as applied by particular requirements of the department or school/unit).
- Ensure that faculty being reviewed receive a written assessment of their progress toward P&T, with specific guidance about any issues or concerns that require attention.
- Ensure that the declared area of excellence is addressed and that the faculty member is documenting at least satisfactory performance in the other areas.
- Ensure that the three-year review is in the office of the Assistant Dean of the Faculties by the due date (generally the middle of May).

Year 4 of faculty appointment:

- Ensure that the faculty member has access to the resources necessary to address any concerns raised in the three-year review.
- Monitor progress toward P&T.

Year 5 of faculty appointment:

- Ensure that the candidate has documented not only excellence in one or more areas but also satisfactory performance in the other areas.
- Develop a list of external and internal peer reviewers for each candidate in accordance with the directions set out by the Dean of the Faculties in the section on peer review.
- Excellence in teaching or professional service requires similar 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. Department chairs should give special attention to identifying external evaluators who can assess the results of an individual's activities in teaching or service.
- If potential referees of some candidates are screened to ask if they would provide a letter if asked, this same process must be applied to all candidates. Chairs should solicit no less than six and usually not more than ten letters. Regardless of how many are sought or received, all solicited external letters that are received for the dossier must be included.
- Provide external reviewers with the appropriate materials to make informed judgments.
 - While school or department policies may detail particular kinds of evidence that should be sent to reviewers (often the C.V., the candidate's statement, and selected publications), the basic goal is to match evidence to criteria. For example, if the candidate is presenting excellence in teaching then teaching products, such as syllabi or course materials produced by the instructor, should be provided to the reviewer. If the candidate has named service as an area of excellence, documents or products detailing the intellectual work and its impact should be sent to the reviewer.
 - Occasionally, a candidate decides to change the area of excellence after external reviews have already been solicited. In these cases, reviewers should be notified of the change and provided supplementary evidence, if needed. All communications, however, should come from the official requesting party, rather than the candidate.
- Make the department protocol for soliciting letters from external peer reviewers available to the candidate. The departmental (or school) protocol for soliciting external letters should be written and should be incorporated into department (or school) procedures. See the appended sample letter for use in soliciting comments from external peers. Similar letters adapted for peers internal to IUPUI should also be used. Advice on the solicitation of external letters for librarians can be found in the Library Faculty document "[Letters in P&T Dossiers FAQs](#)".
- Solicit letters from peer reviewers external to the department and/or external to IUPUI using a standard protocol for the letter.
- Establish a special primary committee including members from outside the department for a faculty member working in an interdisciplinary area relevant to the department's mission, but sufficiently removed from the faculty's ordinary expertise or familiarity as to require an unusual procedure. Such a committee should be composed in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee 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 committee, this wish must be honored.

Year 6 of faculty appointment:

- Ensure that the dossier is in proper format and sign off on the checklist as to the completeness and proper format of the dossier.
- Oversee the timeliness and procedural integrity of the primary committee.
- Compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier. Include the following:
 - supporting evidence of the candidate's institutional citizenship, including specific contributions and outcomes of committee membership or campus initiatives that extend beyond mere membership and attendance.
 - an analysis of the stature of journals, presses, editions, galleries, and other means of disseminating the results of the teaching, research and creative activity, or professional service of the candidates, including the quality of electronic publications. This assessment is required. Stature may be reflected by 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 department, 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 in some fields that may contain material that is comparable in quality and stature to print media. If there is any question about the quality of electronic publications, the chair should address this issue explicitly. In circumstances where publication occurs outside the usual disciplinary journals or presses, chairs 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 teaching, research and creative activity, and service, IUPUI encourages dissemination of results in appropriate media of high quality even when these outlets are unusual for the discipline. Peer review of the material, therefore, is especially important. Whenever a chair is not the appropriate administrative officer to provide an assessment of the media of dissemination, deans should arrange to include this information.
 - indications of professional or disciplinary benchmarks used in the field and relevant to the recommendations being made by the primary committee and the chair.
 - relationship of candidate's evidence of achievement, such as student evaluations or publications, to departmental norms and expectations.
 - a brief statement addressing the expertise of each external reviewer.
- Ensure that candidates receive fair and equitable treatment from the primary committee.
- Sign the routing sheet and ensure that the dossier is complete before submitting to next level.
- When the dossier goes to the next level, send a letter to the candidate containing the recommendations of the primary committee and the chair along with copies of those recommendations.
- Facilitate exchanges between the unit committee and the primary committee that might be necessary during the unit committee's deliberations.

Deans (and Libraries Personnel Officer) Responsibilities

- Ensure that all tenure-probationary faculty and all faculty eligible for promotion have information about P&T workshops.
- Ensure that a current copy of the school's/unit's document on P&T is on file with the Dean of the Faculties and that every new faculty member receives a copy.
- Arrange to include an assessment of the quality of the media used to disseminate a candidate's scholarly work when a department is not the administrative unit.
- Ensure that all dossiers are complete and in the proper format before sending them to the unit committee.
- Ensure that dossiers are complete and in proper order when they are forwarded to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The dossier checklist (see Appendices) should assist with this task. If the dossier is not in proper form and format when it reaches the school/unit level, the dean should ensure that the necessary corrections are made.
- Ensure that candidates are informed of any materials added or changes made; 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.
- When divergent evaluations of a dossier result in different recommendations on tenure, the unit committee may wish to consult with the primary committee and/or department chair. The dean should ensure that such consultation, when necessary, has occurred before the dean considers 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 committee's report, including notice of whether or not the vote of a committee was changed as a result. When there are divergent evaluations with respect to promotion, the unit committee should provide feedback to the primary committee. Only the final vote of committees and administrators should be recorded on the transmittal form. The letter from each committee should include reasons for negative votes, if these have been articulated, especially when there are a substantial number of negative votes.

- As noted earlier with regard to the chair's responsibility to ensure that there are not minority reports, deans must similarly ensure that unit committees do not submit minority reports.
- Following review at the school/unit level, compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier. Include a perspective for campus and University reviewers on standards that candidates must meet in the school/unit.
- When the school/unit process is complete, ensure that the dossier is complete and in proper format before sending it to the campus level and, if not signed earlier, sign off on the checklist attesting to the state of the dossier.
- Send a letter to the candidate announcing the results of the school-/unit-level deliberation, including the recommendations themselves.

DOSSIER FORMAT

The dossier presents the evidence upon which P&T decisions are to be made. Dossiers should be no more than 50 pages, (excluding the candidate's vita; external letters; and chair, dean, and committee letters).

The same dossier is to be used for both P&T reviews.

Each of the six sections 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 school/unit. Binders and Appendices should not be forwarded to the Dean of the Faculties Office unless specifically requested. All dossiers for faculty and librarians should be divided into the following sections:

- I. General Summary
- II. Candidate's statement
- III. Documentation of Teaching and Teaching Scholarship/Evidence of Performance
- IV. Documentation of Research or Creative Activity/Evaluation of Professional Development
- V. Documentation of Service/Evaluation of Service
- VI. Appendices

SECTION I: General Summary

- Section I is the only section of the dossier not prepared by the candidate. The candidate owns the dossier; therefore 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 department or school/unit 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 committee reviews, evaluative material will be added to the dossier by each committee or administrator. Copies of the evaluative materials 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 materials. 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.
- The dean is expected to certify that the above condition has been met.
- Annual reviews will not be part of the dossier, but may be consulted by any of the reviewing bodies without violating the obligation to notify the candidate or earlier reviewers.

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

- Completed Checklist (see appendix).
- Routing and Action Form (see appendix).
- The written recommendation of the primary committee, including the committee's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, research and creative activity, and service or the librarian's performance, professional development, and service. These areas should be evaluated in terms of excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. In the case of tenure recommendations, 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.
- The chair's individual recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure —and a summary evaluation of the teaching, research and creative activity, and service in relation to departmental norms and expectations.
- The candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard format (see appendix).
- External evaluations from persons contacted by the primary committee chair, department chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee.
- A brief (two or three sentence) statement of the expertise of each external letter writer must be provided by the department (or the 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, e.g.:

- external and independent referees
- former or current colleagues (where applicable)
- mentors (where applicable)
- internal letters (in those instances when internal letters may be substituted for external letters for lecturers and clinical faculty [see “External Assessment”]).

Materials Added at the School/Unit Level. The dean of the school/unit is responsible for adding the following to the dossier:

- The school/unit committee's written recommendation and the Committee's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, research and creative activity, and service or librarian's performance, professional development and service.
- The dean's personal recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure and a summary evaluation of the candidate's professional activities (including performance and professional development for librarians).
- If the candidate holds an adjunct appointment in another school/unit, the dean of that school/unit or an appropriate representative must be given the opportunity to provide a letter with his or her recommendation on the candidate.
- If the candidate holds a joint appointment in two schools/units, one school/unit will be designated as the primary unit in the letter of appointment (if the appointment letter does not designate a primary unit, the decision about which school/unit will be considered the primary unit for P&T must be made prior to the dossier being assembled). The P&T committees in both schools/units and departments may be given an opportunity to conduct a full review of the candidate, with the understanding that the input of the secondary school/unit becomes part of the deliberations of the primary school/unit. In the case of all joint appointments, the dean of the secondary school/unit should provide a letter for the dossier, perhaps in consultation with the P&T committee of the primary school/unit.

