**Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines
For Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers
2014-2015**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLEASE NOTE: For your convenience, all appendix documents may be accessed individually on our website (http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/Resources**). The forms may be typed then printed, signed and added to dossiers as needed.**

INTRODUCTION

Promotion and/or tenure reviews are significant transitions in a faculty member's career, and often the source of considerable anxiety. These guidelines are intended to decrease that anxiety by clarifying campus-level expectations and processes. Criteria for promotion and/or tenure for faculty and for librarians are outlined in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*. These University criteria for faculty and librarians are interpreted in each Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) school and/or department according to their respective disciplinary cultures. Those interpretations are defined in school-level and department-level guidelines. More specific criteria relating to librarians are contained in the *Library Faculty Handbook*.

The principles that shape this document are as follows:
- The Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines interpret University policy and criteria to assist in the preparation of promotion and/or tenure dossiers. The guidelines should prove useful in:
  - helping faculty, chairs, and deans understand their role and responsibilities in the promotion and/or tenure 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 appointees:
  - faculty and librarians at IUPUI who are subject to promotion and/or tenure 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 promotion and/or tenure 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 with preparing their dossiers for these important deliberations. In accordance with the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* (p. 66), tenure is based upon the guidelines in effect and agreed to at the time of the appointment. Promotion is based on contemporary guidelines in effect at the time of application for promotion.
- 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 accordance with school policies, departments or divisions should also have such documents.
- School, library, and department documents must comply with the criteria of the University and IUPUI. A current copy must be on file with the Office of Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA). These documents need to be approved by the school's appropriate faculty governance process and by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for their compliance with campus standards. They also should be publicly available on the school's web site so faculty can easily access them.
- Promotion and/or tenure considerations are based on the missions and the contexts of each candidate's department, school, or library in compliance with the IUPUI mission, as defined in each department, school, or library's statement of criteria and standards.

In this document, the term "candidate" refers to both faculty and librarians who are seeking promotion and/or tenure.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PROMOTION AND TENURE

These guidelines should be used in preparing dossiers for promotion and/or tenure. The criteria 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. Promotion or tenure recommendations may be made separately; however, most tenure-probationary faculty/librarians are considered for both at the same time (unless they already hold a rank of associate or full professor/librarian), and, generally, a decision to award tenure is not made without simultaneous promotion in rank.

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 the level of achievement that 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/librarians 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/librarians thus accept a responsibility to the campus as well as towards 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 candidates 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 candidates, 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 candidates 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.

Nine-year Tenure Probationary Timeline for School of Medicine
As of July 1, 2011, tenure track faculty newly hired in the School of Medicine will have a nine-year tenure probationary timeline. This was approved by the Board of Trustees at their February, 2011 meeting. In addition to the three year review cited below, faculty hired under this policy will be given a formal six year review if the faculty member has not petitioned for promotion and tenure by that time. Their timeline will need to be adjusted to reflect the nine-year timeline, with the actions of years 4, 5 and 6 listed below, correlating with years 6, 7 and 8 for those with a nine-year probationary cycle.

"Extension of the School's tenure probationary period does not alter the existing school performance expectations for tenure in place at the time of appointment. Schools retain the right to update their faculty performance expectations in the future in keeping with campus and University guidelines, while faculty retain the right to be evaluated for tenure under the written standards in effect at the time of appointment. Individual faculty under the nine-year tenure probationary timeline will be free to submit their dossiers for promotion and tenure at the sixth year point or earlier when appropriate, or at the seventh or eighth year point, it being understood that a dossier can only be submitted once for tenure, and that administrators may not disallow or discourage faculty from following a standard seven-year schedule." (UFC U8-2009)

ADVICE REGARDING PREPARING FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

Preparation for promotion and/or tenure begins in the first year at IUPUI. Consult both the IUPUI Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines as well as those for your department and/or school. Candidates, chairs, deans, the Chief Academic Officer, and FAA all have distinct and significant roles and responsibilities in the promotion and/or tenure process.

Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline

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

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 promotion and/or tenure, and orient you to departmental expectations. Ideally, this person should be at senior rank.
- You are strongly encouraged to identify an area of excellence at this time. Bear in mind that for promotion and/or tenure reviews you must also document at least satisfactory progress in the other areas and that each department/unit has defined its expectations about an appropriate area of excellence. For more details, consult Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories in the Appendices.
- 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.
- Be sure you know the expectations of your department and school related to grant/contract funding and make sure that your work falls within those guidelines. The Office of Research Development provides helpful workshops and other research support for faculty. These resources can be found at http://research.iupui.edu/.
- Scholarly dissemination of your work is required to document excellence in any of the three areas of faculty work; to document highly satisfactory in each area of a balanced case; and also for assessment of satisfactory in research. Be sure you know the expectations of your department and school related to scholarly productivity and make sure that your work falls within those guidelines. Continue to systematically work on your scholarship output.
- In consultation with your mentor, become familiar with campus resources available in the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the Center for Research and Learning (CRL), and the Center for Service and Learning (CSL). Take full advantage of the wide range of support available to faculty.
- Become familiar with the University, campus, unit/school, and primary/department guidelines for promotion and/or tenure. Attend primary/department and/or unit/school promotion and/or tenure workshops. Attend Promotion and Tenure workshops offered by Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA).
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments.
- Prepare for the three-year review.