SECTION II: Candidate's Statement

- Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a 5-page statement that reflects their own assessments of their accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, and service (faculty) or performance, professional development, and service (librarians) and of prospects for continued development. In cases where the candidate undergoes unit-level review at another campus (e.g., Business, Education), an accommodation with the page-length expectations of those campuses may be needed.
- Candidates for promotion should focus on their designated areas of excellent and satisfactory performance; in the case of research faculty and scientists and scholars, on research and service (if service is expected by their unit); for clinical faculty and lecturers, on teaching and service.
- The Candidate's Statement is a place for reflective commentary focused on the criteria for P&T.
- The Candidate's Statement should address the interrelated aspects of a whole, integrated career. Few faculty and librarians make sharp distinctions among the various aspects of their work as they do it, and the statement should indicate how the candidate views the integration of these aspects, even while assessing achievements in each. Special attention should be given to faculty and librarian work that cuts across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.
- Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work should make every effort to represent their scholarship clearly as well as the significance and value of any interdisciplinary approach they are pursuing.
- Faculty and librarians should be careful to provide clear and sufficient information about their individual roles in collaborative projects, publications, presentation, or grants.
- Candidates should explain how their service has contributed to the common good of the campus and University and how these contributions reflect department and school/unit expectations.
- 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 or creative work agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, and for continued participation through professional service in their profession, the campus, and a community.
 - Faculty in non-tenure track appointments should focus on their respective areas of performance.
 - Similarly, librarians should indicate the prospects for maintaining excellent performance and for continuing to contribute to their profession through their engagement in professional development and service activities.
- Faculty who seek advancement based on excellence in professional service should be able to demonstrate that such service is, in fact, academic work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers. 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 school/unit.

- The candidate's case for excellence should be made in relation to department, school/unit, and University criteria.

SECTION III: Teaching and Performance

A. Faculty: Documenting Teaching

IUPUI requires documented evidence of at least satisfactory teaching by each faculty member for tenure and for advancement in rank (with the exception of those classified as research faculty, scientists and scholars).

This section generally consists of a Statement of Teaching and supporting documentation for the ideas presented in the statement.

Candidates should provide the following evidence to document teaching and advising in Section III. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

- **Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers (required for satisfactory level or higher).**
 - 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. Additionally, local peers outside the discipline can provide an additional perspective of excellence in teaching, including practices in the classroom, teaching materials, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
 - 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 helpful.
 - It is much more difficult for external peers (i.e., external to IUPUI) to observe actual teaching, and thus local peers should prepare reports sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers along with other documented results of effectiveness.
 - Evidence in the dossier should summarize narratives, checklists, and methods used by peers to comment upon the quality of classroom performance and the quality of course design as evident in 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.
- **Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or better).**
 - Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years and compared to other faculty in the school/unit.
 - Only summaries should be included in dossiers. The summary should include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year and item to establish trend lines where applicable.
 - The summary should discuss individual results within the context of the department or school/unit to enhance the usefulness of the information to outside readers. When norms are available for comparison to others in the program, school/unit, campus, or discipline, these should be included. When results of scaled questionnaires are used, the values of the numeric ratings should be stated.
- **Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media, is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence.**
 - Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
 - Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in teaching should have peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning.
 - In some instances, and particularly 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 department chairs (or deans) may wish to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may be better.
- **Evidence that courses taught contribute to the overall student learning outcomes specified by the unit and evidence 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 or through systematic assessment of student achievement or from standardized, nationally-normed profession-related tests.
- 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 (PULs) 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.
- **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 with students on the curriculum vitae or by discussing the nature of the student outcomes in the statement for this section.
- **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, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present 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 activities not reported in the candidate's statement or in the curriculum vitae may be included in this section.
 - Evidence about student learning associated with these activities can be part of the peer review or student evaluation evidence, 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.
- **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.
- **Local, regional, national, or international teaching, advising or mentoring awards**, including information about their nature and significance (e.g., criteria, competitiveness, pool of applicants, number awarded) should be listed. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae, but if explanatory details are needed, they may be included in this section.
- **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.
- **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.
 - While these can be listed as professional service on the curriculum vitae, they may be included in the narrative for this section if explanatory details are needed to support the candidate's case.
- **Information on the teaching load of the candidate should be reported.**
 - While the teaching load is reported on the curriculum vitae, an indication of whether it is greater or less than the average teaching load in the department should be reported in this section.
 - A large number of students is not *per se* evidence of achievement; teaching and student learning must be evaluated.
 - Similarly, teaching a small number of students does not indicate diminished achievement if the teaching load is appropriate and there is a sufficient threshold for evaluating the quality of the teaching.
 - Faculty may hold part-time appointments at any rank and in any classification; the expectations and measures for teaching achievement should be proportionate.
- **Using technology, distributed education, problem-based learning, community-based learning, international videoconferencing, or other new techniques and tools to enhance student learning.**
 - Faculty are encouraged to report their experiments and to document results.
- **Interdisciplinary work**
 - Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary teaching are encouraged to describe the significance and impact of bringing multiple disciplinary approaches to their area of interest.
- **Retention**
 - Since retention of students is of considerable importance to IUPUI, faculty members involved in retention efforts should include a description of these activities.
 - Include any evidence that indicates the impact these activities have had on increasing retention, either in their own classrooms or in a broader school/unit or campus setting.

B. Librarians: Documenting Performance

- A written compilation of performance activities
- A summary of candidates' annual review statements in the area of performance (recommended).
- Documentation from faculty, librarians, or administrators external to the individual library unit must be selected under the same conditions as external letters selected for faculty.

- Candidates for promotion to librarian should also have letters documenting performance from at least six persons external to the campus.
- Other documentation addressing the quality of performance, as described in your Library guidelines for P&T, should be included.

SECTION IV: Research and Creative Activity

- Research or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty at IUPUI, as well as all research faculty, scientists, and scholars.
- For these faculty members, a threshold of documented satisfactory performance is required for P&T.
- In some units, funded research is an expectation and has become incorporated in departmental or school/unit standards for assessing excellence or satisfactory performance. Candidates should be careful to understand departmental or school/unit standards for external funding. Expectations should be applied consistently and equitably to all faculty. The expectation for externally funded research should be available to all faculty in written form if it is a requirement for advancement.
- Peer review of research, scholarship, and creative activity is required.

A. Faculty: Documentation of Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activity

- **Identification and discussion of the three to five most significant publications that reflect the candidate's major research accomplishments in rank.**
 - IUPUI places a higher value on quality and impact of research than number of publications.
 - 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.
 - Increasingly, research, scholarship, or creative activity involves collaboration. Such collaboration across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work. They should make clear their individual role (e.g., conception of work; acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing, revisions, and other communication; administrative and material support) in such collective activity, preferably as related by colleagues involved in the joint work. Department or school/unit assessment of the individual contributions of the candidate who works with more than one author or collaborator must be included.
 - Department or school/unit 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. Avoid abbreviations; reviewers outside the candidate's field are not likely to be familiar with them. In instances where a candidate is working in an interdisciplinary field and is publishing in journals or media other than the normal disciplinary publications, 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 or devaluing the publications.
- **The candidate's own description of a continuing program of research or creative activity that will carry forward into the future.**
 - The Candidate's Statement should include a plan for ongoing research or creative activity, but it may also be included in this section as a separate, expanded description of future research.
- **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.**

B. Librarians: Documentation of Professional Development

- Documentation may take many forms, such as research (both applied and theoretical), publications, or presentations to professional or disciplinary groups.
- Documentation should include a definite continuing program of professional development that advances ideas, knowledge, and technical ability to the whole profession and academic life, including internal and external peer review. Annual reviews may also be included.

SECTION V: Professional and University Service

A. Faculty: Documentation of Professional and University Service

- Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:
 - the public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);
 - the profession or discipline;
 - the campus and University.
- Satisfactory professional service is expected of each faculty member and librarian.
- The importance assigned to service in considering candidates for promotion or tenure may 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 and librarian's disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge of interrelated fields to issues in society.
- To be the basis for tenure or advancement in rank, professional service must be directly linked to the unit and campus mission; the quality and impact of professional service must be evaluated within this context.
- In documenting excellence in professional service, faculty must be alert to the need to collect information and evidence at the time services are provided so that it can be used later to demonstrate impact.
- To be considered as the basis for advancement in rank or for tenure, professional service must be documented as academic work characterized by the following:
 - command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - contributions to a body of knowledge;
 - imagination, creativity and innovation;
 - application of ethical standards;
 - achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - evidence of impact.
- Peer review within IUPUI and by disciplinary or professional peers at other universities or public settings is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service, as it is for teaching and research.
- 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.
- For lecturers, 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.
- 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 academic work.
- Excellence in professional service ordinarily results in the dissemination of results and findings through appropriate publication, whether in print or electronic media. The journals, books, or web documents in which faculty publish the results of their service activities should be assessed and evaluated by department chairs (or deans) in the same manner as they are for research or teaching publications.
- 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
 - must be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities.
- As with research, professional service may span traditional disciplinary boundaries. In such instances, candidates and chairs or deans may wish to develop appropriate procedures (e.g., a specially composed primary committee) to ensure that the nature of interdisciplinary professional service is fully and adequately understood and assessed.
- Professional service to clients and patients as well as to the discipline may be local, regional, national, or international.

This section should minimally include the following items:

- **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 that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
 - Faculty presenting committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate that 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 academic work as described in the Dean of the Faculties "Remarks on P&T."
- **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.
- **Evidence of the candidate's individual contributions**, especially when the professional service is collaborative in nature; specific contributions of the candidate should be noted.
- **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.

- **Evidence of effective dissemination of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or service recipients** in reports, documents, or other means of dissemination 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 for appropriateness and effectiveness as a part of the advancement review process.
- **Evidence and evaluation of the impact of university service.**

Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:

- **External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service**, including refereed and non-refereed publications or other means of dissemination.
 - 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.
 - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
 - Client evaluations may not substitute for peer evaluations.
- **Assessments from local faculty colleagues** who can place the quality of professional service within a context of departmental, school/unit, or interdisciplinary standards.
- **Evaluation by clients, patients or service recipients.**
 - Faculty should arrange for timely evaluations by recipients and determine appropriate ways to use this information.
- **When professional service is highly repetitive**, as is often the case in patient care, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated 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.

B. Librarians: Documentation of Service

- The notion of professional service, as it is applied to faculty, is seldom applicable to librarians since 'professional service' is more typically an aspect of librarian performance. Nonetheless, professional services that do not fall within the scope of a librarian's position description may be included as evidence satisfying the service criterion. These may take the form of professional consulting or teaching.
- Documentation of service should focus on impact.
- A librarian must present evidence of satisfactory service for tenure and, if service is cited as an area of emphasis, evidence of continued improvement beyond the satisfactory level for promotion from assistant to associate librarian.
- Service to national or international organizations is highly encouraged, but not required. Institutional, local, regional, and national service should be document through peer and external review.

SECTION VI: Appendices

- Appendices are not part of the 50-page limit.
- Appendices should provide documentation for all of the assertions made in the Candidate's Statement.
- Appendices may include articles published or accepted for publication, grant proposals accepted or under consideration, syllabi for redesigned courses, or any other materials that support a case for excellence in a chosen area(s) and at least satisfactory performance in the other area(s).
- Librarians, in accord with guidelines for librarian dossiers, should add separate appendices that include supporting documents for: (1) performance; (2) professional development; and (3) service. Appendices should be as succinct and as carefully selected as possible.

INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES AND VALUES

Submission Deadlines

- Dossiers are due to the Dean of the Faculties through the Office of Faculty Appointments and Advancement (formerly the Office of Academic Policies, Procedures, and Documentation) no later than **November 2, 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 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 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 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, deans and school-/unit-level administrators are strongly encouraged to review dossiers to ensure that materials are in the proper format and order, that peer reviews of teaching, research and creative activity, and service have been included, and that only required materials are forwarded.

If there is uncertainty about what may be required, candidates or chairs should confer with the Assistant Dean of the Faculties in the Office of Faculty Appointments and Advancement (formerly APPD) as soon as possible.

Time in Rank

- In most instances, the work being assessed as the basis for promotion or tenure will have been completed since either the initial appointment or last promotion.
- While the probationary period for untenured faculty ordinarily is seven years (with the tenure review occurring in the sixth year), special conditions may warrant earlier than normal consideration.
- For librarians, tenure is based on the entire professional career, including relevant professional positions held prior to coming to Indiana University.
- For faculty, publications and presentations in rank at another institution prior to appointment at IUPUI will be considered part of the candidate's record.
- There is no defined period between associate and full rank, although most associate professors or associate librarians seek full rank five to ten years after promotion to associate. Occasionally, the period under consideration may vary 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.
- When a case has special circumstances, the context for considering a candidate should guide the judgment of reviewers. Candidates and department chairs should provide an explanation for any unusual conditions that may affect the review of the candidates' dossiers.
- Candidates who seek earlier than normal consideration must present evidence of achievements comparable to those who have served the full probationary period. Earlier-than-normal cases sometimes require special care to ensure equity of treatment.
- Some faculty may have a longer-than-normal probationary period. Because extensions are formally approved for important reasons, such as illness, childbirth or unavoidable delays in research infrastructure, candidates should not be held to higher expectations because of a longer-than-normal probationary period.
- Part-time faculty in eligible classifications may be considered for tenure and their probationary periods should be proportionate to those of full-time appointees. Typically, agreements regarding the length of a probationary period for a part-time faculty member have been committed to writing.
- 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 throughout his or her professional career.

Areas of Excellence:

- 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.
- Faculty determine their area(s) of excellence within the academic norms and context of their primary unit. It is not the role of any review committee to change the area(s) of excellence declared by the candidate. Review committees may comment in their evaluation of the dossiers that one or more additional areas are also excellent.
- Balanced case: In some circumstances, faculty may present a record of highly satisfactory performance across all three areas sufficient to demonstrate comparable long-term benefits to the University. However, the Promotion and Tenure standards in many departments/units encourage the choosing of one area of excellence. Faculty should be aware of the preferences of their department/unit.

- Appropriate areas of excellence have been designated for faculty in all categories. These are summarized in the chart 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 varies and the ways in which faculty accomplish their 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 dean and the department chairperson, as well as the evaluations of the primary and school/unit committees (often referred to as the unit committee), must address the area(s) the candidate advances as representing excellence: teaching, research and creative activity, or service. 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). Sometimes faculty 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. Nevertheless, it is essential for candidates who provide evidence for excellence in two areas to provide sufficient documentation meeting at least the minimum standards for satisfactory performance (appended) in the area for which they are not claiming excellence.
- Tenure requires performance commensurate with rank and promise 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, such as documentation of 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 and creative activity, and service to be eligible for promotion or tenure. A faculty member whose work in any one of these three areas is less than satisfactory will not be recommended for promotion or tenure. Faculty whose University service (often referred to as "academic citizenship") is not at least satisfactory may not be advanced for this reason as well. Maintaining high standards of professional conduct is a requirement for tenure and is expected across teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- Librarians are obligated to maintain high standards of performance in the development of library services and in the communication of information and knowledge to others. Evaluations cover the areas of performance, professional development, and service. For tenure, performance must be excellent, and professional development and service must be satisfactory. Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction. For promotion from assistant to associate librarian, performance must be excellent, and the candidate must demonstrate a level of achievement beyond satisfactory in one of the other two areas. The third area must be satisfactory. For promotion to full rank, the librarian must demonstrate superior performance and a continued significant contribution at the state, regional, national, or international level in either professional development or service. Performance in the third area must be satisfactory. Librarians must maintain high standards of professional conduct across all areas of responsibility.
- Clinical faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching or service and satisfactory in the other area. Lecturers are required to be excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service.
- Research professors, scientists, and scholars are required to be excellent in research, scholarship or creative work.
- Expectations for University and professional service will vary by unit and must be articulated in unit policies or in explanatory materials from the dean or chair contained within individual dossiers.

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 and committees that have already assessed the dossier.

- It is the candidate's responsibility to provide these materials to the chair, school/unit dean, or 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 committee.
- Committees at prior levels may elect to change their vote on the case if circumstances warrant this action.
- 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 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 comments or materials that are relevant to the recommendations of a review, this addition of materials constitutes a request for reconsideration. Indiana University policy allows for reconsideration under special circumstances only for faculty and librarians being considered for tenure who receive a negative recommendation. This provision is applicable only to tenure-track probationary faculty and librarians, who should consult 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 or librarian 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.
- A request for reconsideration is appropriate only at the level where a negative recommendation on tenure is first given.
- The request for reconsideration must be made within two weeks after the faculty member or librarian receives notification of the negative recommendation and before the review at the next level is completed.
- Faculty and librarians 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 must therefore 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.
- Under unusual circumstances, reconsideration of promotion decisions may be permitted with the approval of the Dean of the Faculties. The procedures noted above will be followed in such a situation.
- Nothing in the act of requesting reconsideration or being reconsidered precludes a candidate's later seeking a Faculty Board of Review.

Campus Level Reviews and Notification

The IUPUI P&T 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, where fewer than 75% of eligible reviewers approve of promotion or tenure, or when the primary or secondary reader makes such a request.
- Following consideration of the reviews of the primary and secondary reader, members of the Campus P&T Committee discuss the case and vote.
- 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.
- P&T recommendations for Indiana University faculty and librarians and tenure recommendations for Purdue faculty are made to the President and Trustees of Indiana University.
- Faculty and librarians are notified when these recommendations are made.
- A formal subsequent notice of final action is provided to faculty and librarians after the Trustees act.
- In instances where a candidate is not being recommended for promotion or tenure, the memorandum informing candidates of this action will ordinarily be the only notice of a negative decision.
- Probationary faculty not recommended for tenure will also receive a notice of non-reappointment from the Chancellor.

Peer Review

- The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, and service is the bedrock on which P&T decisions are based.
- This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed.

- These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research and creative activity, or service, and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

A. 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 is considered the routine way to document the quality of this work.
- Expectations for peer review of the quality and impact of teaching and professional service are now well established at IUPUI.
- Peer evaluation of teaching or professional service is expected for all candidates with teaching or professional service as an area of performance and it is required for those whose advancement is based on excellence in teaching or professional service. In the absence of a clear reason for the omission, 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, national, or international peers.
- To be credible, peer reviewers must be identified according to their expertise or competence to comment.
- These peer reviews should be requested at intervals by the department chair as part of the department's peer review policies and procedures, and conducted in the standard way specified by the academic unit.

B. External Assessment

- As IUPUI grows in complexity and as the nature of faculty and librarian work evolves, expectations for the form of independent, external assessment of the overall record appropriate to each type of faculty appointment continues to be refined.
- 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. **At least six letters are required.**
- In most instances, the candidate should not be involved in the process of identifying external reviewers, with two exceptions: 1) the candidate should be allowed to list those he or she would definitely not want to serve as an external reviewer, and 2) the candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the chair or the chair's designee. Chairs or deans are not required to use these external reviewers recommended by candidates. The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be as independent as possible. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that referees are objective and credible; persons closely associated with the candidate may not be as objective as those who are not personally associated. In general, reviewers should be at a rank higher than the candidate, and at a peer (or better) institution. School/unit practices may vary in regard to who solicits external letters, but the candidate should not solicit or receive his or her own letters.
- General expectations for external assessment vary with type of appointment.
 - For advancement to full rank for tenure-related classifications and research professors, scientists, and scholars, peer review external to the University is required. Reviewers should be as independent as possible from the candidate.
 - 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 or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation.
 - For advancement to associate rank for tenure-track faculty, a blend of reviewers external to the University and department 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 a sufficient number of IUPUI peers outside the department or discipline provide an objective assessment of teaching or professional service.
 - Clinical faculty seeking promotion to associate may use a blend of peers external to the department and external to IUPUI but those seeking promotion to full professor must obtain peer review external to IUPUI.
 - In the case of librarians, outside letters are required only for candidates for full librarian; candidates for tenure and for promotion to associate librarian must have letters from campus faculty, librarians, or administrators external to the unit but solicited in the same careful way as external letters to ensure objectivity.
- When excellence in teaching or professional service is a basis for advancement, it is important to provide documentation that will enable external reviewers to make informed judgments.
 - For teaching, most schools/units have effectively sought external evaluation of course design and materials as part of their 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, databases, software) or for judging the incorporation of service learning as a part of courses.

- For professional service, candidates should include sample reports, presentation materials or other items, illustrating their scholarship of service, as well as evaluation or impact data related to their work.
- Without documented results and without external peer review, candidates for advancement based on excellence in teaching or professional service should not expect to succeed.
- Librarians should provide external reviewers with materials appropriate to their context, in addition to the standard information on responsibilities and publications and presentations documented in the vitae and candidate's statement
- When submitted to the 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.