Year 3:
- The three-year review provides an opportunity for faculty, primary/departments, and/or unit/schools to take stock of a tenure-probationary candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure.

- Continue all the above activities while you begin to analyze and document progress on your work in terms of improvement and achievement in relation to primary/department criteria, unit/school criteria, University criteria, and the Chief Academic Officer's 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 promotion and tenure.
- By this time, you need to have a well-defined area of excellence which you are actively developing. Distribute evidence of your scholarship under your area of excellence (if other than research) rather than putting all such evidence under "research" in your curriculum vitae. You may only place each item in one area of the CV.
- Analyze teaching evaluations to identify key themes and how they point to teaching achievements or areas for further attention. If data are available, present your performance in relation to peer average scores.
- Analyze peer reviews to determine again how you might improve student learning in your classes.
- Analyze your grant and scholarly dissemination 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 promotion and/or tenure 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.
- If there are significant issues identified in the three-year review, ask for a fourth-year review for further guidance and to update your plan.
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments.

Year 4:
- This is the year to ensure that you are on track with grants and sufficient dissemination of your scholarship 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 issues identified in the three-year review.
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments.

Year 5:
- This is the year you begin to prepare your dossier. If you have kept records from the start of your academic career, you should be in excellent shape to analyze your progress and present your case.
- Be sure to attend the workshops on promotion and/or tenure this year in your primary/department and/or unit/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.
- 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. Place sufficient evidence of scholarship in your area of excellence (if other than research) rather than putting all evidence under "research" in your curriculum vitae. Describe your scholarship in your dossier, making sure to explain it in layman's terms, since faculty from other disciplines will review your case. Minimize abbreviations, jargon and acronyms.
- Your dossier will be submitted for review either at the end of this academic year or at the beginning of your sixth academic year. Make sure you know the timeline for your primary/department and/or unit/school.

- You are not to contact potential external reviewers.
- Make sure you complete and sign the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices).
- You are asked to provide to the department chair and primary committee, the reviewer comments for any grants that you submitted that were not funded. These can be put in the appendices.
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments.

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. DO NOT attempt to communicate with or influence any individuals who are involved in the various levels of review while the dossier review is in process. It is considered an ethical breech and will be dealt with accordingly.
- 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*.

Department Chair (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline
(In core 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 promotion and/or tenure, the chair is responsible for a providing support and guidance throughout the process, and for administrative and procedural tasks. In general, chairs need to:
- Update your knowledge by reviewing the latest version of the Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines each year (found at: http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines).
- Ensure the most current 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 and full rank is on file with FAA. These documents need to be approved by your school's appropriate faculty governance process and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for compliance with campus expectations.
- Develop a system of departmental peer review of teaching that ensures each candidate has several opportunities for peer review prior to their candidacy for promotion and/or tenure.
- Provide candid advice throughout the probationary period and assist the candidate in organizing the materials needed for the dossier.

Year 1 and 2 of candidate appointment:
- Ensure that each new faculty/librarian has a discipline-appropriate mentor related to the candidate's area of excellence who is preferably at a rank higher than the candidate.
- Meet individually with each new faculty member to discuss departmental expectations for promotion and/or tenure. 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 promotion and/or tenure workshop, and encourage attendance at campus-level promotion and/or tenure workshops.
- Encourage new faculty to become acquainted with the CTL, CRL, CSL, and the Office of Research Development.
- 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. Satisfactory performance in the candidate's areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments
- Provide guidance for the faculty member to select an area of excellence appropriate to the department's expectations.

Year 3 of candidate appointment:
- Ensure that each tenure-probationary candidate understands the function of the three-year review.
- Ensure that the three-year review is carried out following IUPUI Faculty Council policy and procedures including review of the candidate by primary/department and/or unit/school committees (as applied by particular requirements of the primary/department, unit/school, or library).
- Ensure that candidates being reviewed receive an annual written assessment of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure, with specific guidance about any issues or concerns that require attention.
- Ensure that the declared area of excellence is addressed and that the candidate is documenting at least satisfactory performance in the other areas. Satisfactory performance in the candidate's areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty) is required for continued probationary reappointments.
- Ensure that the three-year review is sent to FAA by May 1.
- If the candidate's three-year review revealed significant issues, encourage the candidate to seek a fourth-year review or conduct one if required by current school policies.

Year 4 of candidate appointment:
- Ensure that the candidate has access to the resources necessary to address any concerns raised in the three-year review.
- If requested by the candidate or required in current school policies when the three-year review revealed significant issues, conduct a fourth-year review.
- Ensure that candidates being reviewed receive an annual written assessment of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure and that they receive specific guidance about any issues or concerns that require attention.
- Ensure that the declared area of excellence is progressing appropriately and that the candidate is documenting at least satisfactory performance in the other areas.