Joint and Adjunct Appointments

- If the candidate holds a joint or adjunct appointment in another school/unit and that joint appointment represents a significant investment of the faculty member or librarian's intellectual activities, it is important to include at least a letter of recommendation from the appropriate chair, director, or dean of that school/unit.

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.
- Results of this work—whether teaching, research and creative activity, or service—are frequently disseminated through publications with joint authorship.
- Collaborative work is valued, but candidates should make clear their individual role in such collective activity, preferably as specified by colleagues involved in the joint work.

Entrepreneurial Work and Innovation

- IUPUI is a comparatively new institution and has had an opportunity to develop policies, procedures and programs that build on the experiences of others, adapting best practices and creating innovative new approaches to teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- This opportunity has led many faculty to be entrepreneurial in their University duties, after leading their own disciplines into new areas of inquiry or seeking collaboration with other disciplines.
- While there is no criterion specifying entrepreneurial work or innovation, these qualities have long been appreciated and valued within the more traditional criteria ordinarily used to assess faculty achievement.
- Documentation of the impact of this work will help reviewers of the dossier understand its significance.

Research and Creative Activity

- Applied research or scholarship that integrates various applications into improved practices, is often as essential or as valuable as theoretical research.
- IUPUI has made interdisciplinary research a particular focus for its mission and its strategic objectives as a result of combining in one place the traditionally differentiated missions of Indiana University and Purdue University.
- As the state's only public metropolitan university, IUPUI has specific opportunities and responsibilities to engage in research that draws on and supports its urban environment

Interdisciplinary Work and Publication

- In the instance of candidates who work in interdisciplinary fields that transcend the intellectual authority of any single school/unit, special arrangements for primary and unit committee reviews may be necessary. .
- The school/unit 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 schools/units in a primary committee and for an alternative unit committee.
- The special or ad hoc arrangements should be stipulated in advance, be known to the candidate, the program administrators (dean or director), and the dean of the host school/unit.
- In instances where there is not agreement on procedures among the concerned parties, the Dean of the Faculties will determine the process and procedures for reviewing candidates.
- The same high standards of achievement and of documentation for traditional disciplinary work apply to interdisciplinary 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 in every case.

- Candidates should help their chairs 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.

International Work and Publication

- Scholarship and professional work are now often international in terms of their impact and application; collaborators are sometimes based in other countries; and appropriate journals, conferences, and other forums for dissemination may be international in scope and/or published outside the U.S. and in languages other than English.
- Such international work and outreach are encouraged.
- In most cases, they may be evaluated using standard procedures. Sometimes, however, they may require special forms of review and assessment, even—in some cases—the provision of translations.
- Review committees should demonstrate the same flexibility in assessing such international work as they do for interdisciplinary work.
 - International variations in rankings, modes of inquiry, and forms of dissemination must be acknowledged.
 - Candidates and chairs should take special care to explain the quality, audience, impact, and value of such international work and to solicit external evaluation by international peers, when appropriate.

Service

- The distinction between professional service and service to the University requires some elaboration.
 - Faculty and librarian 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 P&T.
 - 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,
 - when it is derived from the mission of the unit,
 - when it is disseminated to a broader audience, and
 - when it is peer reviewed.
- Not all committee service is equal.
 - Some committees, such as an Institutional Review Board, the Committee on Ethics in Research, or a Faculty Board of Review, may require extensive time commitments and may address principles or issues fundamental to the continued effectiveness of the campus. These special features need to be recognized.
 - The primary committee, chair, unit committee and dean are best able to assess the degree of performance of University service.
 - If it 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 campus level for review. The candidate must be informed and be provided an opportunity to respond prior to a final recommendation at the primary and unit levels.

SUMMARY OF AREAS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR VARIOUS FACULTY CATEGORIES

| Advancement to | Area of Excellence ¹ | Other Areas of Performance | Expectation for External Peer Review of Case | Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work) |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Associate Professor Tenure Track² | Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service | Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school | Letters from peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship |
| Professor Tenure Track² | Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service | Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school | Letters from peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship |
| Associate Librarian³ | Performance | Beyond satisfactory in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and satisfactory in other area | Letters from peers outside unit on IUPUI campus | (No Additional requirements) |
| Librarian⁴ | Performance | Excellence in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and at least satisfactory in other area | Letters from peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution | Record of superior performance as an associate librarian and attainment of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession. (IU Academic Handbook, UFC, 1978) Record of exceptional achievements in performance and a record of distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community in the secondary area of excellence. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. (IU Library Faculty Handbook, Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Librarians, 2004) |

¹ Balanced case expectations are defined by the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit [to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others] to the University.” This category applies to only tenure-track faculty and is to be used in exceptional cases.

² For tenure decisions, tenure expectations are for performance commensurate with rank and evidence of continued service with distinction.

³ For tenure decisions, performance must be excellent, and professional development and service must be satisfactory. Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction.

⁴ Balanced case exceptions for librarians only apply to the secondary criteria (to professional development, research and/or creativity and to service).

| Advancement to | Area of Excellence¹ | Other Areas of Performance | Expectation for External Peer Review of Case | Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Clinical Associate Professor | Teaching or Professional Service | Satisfactory in other area and in University Service | Peers external to IUPUI or department | Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence |
| Clinical Professor | Teaching or Professional Service | Satisfactory in other area and in University Service | Peers external to IUPUI | Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence |
| Senior Lecturer | Teaching | Satisfactory in University and Professional Service | Peers external to IUPUI or department | Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching |
| Associate Research Professor | Research | Service expectations, if any, set by unit | Peers external to IUPUI | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research |
| Research Professor | Research | Service expectations, if any, set by unit | Peers external to IUPUI | Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of independent work |
| Associate Scientist/Scholar | Research | Service expectations, if any, set by unit | Peers external to IUPUI | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in research; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline |
| Senior Scientist/Scholar | Research | Service expectations, if any, set by unit | Peers external to IUPUI | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in research; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline |

¹ Balanced case expectations are defined by the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit [to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others] to the University.” This category applies to only tenure-track faculty and is to be used in exceptional cases.

DOCUMENTING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

| Dimensions of teaching performance | Potential Locations | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Section I: CV | Section II: Candidate's Statement | Section III: Narrative contained in Evaluation of Teaching | Peer Review (may be part of Sections I-Dean, Chair Comment or III-internal and external peers) |
| Teaching load | List of courses, etc. | | Details on students mentored, advised, etc. | Comment on relative size of load |
| Teaching goals | | Goals and/or Teaching Philosophy | Expansion of explanation in statement, if desired | Comment on fit with IUPUI and unit goals |
| Continuing professional development | List of formal activities | Description of activities and their significance | Details of workshops attended, study, reading, etc and their significance | Comment on efforts undertaken |
| Use of exemplary teaching methods | | Description of methods | Details, on specific methods such as teaching with technology, use of PBL, service learning, or other innovative methods, inclusive teaching | Local peer review, external if knowledgeable |
| Quality of teaching | | Reflective comments | Student rating summaries, peer review of class performance or materials | Local peer review, external if knowledgeable |
| Evidence of student learning | | Reflective comments | Results of nationally normed tests, pre-post evaluations of course knowledge gains, analysis of student work, student/alumni reports, approach toward PUL's (for UG courses) | Local peer review, external if knowledgeable |
| Ethics | | Self-report | Student report in letters | Local administrative and peer comments |
| Scholarship of teaching and national leadership | Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline | Descriptions of scholarly approach | Details, commentary on activities listed in CV | Local or external peer review |
| Course and curriculum development | List of committees, etc. | Self-report | Details on CV entries | Local peer review, external if knowledgeable |
| Recognition (grants, awards) | List of recognitions | Can be mentioned | Details on CV entries, if needed | Commentary on stature of awards |

SUGGESTED STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

| Type | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Instruction | <p>Incomplete lists of formal instruction</p> <p>Incomplete evidence to interpret load</p> <p>Incomplete information about goals of instruction</p> <p>Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative</p> <p>Incomplete information on learning outcomes</p> <p>Absence of peer review evidence or superficial peer commentary not based on systematic review</p> <p>Poor performance on many of the above measures</p> | <p>Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes</p> | <p>Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction</p> | <p>Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes;</p> <p>The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy;</p> <p>Evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice.</p> |
| Course or Curricular Development | <p>Incomplete evidence of nature of activities or results</p> <p>Incomplete evidence of individual role in outcomes</p> <p>No review by others</p> <p>No evidence on how work is connected with department or campus goals</p> <p>Poor course or curricular design products</p> | <p>Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness</p> | <p>Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes</p> | <p>In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation or other means.</p> <p>Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence</p> |
| Mentoring and Advising | <p>Numbers of students mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided</p> <p>Comparative load for unit not indicated</p> <p>Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented</p> <p>Poor performance indicated by data</p> | <p>Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized</p> <p>Student satisfaction indicated by evidence</p> <p>Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear</p> | <p>Important impact and student achievement documented</p> | <p>Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach</p> <p>High accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor</p> <p>Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented</p> <p>Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students</p> <p>External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| Scholarly Activities, including Awards | No teaching awards or other recognition of successful teaching and learning No evidence of dissemination of good practice or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) | Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL Some recognition of teaching efforts | Evidence of regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and recognition of high quality of teaching Grants or awards at the department or campus level (For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence) | Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels Positive departmental evaluations of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals) Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods National or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects |
| Professional Development Efforts in Teaching | No information about teaching development efforts given Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise No mentoring of colleagues Evidence of ineffective performance in this area | Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance, personal experimentation, or reading Record of mentoring other teachers Reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching Peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth or mentoring of others | High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments (For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence) | Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning Membership in communities of practice on the campus, national, or international level Participation in dissemination of good practice Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area |

DOCUMENTING RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE DOSSIER

| Evidence Required | Potential Locations | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| | Section I: Chair's Letter, Dean's Letter, Primary and Unit Committee Reports | Section I: CV | Section II: Candidate's Statement | Section III: Narrative contained in Evaluation of Research | Peer Review (may be part of Sections I, Dean, Chair or III, internal and external peers) |
| Three to five most significant publications which reflect major research accomplishments | | List all publications and indicate in rank and whether refereed | Description in personal statement may also note the most significant publications | May contain a more thorough discussion of the most significant published research and the status of the journals or other publications | |
| Evaluation of stature of journals in which articles appear | Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature | May be an indication in CV (refereed v. non-refereed, name of publisher, age of journal title) | Candidate may also comment on a journal's quality in the Candidate's Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident | As above | External letters may also provide guidance on the stature of journals and other publications |
| Evaluation of stature of galleries where works appear or stature of performance venues | Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature | May be an indication in CV (stature of gallery or performing venue, city, potential size of audience) | Candidate may also comment on galleries in the Candidate's Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident | As above | External letters may also provide guidance on the stature of galleries and performance venues |
| Research Expectations | As above: a letter often points out unusual circumstances related to work load | | This may also be commented on in the personal statement (but seek confirmation from other documents in the dossier) | May be more detailed comments on this, particularly where load is considered heavy in school or department | Comment on fit with IUPUI and department/school goals and quantity of effort |
| Research goals/program of research | Letters from Chair and Dean may comment, as may committee reports (important for tenure, as the University is projecting candidate's future contributions and productivity) | | List of goals and candidate's description of continuing program of research, scholarship or creative activities | May include a more thorough discussion of the research projects in progress and/or future research plans; may include listing of manuscripts submitted for publication and their status | Interpretation of candidate's research progress and future potential in external letters |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Quality of research | Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | CV | Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate's Statement | Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate's Statement | Experts in candidate's field through letters solicited by chairs or deans |
| Assessment of contributions when more than one author or collaborator | Departmental evaluation, committee reports | Listed in CV using citing conventions appropriate to the school/unit or discipline | An annotated bibliography in the CV can be helpful, with interpretive comments in the personal statement | Candidates may provide additional detail as to their own individual contributions to the effort (important to cross check against other documentation) | External and internal letters can indicate the stature of collaborators |
| Contributions to interdisciplinary research | Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | CV may indicate which items are interdisciplinary | Candidate's Statement may comment on how interdisciplinary work may have contributed to the candidate's career and research goals | Candidate should highlight this as appropriate, since interdisciplinary research is a major goal of the campus | Evaluations by peers in research centers or other departments/schools may identify achievements in interdisciplinary research |
| Grants and awards | Committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | List of grants and awards (Accuracy in amounts and dates is very important.) | Explanation of most significant grants and awards is crucial. | May include a more thorough description of grants and awards, as well as information on grant applications in process where appropriate | External letters may reference grants and awards received |
| Stature of grants and other awards | Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Dean and Chair | May appear on CV (reputation of granting agency, national v. state or local reach of grant, constituents to be served) | Candidate's own assessment of the stature of grants and awards | Candidate's assessment of the significance of grants and awards and how they fit in an overall research plan may be more fully documented here | Experts in candidate's field through letters solicited through school procedures |
| Continuing efforts to enhance research, scholarship and creative activities | Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | CV | Reflective comments by candidate | Reflective comments by candidate | Experts in candidate's field through letters solicited through school procedures |

SUGGESTED STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

| Type | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Disciplinary or Professional Research | <p>Research has not been regularly conducted or there is no evidence of dissemination.</p> <p>Evidence comes only from colleagues, collaborators, or ex-students</p> <p>Individual role and level of collaborative work is unspecified</p> <p>Research is of poor quality</p> <p>No research program has been presented</p> | <p>Candidate has performed research that is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice</p> <p>Candidate has disseminated the results of research in scholarly journals and other appropriate venues</p> <p>Research program is clearly articulated</p> | <p>Candidate's work has attracted favorable peer review and peer commentary</p> <p>notes promise</p> | <p>Significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that clearly demonstrate attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of research</p> |
| Grants and external support | <p>No evidence of attempts to seek support</p> | <p>Evidence of attempts, which show promise</p> | <p>Successful grant and external support has been obtained and continuing efforts and promise are documented</p> | <p>Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support, including the degree to which the process was competitive</p> |
| Peer review | <p>Local and external peer reviews have evaluated the work as unsatisfactory.</p> <p><i>[Procedures require internal and external reviews.]</i></p> | <p>Departments provide clear information about the stature of journals and the significance of the research publications</p> <p>Departments affirm the candidates' plans for continued research</p> | <p>Regular local and external peer review</p> | <p>Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations, grants, and publications</p> <p>Evidence of national recognition of the quality of work</p> |
| Scholarly activities, including awards | <p>None are documented</p> | <p>Local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred</p> | <p>Regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred</p> | <p>Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others</p> <p>Departmental evaluations of the stature of the work</p> |

DOCUMENTING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

| Evidence Required | Potential Locations | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Section I: CV | Section I: Internal Supporting Letters & Reports | Section II: Candidate's Statement | Section III: Evaluation of Professional Service | External Peer Review |
| Satisfactory University Service* | List of university service | Evidence (e.g., assigned responsibilities context, role, growth, impact) and basis for judging it satisfactory | Relevance to professional development and goals as well as evidence of impact | Annotation of roles, contributions, and impact | External letters evaluate the achievement evident in the products of research. |
| Significance and impact of professional service | List of community, disciplinary/professional, and university service | Assessment of significance and impact to the context of the unit or campus mission | Relevance to professional development and goals and evidence of impact | Evidence of impact on constituencies and intellectual contribution from and to the discipline or profession | External letters evaluate the adequacy of the evidence |
| Description of activity and individual's responsibility | List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer) | Evidence of candidate's contribution | Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and contributions | Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and intellectual contributions | |
| Growth and leadership | List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer) | Evidence of leadership | Self-assessment of growth and leadership | Annotation of specific roles, responsibilities, intellectual contributions | Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers |
| Publications related to service | List of refereed publications and non-refereed publications | Assessment of significance to the discipline, constituencies, and mission | Relevance to professional development and goals | Annotation on significance as intellectual work | Comments on this criterion within letters from external reviewers |
| Dissemination of results of service | List of presentations, workshops, and reports | Assessment of significance to the discipline or profession | Relevance to professional development and goals | Annotation of nature of dissemination as appropriate and effective | Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers |

*University service is necessary for promotion and/or tenure. It qualifies as professional if it is documented as intellectual work that relates to the discipline or to the mission of the university. For example, the economist on the task force charged with revising university revenue distribution policies may be performing professional service but the English professor would be engaged in university citizenship.

SUGGESTED STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

| Type | Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| University Service* | No evidence of activities or results Evidence on outcomes of collaborative work, but no evidence of individual contribution No review by others No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals Poor performance on service activities | Citizenship: Routine department expectations Chair's determination that service is more than mere participation Noted in CV, but not in promotion and tenure document | Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance by Faculty Council) "wrote a policy that was approved by committee" "not required or expected" Played a major role in initiative over a period of time that contributed to campus or unit goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others | Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received |
| Service to Discipline | No evidence of activities or results Evidence on outcomes, but no evidence of individual contribution No review by others No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals Poor performance on service activities | Activities: routine, required, or expected | Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants) "organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered" Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to discipline's goals or organization's mission, with independent evidence of significance, impact, role, and effective communication to others | Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received |
| Service to Community | No evidence of activities or results Evidence on outcomes, but no evidence of individual contribution No review by others No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals Poor performance on service activities | Professional Activities: routine, required, or expected | Accompanied by independent evidence of impact "chaired a subcommittee of the board that accomplished X, Y, & Z" "played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization" Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to community goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others | Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received |

DOCUMENTING PERFORMANCE IN IUPUI LIBRARIAN DOSSIERS

| Evidence Required | Potential Locations | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| | Section I: CV | Section I: Internal Supporting Letters & Reports | Section II: Candidate's Statement | Section III: Evaluation of Professional Service | External Peer Review |
| Listing of major performance achievements and positions held | May be referenced in all of these sources | List of positions in CV | Description in personal statement | May be more fully described in personal statements (changes in job responsibilities and major projects may be highlighted by series of position descriptions) | May be referenced in letters from peers, unsolicited testimonials from library users and from external solicited letters |
| Evaluation of performance | All of the above sources may contain evidence of the effectiveness of the librarian's performance | | Self-reflective comments on performance may certainly appear in personal statement, especially achievements of significance or patterns of professional growth | Written compilation of performance activities, including summary of annual review statements; supervisor's statements from annual review (with permission from supervisor) | Letters and testimonials from those familiar with the librarian's work, but external letters may also be useful |
| Performance Expectation | Indication in the materials submitted above (use to cross-check against materials supplied by candidate) | | Referenced in personal statement (# of hours at reference desk compared to others) | Additional detail, particularly in position descriptions | Additional evidence of this, particularly in solicited external letters (i.e., candidate's performance is particularly noteworthy since he/she is on the reference desk # hours per week) |
| Contribution of librarian's performance to library operations quality of services | All of the above; include a copy of the library's mission statement | CV notations, particularly if publications or presentations given as part of job responsibilities | Reflective comments | Supporting materials on any grants received that relate to library services and their impact on the library or materials prepared (bibliographies, research aids, etc.) | Letters solicited through school procedures from peers or students, faculty, staff and others who have benefited from the librarian's expertise and contribution in this area |
| Assessment of contributions when more than one librarian is involved in a project | Specific notations in all of the above | List in CV using citing conventions appropriate to the library | Reference to contribution | Additional detail | Joint statements or letters when librarian served as part of a team |
| Evaluation of teaching when teaching is part of job assignments | See grid for Teaching | See grid for Teaching | See grid for Teaching | See grid for Teaching | See grid for Teaching |
| Continuing efforts to enhance performance | Above documents | List of professional development activities related to performance | Description of significant continuing education and training activities undertaken to improve performance | Highlights in Summary of Performance Activities | Letters on the significance of these activities in enhancing the librarian's performance |

Candidate _____

ID# _____

Area(s) of Excellence _____

School _____

Department _____

Faculty

Promotion and Tenure Dossier Checklist

Note: Not every item is required in every case, but most items are required in most cases; check all items that are included.

- Submit Three Copies of Full Dossier (copies can be submitted on a CD)
- *Completed Checklist
- *Routing and Action Form
- *Dean's recommendation and summary evaluation of candidate's work
- If a candidate has an adjunct or joint appointment in another school, letter of recommendation from that school's dean.