Year 5 of candidate appointment:
- Ensure that candidates being reviewed receive an annual written assessment of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure and that they receive specific guidance about any issues or concerns that require attention.
- Ensure that the declared area of excellence is progressing appropriately and that the candidate is documenting at least satisfactory performance in the other areas. Satisfactory performance in all three areas is required for continued probationary reappointments.
- Develop a list of external and internal peer reviewers for each candidate in accordance with the directions set out by the Chief Academic Officer in the section on External Assessment.
- 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/librarians apply to teaching, professional service, research and creative activity where applicable to the candidate. Department chairs should give special attention to identifying external evaluators who can assess the impact of an individual's activities in teaching or service if one of those areas is the declared area of excellence.
- If a screening process is used to find out if potential referees would provide a letter if asked, the process must be applied to all candidates within the school. Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at "arm's length" or independent as described in the section on External Assessment. Chairs should aim to receive no fewer than six, nor more than ten letters. All solicited external assessment letters received must be included in the dossier whether or not they exceed the suggested maximum of ten.
- Provide external reviewers with the appropriate materials to make informed judgments.
  o While unit/school or primary/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 related to service and its impact should be sent

to the reviewers. Primary/department or unit/school criteria as well as the IUPUI excellence tables located in the Appendices of these Guidelines should be provided to the reviewers.

- o 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 should come from the official requesting party, in most cases, the dean or chair.
- o Candidates should be instructed that they are not to contact external reviewers.
- Make the primary/department and/or unit/school protocol for soliciting letters from external peer reviewers available to the candidate. The primary/department (and/or unit/school) protocol for soliciting external assessment letters should be written and should be incorporated into primary/department (and/or unit/school) procedures.
- Solicit letters from peer reviewers external to the primary/department, unit/school, and/or external to IUPUI using the standard protocol. The External Referee Form found in the Appendices should accompany the letter of request.
- The Sample Letter to Request an External Evaluation, found in the Appendices, differentiates advancement on the basis of teaching, research or creative activity, and service; references the rank and expectations for that rank; and allows chairs to delineate any particular contextual circumstances or expectations for the candidate. These distinctions give reviewers the information they need to provide helpful reviews. (Further tips on soliciting external assessment letters are included in the Appendices.) Similar letters adapted for peers internal to IUPUI should also be used. Advice on the solicitation of external assessment letters for librarians can be found in the Library Faculty document "Letters in Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers FAQs".
- o Make sure that the primary committee complies with all of the requirements found in the Primary and Unit Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities section below.
- o If the primary/department committee does not have faculty/librarians at or above the rank sought by the candidate, establish a special primary committee that may include members from outside the department, school, or campus. Such a committee should be composed in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee and should reflect disciplines as similar to the candidate's as possible. The committee should be of sufficient size to produce a minimum of four votes.
- o If the candidate's scholarship is interdisciplinary or team science in nature, consider adding additional ad hoc members who can appreciate the interdisciplinary nature of the work to be reviewed to the primary/department committee for that case. Such ad hoc members should be added in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee. The committee should be of sufficient size to produce a minimum of four votes.

Year 6 of candidate appointment:
- Oversee the timeliness and procedural integrity of the primary committee (see Primary and Unit Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities).
- Provide an assessment of the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case), such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance. This assessment will be placed in Section 10 of the dossier with the candidate's curriculum vitae:
- o Analyze the stature of journals, presses, editions, galleries, presentations 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 (such as the stature of the reviewing agency/organization), 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. Address authorship convention for discipline. 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 other 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.

- o Review the candidate's unsuccessful grant applications and interpret the reviewers' comments in a short assessment. The analysis of the overall pattern of grant success should be included in the department chair's vote letter for promotion and/or tenure. **This grant assessment is required if applicable.**

- Compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier. (This letter is waived if the Department Chair does not hold tenure and/or a rank equal to that sought by the candidate.) Include the following:
  - o Relationship of candidate's evidence of achievement, such as student evaluations or publications, to departmental norms and expectations.
  - o Indications of professional or disciplinary benchmarks used in the field and relevant to the recommendations being made by the primary committee and the chair.
  - o 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.
  - o Specifically address if excellence is achieved in the stated area of excellence and validate if the other area(s) of performance are at least satisfactory.
- 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, include at least a letter of recommendation from the appropriate chair, director, or dean of that school/unit.
- If a school has a structure that includes section chiefs, invite the section chief to write a letter that will become part of the dossier.
- Provide a brief statement addressing the expertise of each external reviewer which will be placed in Section 04 of the dossier with the external assessments (see External Referee List for format). Ensure that all external reviewers meet the guidelines for independence outlined in the section on External Assessment. If not, then secure additional external reviews sufficient to meet the six reviewer minimum standard prior to forwarding the dossier to the unit committee. All reviews received must be retained in the dossier. The campus will return a dossier that does not meet the six-reviewer, arm's-length minimum.
- Ensure that candidates receive fair and equitable treatment from the primary committee.
- The report from the primary committee should make an effort to explain the reasons for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The report should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate's qualifications.
- Before submitting to the next level:
  - o Ensure that all dossiers are complete and in proper format/order.
  - o Ensure that the Candidate has signed the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices).
  - o Ensure that primary committee votes are recorded properly and you have recorded your conclusion by initialing approval or disapproval under Chair's recommendation on the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices).
- Meet with the candidate to discuss the results of the primary committee's deliberation and the chair's letter. Have the candidate sign for receipt of the documents. In a tenure case, at the first level where there have been negative votes, (if applicable) discuss the candidate's right and the process for reconsideration. **This must be done in a timely manner and prior to the next level of review.**
- Facilitate exchanges between the unit/school committee and the primary/department committee that might be necessary during the unit/school committee's deliberations.

Dean (and Libraries Personnel Officer) Responsibilities

- Update your knowledge by reviewing the latest version of the Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines each year (found at: http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines).
- Ensure that all tenure-probationary candidates and all candidates eligible for promotion have information about promotion and/or tenure workshops and the school's calendar of deadlines for the P & T process.
- Ensure that a current copy of the unit's/school's promotion and/or tenure document is on file with FAA and that every candidate receives a copy. These documents need to be approved by your school's appropriate faculty governance process and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for compliance with campus expectations.
- 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 candidates are informed of any materials added or changes made to the dossier. Candidates and all previous reviewers must be provided with an opportunity to comment on or to respond to such additions. The added information and the responses become a part of the dossier. (See Addition of Materials/Comments.)
- Ensure that all external reviewers meet the guidelines for independence outlined in the section on External Assessment. If not, then secure additional external reviews sufficient to meet the six reviewer minimum standard prior to forwarding the dossier to FAA. The campus will return a dossier that does not meet the six-reviewer, arm's-length minimum.
- All reviews received must be retained in the dossier. Similarly, all supporting letters received must be retained in the dossier.
- Make sure that the unit/school committee complies with all of the requirements found in the Primary and Unit Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities section below.
- 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. The report from each committee should account for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The reports should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate's qualifications. It is strongly recommended that the letter address the criteria as listed in the Reviewer's Summary Evaluation.
- As noted earlier with regard to the chair's responsibility, deans must similarly ensure that unit committees do not submit minority reports. Only the final vote of committees and administrators should be recorded on the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices).
- Ensure that the unit committee has given a copy of their summary letter to the candidate. Have the candidate sign and date for receipt of his/her copy of the letter.
- A candidate for tenure **must** be notified at the first level of negative tenure review. This must happen in a timely manner and before the next scheduled level of review. They must be apprised of their right for reconsideration at that time.
- Following review at the unit/school level, compose the dean's letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier. Specifically address if excellence is achieved in the stated area of excellence and validate if the other area(s) of performance are at least satisfactory. Have the candidate sign and date for receipt of his/her copy of the letter.
- Include a perspective for campus and University reviewers on standards that candidates must meet in the school/unit.
- Before submitting to the next level:
  o Ensure that all dossiers are complete and in proper format/order. The dossier checklist (see Appendices) should assist with this task. Properly completing this step will prevent dossiers from being returned for correction (see Returned Dossiers). Please contact FAA if you need assistance with this step.
  o If not signed earlier, sign off on the checklist (see Appendices) attesting to the state of the dossier.

- o Ensure that all committee votes and the chair's recommendation have been recorded properly on the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices).
- o Record your conclusion by initialing approval or disapproval under Dean's recommendation on the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices).

Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities
Primary/Department and Unit/School level promotion and/or tenure committees must comply with the following guidelines:

- Committees should have a minimum number of members sufficient to result in at least four approve/disapprove votes being recorded (in case members cannot vote for any reason). If there are insufficient faculty to comprise a committee resulting in at least four votes from members of the proper rank, the Dean should seek additional members (either from another department within the school or from another school) in consultation with the duly constituted committee.
- Voting members must fully participate in committee deliberations. There can be no proxy voting on promotion and/or tenure cases at any level.
- Faculty members and administrators who participate in the promotion and/or tenure process must have full access to all materials in the candidate's dossier and to assessments at all previous levels of review.
- Except for reconsideration of prior decisions, each faculty member and administrator who participates in the promotion and/or tenure process votes only once on any particular case. The committee member may decide at which level to vote if they serve on more than one level of review, as long as there are a minimum of four votes at each level.
- All assessments by review committees or administrators must clearly describe the candidate's performance by referencing the terminology in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* ("excellent," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory") even if additional categories or alternative terminology is also used. At IUPUI, the campus also uses the terminology, "beyond satisfactory" and "highly satisfactory." For example, "beyond satisfactory" is used for the Associate Librarian secondary area of review and "highly satisfactory" is used in a balanced case review.
- The Administrative heads at the primary/department level (usually a department chair or IUPUI executive associate dean for core schools) or unit/school level (the dean) write their own letter of assessment for candidates. Therefore, they may not vote at any other level in the promotion and/or tenure process. Depending on the school's bylaws, the administrative heads may be present during deliberations of promotion and/or tenure committees within their schools and may seek clarification of issues related to the case, but they may not influence the outcomes of promotion and/or tenure committee votes within the school.
- Clinical track faculty cannot serve on promotion and/or tenure review committees for tenure track faculty.
- Those voting for a promotion must at least hold the rank being sought by the candidate. If committee members at lower rank than the candidate are members of a primary or unit committee, they may be present for the discussion and participate up to the point of vote.
- Those voting for tenure must hold tenure.
- The report from each committee should account for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The report should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate's qualifications. The committee chair gives a copy of the summary letter to the candidate. Have the candidate sign and date for receipt of his/her copy of the letter.
- The primary committee is asked to consider reviews of unsuccessful grant submissions. Analyze the pattern of grant success, where applicable, and include a summary in the committee's vote letter for promotion and/or tenure. Please review the candidate's level of funding in light of the present context for funding in the field.

DOSSIER FORMAT
The dossier presents the evidence upon which promotion and/or decisions are to be made. Guidelines for dossier format and documentation are to be used whether the candidate is being reviewed for promotion, tenure or both.

Dossiers should be no more than 50 pages (excludes sections 01 through 05 and sections 10 through 11). In other words, the four sections (sections 06 through 09) that are solely the candidate's responsibility for compiling should be no more than 50 pages total. The general format of the document should include one-inch margins, single-spaced copy using typical fonts (Arial, Calibri, Times New Roman) with a font size no smaller than 11 point.

The candidate owns the dossier; therefore, any substantive changes in the dossier must be reviewed by the candidate (see Addition of Materials/Comments). However, certain materials are added to the dossier by others as a regular part of the process. These include but are not limited to:
- External Assessments
  - Before the review process begins, external reviews will be added by the primary/department or school/unit person designated to collect them.
- Committee/Administrator reviews
  - Evaluative reports will be added to the dossier by each committee or administrator. Copies of the evaluative reports are to be sent to the candidate as the dossier is forwarded. As these evaluations are added, they become a permanent part of the dossier.
  - The dean is expected to certify that the above condition has been met.
  - The candidate is not expected to respond to or comment on these evaluative reports.

One electronic copy of the candidate's dossier is to be submitted to FAA. Coversheets, section tabs and tables of contents are not necessary. If a table of contents is included, it should be its own section and the PDF file labeled accordingly. (For example, "Smith Table of Contents.") Candidates should check with their Primary/Department and/or Unit/School to see if a hard copy version of their dossier needs to be submitted.
- All files in the electronic copy are to be searchable PDFs. (When existing electronic files are converted into PDF format, they are usually searchable. When documents are scanned, additional steps will need to be taken to make the document searchable. For help with either process, please consult the PDF Instructions posted on our website or contact UITS or the CTL as they may be able to provide one-on-one help.)
- Each section constitutes one searchable PDF file.
- Each PDF file shall be labeled with the Candidate's Last Name, the dossier section number and section title, for example:
  - Smith 01 Transaction Forms
  - Smith 02 Review Level 2
  - Smith 03 Review Level 1
  - Smith 04 External Assessments
  - Smith 05 Reference Letters
  - Smith 06 Candidate's Statement
  - Smith 07 Teaching (or for Librarians: Smith 07 Performance)
  - Smith 08 Research & Creative Activity (or for Librarians: Smith 08 Professional Development)
  - Smith 09 Professional and University Service
  - Smith 10 Assessment/CV
  - Smith 11 Appendices
- Before transmitting the electronic copy to FAA, the individual PDF files for a candidate shall be assembled into a PDF Portfolio. Please select "grid" as the layout style for the PDF Portfolio.
- Each PDF Portfolio shall be labeled with the Candidate's Name and the School's HRMS Code, for example:
  - Smith, John – MED
  - Doe, Jane - LART
- According to University policy on data management and file sharing, these confidential documents may NOT be sent via e-mail. The school P&T coordinator needs to upload a zipped folder containing the PDF Portfolios for their school to https://www.slashtmp.iu.edu/ and send a secure download link to ofaa@iupui.edu. The school P&T coordinator will then send a separate e-mail to ofaa@iupui.edu containing the password required to download the file.
- The unit/school must transmit the electronic files by the deadline set forth in the section titled **Submission Deadlines**.