General Summary

- *School Committee's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's work
- If a candidate has a joint appointment in another school, recommendation from that school's committee (optional—decided by that school)
- *Chair's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's work
- *Primary Committee's recommendation and evaluation (including statement concerning candidate's potential for continued development)
- *External letters of evaluation and statement of expertise of letter writers
- *Copy of candidate's *curriculum vitae*

Candidate's Statement

- *Candidate's own statement on work, including plans for future work in the intended areas of excellence

Teaching

- Teaching Narrative
- Teaching load information; graduate committees served on or chaired
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Student evaluation of teaching
- Evidence of student learning and match with unit and IUPUI student outcome goals
- Evidence of scholarly dissemination of work and leadership on teaching
- Department evaluation of stature of journals in which teaching publications appear
- Evidence of undergraduate or graduate student research or mentoring
- Evidence of quality of course development or innovation efforts
- Listing of teaching awards and grants
- Evidence of teaching development efforts

Research or Creative Activity

- Research and Creative Activity Narrative
- Peer evaluation of research or creative activity
- Evidence of scholarly publications and presentations
- Departmental evaluation of stature of journals in which publications appear or galleries in which showings have been presented
- Research load information; amount of time devoted to research
- Documentation of individual contributions to collaborative work

Service

- Service Narrative
- Summary of professional service activities and service load information
- Peer evaluation of quality as well as quantity of professional service as intellectual work
- Evidence of scholarly publications, presentations, or other means of dissemination
- Departmental evaluation of stature of journals in which publications appear
- Evaluation by Chair of quality and quantity of professional service

University Service

Evaluation by chair of the adequacy of University service

Appendices

As determined by candidate and department (do not forward to campus).

**These materials will be retained by Dean of the Faculties Office for permanent file.*

Important: At the department or school level, a person well-informed about requirements for dossiers should review the complete dossier, ensure that all required materials are included, and place materials in the proper order. This reviewer may be an administrative assistant, designated faculty member, or other person specified by the chair or dean. The reviewer is required to sign this checklist indicating that to the best of his or her ability the requirements for dossier preparation have been met. This certification may **not** be provided by the candidate. In instances where campus-level reviewers have questions about the content or form of the dossier, this is the person who will first be contacted for assistance.

Signature

Title

Telephone

E-mail

Date

Candidate _____

ID# _____

Area(s) of Excellence _____

School _____

Department _____

**Librarian
Promotion and Tenure Dossier Checklist**

- Submit Three Copies of Full Dossier (copies can be submitted on a CD)
- *Completed Checklist
- *Routing and Action Form
- *Dean's recommendation and summary evaluation of candidate's performance, professional development and professional service (either the dean of IUPUI University Library or the dean of the professional school, as appropriate)
- If a candidate has an adjunct appointment in another school, letter of recommendation from that school's dean
- *If a candidate has a joint appointment in another school, letter of recommendation from that school's dean

General Summary

- *Unit Committee's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's teaching, performance (e.g. research/creative activity) and service
- If a candidate has a joint appointment in another school, recommendation from that school's committee (optional)
- *University Librarian's recommendation and evaluation of performance, professional development, and professional service
- *Supervisor's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's performance, professional development, and professional service
- *Copy of candidate's *curriculum vitae*
- *External letters of evaluation and statement of expertise of letter writers

Candidate's Statement

- *Candidate's own statement on performance, professional development, and professional service

Performance

- Position description(s)
- Summary of performance activities

Professional Development

- Summary of professional development activities

Professional and University Service

- Summary of professional service activities
- Evaluation by supervisor of the adequacy of University service

Appendices (should not be forwarded to the campus)

- Supporting documents for performance
- Supporting documents for professional development
- Supporting documents for service

**These materials will be retained by Dean of the Faculties Office for permanent file.*

Important: At the department or school level, a person well-informed about requirements for dossiers should review the complete dossier, ensure that all required materials are included, and place materials in the proper order. This reviewer may be an administrative assistant, designated faculty member, or other person specified by the chair or dean. The reviewer is required to sign this checklist indicating that to the best of his or her ability the requirements for dossier preparation have been met. This certification may **not** be provided by the candidate. In instances where campus-level reviewers have questions about the content or form of the dossier, this is the person who will first be contacted for assistance.

Signature

Title

Telephone

E-mail

Date

**FACULTY ROUTING AND ACTION FORM
FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2007-08 ACADEMIC YEAR**

Full Name _____

School: _____ Department(s): _____

Dean(s): _____ Chair(s): _____

Title Sought: _____ Year Initially Appointed at IUPUI: _____

Faculty Service at IUPUI: (Please list your current position(s) first)

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| <i>Rank/Title</i> | <i>Year Rank Achieved</i> | <i>School/Department</i> |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|

If Going Up for Tenure, Year Begun on Tenure Track: _____ Years Credit Toward Tenure (if any): _____

Degrees: (Please rank degrees from the highest degree achieved to the lowest)

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>Degree</i> | <i>Year</i> | <i>Institution</i> | <i>Field</i> |
|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|

Doctoral Dissertation Title (if any): _____

Professional Service Prior to IUPUI:

| | | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <i>Rank/Title</i> | <i>Years</i> | <i>Institution</i> |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|

Candidate's Review of Dossier

I have reviewed the contents of the dossier and have had an opportunity to provide necessary information in accord with the guidelines for preparing dossiers issued by the Dean of the Faculties and in accord with school and department guidelines.

Signature of Candidate

Date

The upper portion of this routing form should be completed before the dossier is evaluated at the department or school level.

Review Process

As applicable, the Primary Committee, Department Chairperson, Unit Committee, and Dean should attach supporting statements for their recommendation. The final vote in each committee should be recorded below; if there are abstentions, this fact may be explained, but an abstention is neither negative nor positive. If new materials were added, please indicate at what level and certify that earlier reviewers and the candidate have received copies of the new materials.

A. Promotion Recommendation (record actual committee votes): _____ Date Candidate Notified: _____

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|
| Primary Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Department Chairperson | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Unit Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| IUPUI Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of the Faculties | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chancellor | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |

B. Tenure Recommendation (record actual committee votes): _____ Date Candidate Notified: _____

| | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|
| Primary Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Department Chairperson | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Unit Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| IUPUI Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of the Faculties | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chancellor | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARY LIBRARIAN ROUTING AND ACTION FORM
FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2007-08 ACADEMIC YEAR**

Full Name

School: _____ **Department(s):** _____

Dean(s): _____ **Chair(s):** _____

Title Sought: _____ **Year Initially Appointed at IUPUI:** _____

Faculty Service at IUPUI: (Please list your current position(s) first)

| <i>Rank/Title</i> | <i>Year Rank Achieved</i> | <i>School/Department</i> |
|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|

If Going Up for Tenure, Year Begun on Tenure Track: _____ **Years Credit Toward Tenure (if any):** _____

Degrees: (Please rank degrees from the highest degree achieved to the lowest)

| <i>Degree</i> | <i>Year</i> | <i>Institution</i> | <i>Field</i> |
|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
|---------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|

Doctoral Dissertation Title (if any): _____

Professional Service Prior to IUPUI:

| <i>Rank/Title</i> | <i>Years</i> | <i>Institution</i> |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|

Candidate's Review of Dossier

I have reviewed the contents of the dossier and have had an opportunity to provide necessary information in accord with the guidelines for preparing dossiers issued by the Dean of the Faculties and in accord with school and department guidelines.

Signature of Candidate _____
Date

The upper portion of this routing form should be completed before the dossier is evaluated at the department or school level.

Review Process

As applicable, the Primary Committee, Department Chairperson, Unit Committee, and Dean should attach supporting statements for their recommendation. The final vote in each committee should be recorded below; if there are abstentions, this fact may be explained, but an abstention is neither negative nor positive. If new materials were added, please indicate at what level and certify that earlier reviewers and the candidate have received copies of the new materials.

A. Promotion Recommendation (record actual committee votes): **Date Candidate Notified:** _____

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|
| Primary Peer Review Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | |
| Team Leader | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chair, IUPUI Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of University Library | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| IUPUI Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of the Faculties | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chancellor | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |

B. Tenure Recommendation (record actual committee votes): **Date Candidate Notified:** _____

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|
| Primary Peer Review Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | |
| Team Leader | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chair, IUPUI Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of University Library | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| IUPUI Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of the Faculties | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chancellor | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |

**PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL LIBRARIES
LIBRARIAN ROUTING AND ACTION FORM
FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2007-08 ACADEMIC YEAR**

Full Name

School: _____ **Department(s):** _____

Dean(s): _____ **Chair(s):** _____

Title Sought: _____ **Year Initially Appointed at IUPUI:** _____

Faculty Service at IUPUI: (Please list your current position(s) first)
Rank/Title _____ **Year Rank Achieved** _____ **School/Department** _____

If Going Up for Tenure, Year Begun on Tenure Track: _____ **Years Credit Toward Tenure (if any):** _____

Degrees: (Please rank degrees from the highest degree achieved to the lowest)
Degree _____ **Year** _____ **Institution** _____ **Field** _____

Doctoral Dissertation Title (if any): _____

Professional Service Prior to IUPUI:
Rank/Title _____ **Years** _____ **Institution** _____

Candidate's Review of Dossier

I have reviewed the contents of the dossier and have had an opportunity to provide necessary information in accord with the guidelines for preparing dossiers issued by the Dean of the Faculties and in accord with school and department guidelines.

 Signature of Candidate _____ Date _____

The upper portion of this routing form should be completed before the dossier is evaluated at the department or school level.

Review Process

As applicable, the Primary Committee, Department Chairperson, Unit Committee, and Dean should attach supporting statements for their recommendation. The final vote in each committee should be recorded below; if there are abstentions, this fact may be explained, but an abstention is neither negative nor positive. If new materials were added, please indicate at what level and certify that earlier reviewers and the candidate have received copies of the new materials.

A. Promotion Recommendation (record actual committee votes): _____ **Date Candidate Notified:** _____

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|
| Primary Peer Review Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Library Director | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chair, IUPUI Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of Professional School | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| IUPUI Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of the Faculties | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chancellor | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |

B. Tenure Recommendation (record actual committee votes): _____ **Date Candidate Notified:** _____

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|
| Primary Peer Review Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Library Director | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chair, IUPUI Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of Professional School | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| IUPUI Committee | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Dean of the Faculties | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |
| Chancellor | Approval _____ | Disapproval _____ | Abstention _____ | _____ |

**CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIERS**

NAME: _____
(Last) (First) (Initial)

EDUCATION:
UNDERGRADUATE: _____
GRADUATE: _____
POST DOCTORAL: _____

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (inclusive dates):

OTHER APPOINTMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTSHIPS (including other remunerated employment):

LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION:

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (including offices held and committee memberships):

HONORS AND AWARDS:

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS:

List the course number, short title, term, and enrollment for each course taught since appointment or last advancement.

(For LIBRARIANS: PERFORMANCE:

Provide a composite description of your professional experience and activities in your current position at IUPUI and, where applicable, prior to coming to IUPUI)

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

Distinguish carefully between University and professional service and record professional service activities that advance the discipline or interdisciplinary field of inquiry as intellectual work.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE:

List committee, administrative, and other University service since appointment or last advancement.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Record professional activities in current rank that you consider significant that are directly related to your work as a faculty member, and which are not covered elsewhere in curriculum vitae, including international activities not listed elsewhere. This section can be used to detail presentations that are not listed in other categories. They should be annotated to include information on audience and place of presentation, as well as date and title, co-presenters, if any, and whether the presentation was invited or made following a peer review process. Please do not include voluntary service in this section, no matter how significant or important to the civic community.

GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS:

Indicate the name of the granting agency, title of the project, amount, and duration of all grants and fellowships received.

Page 2
Curriculum Vitae Format

PRINT AND ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS:

Divide publications or creative works into three areas: (I) teaching, (II) research and creative activity, or (III) service. Publications should only be listed once so when work involves integration of two or more aspects of faculty work, it should be placed in one area with a notation such as (T), (R), or (S) preceding it to indicate that it belongs in multiple categories. Authors should be listed as they appear in the publication. Refereed and non-refereed works should be noted by separating works into distinct categories within each of the three areas. Publications should be numbered sequentially within each of the three sections. Their full relevance 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. Co-authored and multiple-authored publications should be annotated to explain the nature and extent of the candidate's contribution.

Entries should be listed chronologically or in reverse chronology, consistent with the traditions of the discipline. The exact status of each publication should be noted if the status is ambiguous. For example, unpublished articles that have been officially accepted by an editor or publisher should be identified as "in press." Articles that have been submitted for editorial review, but have not been accepted or have been accepted subject to revision, should be identified as "submitted" or "under editorial review." Work in preparation should not be listed in the vitae. Projected work or work in preparation should be reported in the candidate's statement.

Software, multimedia presentations, films or videos, and other scholarly or creative works designed for electronic technologies should be similarly listed in one of the three categories and be designated as refereed or not. If additional explanatory information would be helpful to reviewers, this information should be provided in an appendix to the dossier. IUPUI recognizes and encourages electronic publication, but care must be taken to identify and explain the venue and to explain what procedures for peer review are in place. Electronic publication should reflect the same quality and standards as print publication.

Similarly, interdisciplinary work that appears in journals or other publication forms that may not be traditional should be listed in one of the three categories and designated as refereed or not. Additional explanatory information may be provided in an appendix to the dossier. Such work is encouraged by IUPUI, and it should be fully described to ensure that it is appreciated as peer reviewed and valuable.

NOTE: As a part of the dossier preparation, department chairs (deans where applicable) should provide an assessment of each journal, press, or other medium of publication. This requirement applies to electronic media and to interdisciplinary media. See the statement of chair's responsibilities.

(Date)

(Signature of Candidate)

**INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
DEAN OF THE FACULTIES' COMMENTS
REGARDING OUTSIDE LETTERS**

Practices and procedures for obtaining outside letters of review vary among the departments and schools. External letters are required for all promotion and tenure (P&T) cases, and are expected to address teaching or performance, research and creative activities, and service, with particular attention to the candidate's chosen area of excellence. In all instances, the relationship between the candidate and the external reviewer should be as independent as possible.

Ordinarily, chairs should solicit outside letters. However, chairs may delegate this responsibility to another member of the department, such as the chair of the primary committee, in accord with established departmental or school procedures. In most instances, the candidate should not be involved in the process of identifying external evaluators, with two exceptions: 1) the candidate should be allowed to list those he or she would definitely not want to serve as an external reviewer, and 2) the candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the chair or the chair's designee. Generally, the candidate should not provide any outside letters. If outside letters are added by the candidate, these must be clearly designated as such and candidates should recognize that letters solicited by them do not have the same value as letters solicited by the chair or dean; candidate-solicited letters should be placed in an appendix to the dossier and they should not be forwarded for campus-level review unless they offer support for specific claims that otherwise would not be adequately documented. The value of external letters is greatly enhanced by the objectivity and credibility of the author. Care should be taken to avoid relying on persons closely affiliated with the candidate.

Please consider these points:

1. The chair (primary or unit committee chair, dean, or other person specified by department or school procedures) should request and receive these letters.
2. The solicitor should use identical letters of solicitation for all referees, and a copy of the letter that was used should be included in an appendix of the dossier. If circumstances require different letters (e.g., reviewing different areas of the candidate's work), then copies of all letters used should be included.
3. All letters should be solicited at the same time; specifically, additional letters should not be requested following receipt of a negative evaluation. If additional letters must be sought because a referee declines, the reason should be explained.
4. Letters of solicitation must explicitly mention the candidate's area(s) of excellence. Letters of solicitation for candidates choosing to present a balanced case must include an explanation of Indiana University's policy on the balanced case.
5. Individual letters must be sent for each candidate; it is inappropriate to solicit external reviews for more than one candidate from a particular external reviewer in the same letter.
6. All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier; neither the candidate nor subsequent reviewers may exclude letters.
7. Referees should be selected on the basis of their ability to comment on the candidate's professional accomplishments.
8. Referees for professional service, teaching, and some other areas of creative or scholarly work may not necessarily hold academic appointments, but they should be selected on the basis of having an established expertise to evaluate the evidence presented to them. Letters from former students, of course, constitute a special category and should not be used. Academic referees are expected to hold at least the rank for which the candidate is being considered.
9. The dossier should contain a brief statement of professional qualifications for each referee sufficient to establish the authority of the referee in relation to the specific case under review; ordinarily, two or three sentences should suffice. Academic referees are expected to hold at least the rank to which the candidate aspires.

10. When writing to referees, include the vitae, candidate's statement, and copies of publications, including books, unless you are certain they are available to the referee. In instances in which a referee is asked to read a book-length manuscript, an honorarium should be provided.
11. Evaluators should not be asked to make a recommendation on promotion or tenure; they should be asked to evaluate the candidate's work or activities. *They should not be asked to speculate on whether the candidate would receive promotion or tenure at their own institutions.* The purpose for seeking these letters is to obtain an objective peer review of the work, and, hence, they should be phrased in a neutral fashion without any suggestion about the department's likely eventual recommendation.
12. To provide useful information for review beyond the department level, avoid using abbreviations that are not likely to be known to colleagues outside the field.
13. *Special considerations must be given to evaluating creative work (especially when performances or exhibitions are available for a short period of time).* The same degree of objectivity should be maintained in evaluating creative works as in evaluating research. In some cases, it may be necessary to invite external evaluators to campus to view works or performances even though the promotion or tenure review may be several years away.
14. Results of teaching, research and creative activity, or service disseminated through electronic media are as valuable as results published in print media. The same care and concern for objective peer assessment should be observed when reviewing such electronic publications.
15. While collaborators should ordinarily not be asked to evaluate the quality and importance of shared work, they may be asked to document the extent and nature of the candidate's individual contributions to a team effort. Such letters should be specific about this purpose and not be confused with external letters from peers asked to evaluate the quality and impact of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
16. Electronic letters of reference are acceptable if they have been verified.

SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION

(Schools may develop their own letters, but they should use the same format to contact all persons asked to provide evaluations)

Dear ():

Professor () is being considered for promotion (and/or tenure) at the rank of () in the Department of () within the School of () at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). Professor () has identified () as the area(s) of excellence and thus the area(s) where the evaluation by peers is most important. [Or Professor () has chosen to present a balanced case in keeping with Indiana University's policy on balanced cases: *"In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance"* [Indiana University Academic Handbook]. In considering (his/her) candidacy, we would appreciate your evaluation of the professional activities (i.e., teaching, research and creative activity, or service) for which you have sufficient knowledge regarding the performance of Professor (). We would be particularly grateful for your comments on the significance of this work and its relation to work in your field.

If you are commenting on Professor ()'s research, we would welcome comments on the quality of the publications and journals that have been listed as well as other creative work and exhibition media. Comments on Professor ()'s teaching might include your evaluations of course syllabi, examinations, other teaching materials, and publications on teaching as well as any personal experience you have of (his/her) teaching. If you are aware of Professor ()'s contributions to professional organizations or the discipline through (his/her) professional service activities or publications in this area, we would welcome your comments in this area as well. To assist you in your evaluation, I am enclosing a curriculum vitae, the candidate's statement, and copies of recent publications and teaching materials.

It would also be helpful for us to know how long and under what circumstances you have been familiar with Professor (). To provide other reviewers at the campus level with a context for your comments, we would welcome a copy of your vitae or brief biography.

Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the work. We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion or tenure nor do we want to know if the candidate might receive promotion or tenure at your institution.

Needless to say, we will appreciate your assistance as we consider Professor ()'s candidacy. We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and we assure you that your comments will be highly valued. Although letters are not normally disclosed to candidates, a state law permits employees to gain access to their personnel files. We can appreciate concerns you might have about writing a candid assessment under this condition, but we sincerely hope you will agree to assist us. If upon reflection you feel that you cannot be completely candid, however, we will respect your decision not to write an evaluation.

In order to complete Professor ()'s dossier for University review, we would appreciate receiving your comments by (). I hope you will be able to assist us.