All dossiers for tenure-track/tenured faculty and librarians should be divided into the following sections:
  01. Transaction Forms
  02. Review Level Two (Unit/School)
  03. Review Level One (Primary/Department)
  04. External Assessments
  05. Reference Letters
  06. Candidate's statement
  07. Teaching (For Librarians: Performance)
  08. Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: Professional Development)
  09. Professional and University Service (For Librarians: Service)
  10. Assessment/Curriculum Vitae
  11. Appendices

Dossiers for non-tenure eligible faculty (clinical, research and lecturer ranks) should only include sections relevant to the candidate's appointment and required areas of evaluation. (See Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories in the Appendices.)

Most sections are prepared by the candidate unless otherwise noted in the descriptions below.

SECTION 01: Transaction Forms
- This section of the dossier is prepared by multiple people.
- This section contains only the following documents which should be placed in the exact order listed below:
  - Completed Checklist (see Appendices).
  - Routing and Action Form (see Appendices). Please make sure:
    - Candidates have signed and dated the form.
    - Committee votes are recorded completely. If there are no abstentions, please record zero. Also, if a committee member is absent for the vote, the number *not present* should be recorded.
    - The dean and/or chair votes are recorded. The dean and/or chair (or their designee) should place their initials on the correct line indicating their approval or disapproval.
    - The dates candidates are notified of the decision made by each level of review are noted in the space provided.
    Note: The original was added to the dossier at a prior level; however, it will need to be scanned once all votes have been recorded.

SECTION 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)
- This section of the dossier is not prepared by the candidate.
- Documents in this section are typically added to the dossier by the unit/school level reviewers/administrators.
- This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:
  - Dean's recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure and a summary evaluation of the candidate's professional activities (including performance and professional development for librarians). This evaluation should be dated, signed and printed on letterhead,
  - If the candidate holds an adjunct appointment in another school/unit, the dean of the secondary unit/school or an appropriate representative should be given the opportunity to provide a letter for the dossier with his or her recommendation on the candidate; however, it is not required. This evaluation should be dated, signed and printed on letterhead.
  - Unit/school 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. This evaluation should be dated, signed and printed on letterhead,
  - If the candidate holds a joint appointment in two schools/units:
    - One unit/school 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 the promotion and/or tenure process must be made prior to the dossier being assembled).
- ▪ The promotion and/or tenure 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.
- ▪ The dean of the secondary school/unit must provide a letter for the dossier with his or her recommendation on the candidate, perhaps in consultation with the promotion and/or tenure committee of the secondary primary school/unit. This evaluation should be dated, signed and printed on letterhead,
- o Reconsideration documents in chronological order, if applicable. For example,:
  - ▪ Original letter with first overall negative tenure outcome
  - ▪ Candidate's Reconsideration Request
  - ▪ Response to Reconsideration Request

SECTION 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)
- • This section of the dossier is not prepared by the candidate.
- • Documents in this section are typically added to the dossier by the primary/department level reviewers/administrators. For core schools based in Bloomington, this is the Indianapolis review. Some schools do not have a level one review so some of these documents may not apply; those that do will need to be inserted by unit/school level reviewers/administrators.
- • This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:
  - o Department 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. (Note: For core schools this recommendation is made by the Executive Associate Dean on the Indianapolis campus.) This evaluation should be dated, signed and printed on letterhead. For schools with official departments only, if a chair letter will not be included because the candidate is the chair, the chair is of a lesser rank than a candidate or for another reason, please include a note stating the reason no chair letter will be included as a placeholder.
  - o 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.
  - o Reconsideration documents in chronological order, if applicable. For example,:
    - ▪ Original letter with first overall negative tenure outcome
    - ▪ Candidate's Reconsideration Request
    - ▪ Response to Reconsideration Request

SECTION 04: External Assessments
- • This section of the dossier is not prepared by the candidate.
- • Documents in this section are added to the dossier by person who requests the external assessments. This may be the primary committee chair, department chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee.
- • This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:
  - o A sample of the external assessment solicitation letter sent to reviewers for candidate.
  - o A list containing brief statements (two or three sentence) on the expertise of each external referee (see External Referee List for format). Please do not include CVs of external referee.
  - o Completed External Referee Forms and external assessments placed in the order they appear on the expertise statement list mentioned above. If a reviewer does not return the External Referee Form, please note how you attempted to get it. For example: Form A, Letter A, Form B, Letter B, Form C, Letter C, etc.

- Please note that all external assessments must comply with the criteria defining "arm's length" or independence of external reviewer (See External Assessment). **No candidate dossier should be forwarded to FAA without the required six "arm's length" external reviews.**

SECTION 05: Reference Letters
- This section of the dossier is not prepared by the candidate.
- This section of the dossier is optional; not all cases will have letters for this section.
- Documents in this section are added to the dossier by the person who requests the reference letters. This may be the primary committee chair, department chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee.
  - Letters solicited by the candidate should NOT be placed in this section. They should be placed in the evidence section they best support – teaching, service or research/creative activity.
- This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:
  - A sample of the reference solicitation letter sent for candidate.
  - All solicited reference letters received. Once a letter is added at any level of review, it becomes a permanent part of the dossier and is not to be removed.
  - Please do not include CVs of reference letter writers.

SECTION 06: Candidate's Statement
- This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
- Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate's statement that reflects their own assessments of their accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, and service (for tenured or tenure track faculty); teaching and service (for clinical and lecturer faculty); or performance, professional development, and service (for librarians). Prospects for continued development in these areas must be addressed.
Candidates have the option to limit the Candidate's Statement in Section 06 to five pages and include two single-spaced pages, addressing the area of excellence, as a section introduction in either Section 07, 08 or 09 depending on chosen area of excellence.
Candidates going up on a balanced case should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate's statement, inclusive of the three areas of highly satisfactory work in Section 06. In cases where the candidate undergoes unit-level review at another campus (e.g., Core Schools like Business, Education, etc.), an accommodation with the page-length expectations of those campuses may be needed.
- Candidates are cautioned to describe their work in clear language that can be understood by readers from other disciplines.
- The Candidate's Statement is a place for reflective commentary focused on the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- The Candidate's Statement should address the interrelated aspects of a whole, integrated career. Few candidates 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 work that cuts across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.
- Candidates engaged in interdisciplinary work or team science should make every effort to represent their contribution to collaborative scholarship clearly, as well as the significance and value of any interdisciplinary approach they are pursuing. Candidates should carefully document their individual contributions within this context and should also demonstrate some level of independent research beyond the team science work.
- Candidates involved in public scholarly work or civic/community engagement should clearly articulate the nature of their work and how it differs from traditional scholarship, evidence metrics and dissemination outlets.
- Candidates 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.
  - o Whenever possible, tenure-track faculty members should state specific plans for a research or creative activity agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, and for continued participation through professional service in their profession, the campus, and a community.
  - o Faculty in non-tenure track appointments should focus on their respective areas of performance.
  - o 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.
- Candidates 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 07: Teaching (For Librarians: Performance)
- This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
- This section is excluded for non-tenure eligible research ranks.

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 supporting documentation related to teaching and, if this is the area of excellence, the candidate has the option to limit the Candidate's Statement in Section 06 to 5 pages and add a Statement of Teaching (a narrative analyzing the teaching area that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages as a section introduction). Candidates should provide the following evidence to document teaching and advising in this section. 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).**
  - o Peer review of teaching is as important as peer review of research and creative activity.
  - o Review of teaching is a formative activity to facilitate improvement and skill development in teaching. Rank requirements such as those used for external evaluators are not applied to the formative teaching review processes.
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o Evidence in the dossier should summarize statements, 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 statement 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).**
  o Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years and compared to other faculty in the school/unit.
  o **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.
  o 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.**
  o Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
  o 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.
  o Discussion of the significance and impact of peer-reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.
  o 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 better fit with standards in the field.
- **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.**
  o 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.
  o This may be captured through peer review or through systematic assessment of student achievement or from standardized, nationally-normed profession-related tests.
  o 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.
  o At the graduate and graduate professional levels, comparable assessment measures for student learning should be developed if they do not yet exist and the Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGPLs) should be addressed.
- **Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided <u>when applicable</u>.**
  o 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.**
  o 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.

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o Improvement in teaching for probationary faculty can be compelling when documentation demonstrates that the improvements can be sustained.
- o External peer evaluation of course development is highly recommended for faculty documenting excellence in teaching.
- **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 statement 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.
  - o While these can be listed as professional service on the curriculum vitae, they may be included in the statement 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.**
  - o 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.
  - o A large number of students is not *per se* evidence of achievement; teaching and student learning must be evaluated.
  - o 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.
  - o 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.**
  - o Faculty are encouraged to report their experiments and to document results.
- **Interdisciplinary work**
  - o Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary teaching are encouraged to describe the significance and impact of bringing multiple disciplinary approaches to their area of interest.
- **Retention**
  - o Since retention of students is of considerable importance to IUPUI, faculty members involved in retention efforts should include a description of these activities.
  - o 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.

Librarians: Documenting Performance

The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* requires that the primary area of excellence for every librarian be Performance. This section consists of supporting documentation related to librarian performance. Any scholarship related to performance is considered Librarian Professional Development.

Candidates should provide the following evidence to document librarian performance in Section 07 of the dossier:

- **A Statement on Performance describing performance activities and their impact is expected.** The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian performance area. When performance is highly repetitive, as is often the case for librarians, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated activities.
- **Position description(s) detailing performance responsibilities.**
- **Evidence of quality or impact by patrons, faculty or other recipients of librarian performance.** It is difficult for external peers to observe actual performance, and thus, these activities should be sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers.
- **Other documentation addressing the quality of performance can be included, and might contain:**
  - Table or charts that summarize major performance projects/products.
  - Statistical summaries over time.
  - Other documentation addressing the quality of performance, as described in the "Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance," should be included.

SECTION 08: Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: Professional Development)
- This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
- 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 promotion and/or tenure.
- 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 within units. Information regarding 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 and creative activity is required, both for satisfactory and for excellence levels of evaluation.