Sincerely,

Chair

NOTE: If a candidate waives right of access and this condition is stated in the letter requesting a reference, please note in the letter that there may be some circumstances under which the candidate may gain access at a later time, such as through legal proceedings.

SAMPLE LETTER FOR EXTERNAL RECOMMENDATION TO FULL RANK LIBRARIAN

Dear ():

() is being considered for promotion to the rank of Librarian at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). It would be very helpful to me and the Indiana University Librarians' Promotion and Tenure Committee to receive your evaluation of ()'s contribution to and standing in the profession.

The established criteria at Indiana University for promotion from the rank of Associate Librarian to the highest rank of Librarian are described as follows:

Superior performance is the primary criterion. The candidate must show evidence of performance that is achieved by few others at Indiana University. If professional development is the secondary criterion, the librarian must show a continued significant contribution at the state, regional, national, or international level. If service is the secondary criterion, the librarian must show a continued significant contribution at the community, state, regional, national, or international level. Performance in the third area must be at least satisfactory.

In order to evaluate objectively the criterion of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession, we will depend heavily upon the opinions of prominent colleagues outside Indiana University who are knowledgeable in the field of specialization of the library faculty member in questions. Your frank appraisal of the candidate's contributions to the profession is very important.

() has signed a waiver of her/his right to inspect letters of evaluation, but may request a detailed summary of the major points raised in all external letters, in one combined document, in a manner which protects the identity of the evaluators. Under some circumstances, however, Indiana law may require that letters of evaluation be made available to a candidate; it will be our practice to keep such letters confidential, however.

I appreciate your time and aid in allowing us to compile as thorough a dossier as possible for (). We would be grateful for your reply by (). Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Dean of University Libraries

IUPUI PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE 2007-2008

CANDIDATE REVIEW FORM

Please review the "Candidate Profile" below, review the dossier, and complete the "Review Form" section.

| CANDIDATE PROFILE SUMMARY | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| | Primary Reviewer: |
| Candidate Name: | Secondary Reviewer: |
| Department: | Highest Degree: |
| School: | Year Highest Degree Achvd: |
| Initial IUPUI Appointment Yr: | Institution: |
| Current Rank: | Rank Sought: |
| Year Current Rank Achvd: | |
| Candidate for Promotion: | Candidate for Tenure: |
| | |
| Areas of Excellence Declared by Candidate | |
| Teaching/Performance: | Research/Professional Development: |
| Professional Service: | Balanced Case: |
| | |
| Prior Actions for Tenure | |
| Primary: | Dean: |
| Unit: | Department Chair: |
| | |
| Prior Actions for Promotion | |
| Primary: | Dean: |
| Unit: | Department Chair: |

REVIEW SECTION

Please indicate your overall rating of the candidate for each area of service and make your recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. **Note:** Areas of service differ for librarians. "Performance," for librarians, is the equivalent of "Teaching," and "Professional Development" is the equivalent of "Research." For "All Read" cases, please omit this rating.

Summary Global Rank

Teaching/Performance:

- Excellent
- Highly Satisfactory
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Research/Professional Development:

- Excellent
- Highly Satisfactory
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Professional Service:

- Excellent
- Highly Satisfactory
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Reviewer's Recommendations

- For Tenure: Yes No
- For Promotion: Yes No

REVIEWER'S SUMMARY EVALUATION

Check the corresponding boxes below to indicate the aspects of **teaching/performance, research and creative activity/professional development, and service** about which the dossier **did not** contain sufficient documentation.

Summary Evaluation of Achievement: Provide a summary statement that addresses the principal accomplishment in the areas and evaluates strengths and weaknesses, commenting as appropriate on: clarity of goals, preparation, methodology, and self-reflection. Then, indicate whether the dossier contained adequate documentation regarding each area.

I. TEACHING: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

| Criteria | Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one) | Comment (optional) |
|---|--|--------------------|
| A. Peer Evaluations | | |
| 1. Class visits by peers | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Peer review of materials | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| B. Scholarship | | |
| 1. Publications | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. National/international presentations | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Course/curriculum/procedure development | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| C. Student Evaluation | | |
| 1. Evidence over several terms | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Normed for dept/school | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Mentee/alumni comments | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| D. Effective and Appropriate Methods | | |
| E. Student Learning | | |
| 1. Student outcomes/results | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Clear course goals | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| F. Teaching Awards | | |
| 1. State/national | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. University/campus | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. School/department | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| G. Plan for Increasing Future Teaching Effectiveness | | |
| H. Teaching Load | | |
| 1. Appropriate for dept/school | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Appropriate for emphasis | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |

II. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

| Criteria | Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one) | Comment (optional) |
|--|--|--------------------|
| A. External Peer Evaluations | | |
| B. Publications/Performances | | |
| 1. Stature of journals/works/galleries | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Refereed | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Rate of productivity | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| C. Grants Received | | |
| 1. Number in rank | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 2. Total amount in rank | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Source of grants | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| D. Research Focus Goals | | | |
| 1. Progress towards goals | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Future plans | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| E. Research Load | | | |
| 1. Appropriate for dept/school | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Appropriate for emphasis | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |

III. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

| Criteria | Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one) | | Comment (optional) |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| A. Contributions/Scholarship | | | |
| 1. Service to patients/clients/others | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Administrative: Hospitals/clinics/courts/others | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3. Publications | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| B. Professional Service to Community | | | |
| 1. Peer reviewed | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Other evidence | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| C. Regional/National/International Professional Organizations | | | |
| 1. Offices held | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Other professional service | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| D. Professional Service Load | | | |
| 1. Appropriate for dept/school | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 2. Appropriate for Emphasis | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | |

IV. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| A. Is there sufficient evidence of satisfactory University service? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Is there sufficient evidence of high standards of professional conduct across teaching, research and creative activity, and service? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Do you have any comments to go back to the chair or dean about issues raised in reviewing this dossier? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | |
| Overall Comment on Dossier: | | |

INDEX

A

Addition of Materials · 8, 9, 10, 17, 18
Adjunct Appointments · 4, 10, 20, 32, 34
Administrative Review · 16, 20
Advising · 11, 12, 23, 24
Annual Reviews · 7, 9, 12, 13, 31
Assessment, course-based · 12
Awards · 4, 12, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32, 45

B

Balanced Case · 16, 22, 40, 42, 44
Board of Trustees · 18

C

Campus Level Reviews · 18
Candidate's Statement · 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 39, 41, 42
Candidate's Responsibilities · 6, 17
Candidate's review form · 44
Center for Service and Learning · 5, 6
Center for Teaching and Learning · 5, 6
Chair's Responsibilities · 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 19
Chancellor · 18, 35, 36, 37
Checklist · 9, 32, 34
Clinical Faculty · 4, 10, 11, 17, 19
Collaboration · 10, 13, 14, 20, 28, 30, 32
Community Service · 22, 30, 43, 46
Consortium for Learning and Scholarship · 5, 6
Curriculum Development · 12, 23, 45
Curriculum Vitae · 9, 32, 34, 42
 content · 11, 12, 23, 26, 27, 29, 31
 content · 12
 format · 9, 38, 39

D

Deadlines · 7, 15, 18
Dean of the Faculties · 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40
 assistant · 7, 16
Dean's Responsibilities · 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 19
Department responsibilities · 4, 10
Dissemination · 8, 11, 14, 15, 19, 21, 25, 28, 29, 32
Dossier · 5
 format · 9
 outline · 9

E

Evaluation · 24, 28, 30
 client · 14, 15
 divergent · 8
 external · 13, 15, 22
 student · 11, 12, 23, 24
Evidence · 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 40, 42, 43, 46
Excellence, areas of · 7, 16, 17, 22, 40, 42, 44
Extension requests · 15

External Assessment · 10, 19, 20, 21
External Evaluations · 45
External Letters · 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 19, 22, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 40, 41, 43
Dean of the Faculties' comments · 40
sample letter to request · 42, 43

F

Faculty Board of Review · 18, 21
Faculty Council Executive Committee · 4

G

Grants · 6, 10, 12, 23, 27, 28, 31, 32, 38, 46
Guidelines
purpose of · 4
school and department · 5, 6, 7, 10

I

Indiana University Academic Handbook · 4, 5, 6, 16, 18, 22, 42
Interdisciplinary Work · 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27, 39

J

Joint Appointments · 10, 20, 32, 34
Journals
quality of · 20
stature of · 13

L

Leadership · 12, 14, 23, 29, 30, 32
Lecturers · 4, 10, 11, 14, 19, 25
Librarians · 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 31, 34, 36, 37, 43, 44
Library Faculty Handbook · 4, 22
FAQ Document · 7

M

Mentoring · 5, 6, 11, 12, 24, 25, 32
Minority Reports · 9

N

Negative Recommendation · 18
Non-reappointment · 18
Non-tenure Track · 5, 10

O

Off-site faculty · 4

P

Peer Review · 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 45
President · 18
Primary Committee · 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21, 40
Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PUL's) · 12, 23
Probationary Period · 4, 5, 6, 12, 16, 18
Professional Development · 9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 22, 23, 29, 30, 31, 34, 43, 45
Professional service
 evaluation · 15
Promotion
 definition of · 5
Promotion and Tenure (P&T) · 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44
Promotion and Tenure Committee · 18
Publications · 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 39, 41, 42
Purdue Faculty · 4, 18, 19

R

Reconsideration · 18
Research
 evaluation of · 13
Research and Sponsored Programs · 5, 6
Research Faculty · 4, 10, 11, 13
Resubmission · 16
Returned Dossiers · 16
Routing and Action Form · 6, 8, 9, 17, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37

S

Scholars · 10, 11, 13, 17, 19, 21, 40
School recommendations · 10
Schools
 responsibilities · 9, 16
Schools
 and Tenure · 4
Scientists · 10, 11, 13, 17, 19
Special committees · 20

T

Teaching Load · 12, 23, 32
Tenure
 definition of · 4
 Location of · 4
Tenure-probationary · 4, 7, 8
Tenure-track · 5, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22
Three-year review · 5, 6, 7
Time in Rank · 16

U

University Service · 13, 14, 17, 21, 22, 29, 30, 33, 34, 38, 46