Faculty: Documentation of Research or Creative Activity
This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to research or creative activity and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Research or Creative Activity (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the research or creative activity area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to document research or creativity in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:
- **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 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; corresponding or primary authorship) 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.
- **The candidate's own description of a continuing program of research or creative activity that will carry forward into the future.**
- **Discussion of the significance and impact of peer reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its**

breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.
- **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.**

Librarians: Documentation of Professional Development

Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to Performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If Professional Development is selected, a Statement on Professional Development describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian's Professional Development.

Librarian Professional Development includes **all** scholarship (including any scholarship of performance, professional development, and service).
- 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 09: Professional and University Service (For Librarians: Service)
- This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

Faculty: Documentation of Professional and University Service

This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to service and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Service (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the service area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to service in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:
- Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:
  o the public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);
  o the profession or discipline; and
  o 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.
- 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 the basis for tenure or for advancement in rank, University and 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 and must be assessed as academic work characterized by the following:
  o command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
  o contributions to a body of knowledge;
  o imagination, creativity and innovation;
  o application of ethical standards;
  o achievement of intentional outcomes; and
  o 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. Evaluation of service impact may include outcome data for the population served, compliance with evidence-based practice guidelines, or comparative data from benchmark groups.

- 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 quality and is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. In all cases, this work must:
  - o have impact beyond the direct recipient of the service; and
  - o be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 <u>minimally</u> include the following items:
- **Description of the candidate's professional service activities.**
  - o Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care.
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as academic work.
- **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 <u>excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure</u>:
- **External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service**, including refereed and non-refereed publications or other means of dissemination.
  - o While some peers may come from the practice community, a majority should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional

service. Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at "arm's length" or independent as described in the section on External Assessment.

- o Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
- o When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
- o Client evaluations may not be substituted 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.**
  - o 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.

Librarians: Documentation of Service

Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to Performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If Service is selected, a Statement on Service, describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian's 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 documented through peer and external review.

SECTION 10: Assessment/Curriculum Vitae

- This section of the dossier is prepared by the candidate and the primary/department level reviewers/administrators. For core schools based in Bloomington, this is typically the Executive Associate Dean or their designee. For schools that do not have a level one review this will be done by unit/school level reviewers/administrators.
- This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:
  - o An assessment the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case). This is typically prepared by the department Chair (see Year 6 under Chair Responsibilities for complete details); however, it could be prepared by the primary committee chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee. It is NOT prepared by the candidate. 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 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 actual assessment must be placed here; it is not acceptable to simply place a marker that asks the reviewer to refer to the chair's letter or some other place in the dossier.**

- A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard format (see Appendices).

SECTION 11: 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 and at least satisfactory performance in the other areas.
- 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.
- Appendices are to be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. **Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested.** If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in the electronic copies sent to FAA; however, this is *not* required.

PEER REVIEW AND EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT

Peer Review
- The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, and service is the bedrock on which promotion and/or tenure 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.

Ongoing Review
- Traditionally, peer review of research 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 or on a balanced case. 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.

External Assessment

External assessment is essential to provide the committees evaluating each candidate for promotion and/or tenure an objective evaluation of the value and impact of the candidate's work within the discipline, and to demonstrate that each candidate for associate professor has achieved an emerging national reputation and that each candidate for full professor has achieved a sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered. External assessment is a summative evaluation process with associated rank requirements.

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.

- External assessment (ordinarily in the form of a letter or verified email note) is expected of all candidates at all ranks. To provide each candidate maximal opportunity for success, **at least six assessment letters are required**. **Cases that come to the campus level without six acceptable "arm's-length" letters will be returned to the school.**
- If a candidate is reapplying for promotion within three years of a previous dossier submission (whether as a result of denial of promotion or withdrawal of the case prior to final decision), all original external letter writers must be contacted with a request to update their letter with the new dossier information. If provided, the new letter is substituted in the dossier. If not, the original letter must be retained in the dossier. Three additional new letters should be sought at the time of resubmission.
- The candidate should not be involved in the selection of 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. The candidate must discuss this list with their academic administrator and should indicate clearly on the list that each meets the "arm's length" or independent criteria outlined below. Chairs or deans are not required to use the external reviewers identified by candidates.
- Chairs/Deans may seek additional guidance to identify potential external reviewers, for example, from chairs of similar departments in other universities, from senior faculty in the department in the same or related specialty, or from the scholars quoted in the candidate's publications. Reviewers do not have to be scholars in the identical sub-specialty as the candidate. Chairs should not inform candidates about the identities of the final external reviewers. Biographic summaries of external reviewer should be provided by the department chair, and are not to be written by the candidate.
- **Criteria Defining "Arm's Length" or Independence of External Reviewers:**
  The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be as independent as possible. To qualify as "arm's length" or independent, reviewers providing external assessment should have no personal, professional or academic relationship with the candidate that would cause them to be invested in the candidate's promotion. Specific examples of reviewers to <u>avoid</u> include (but are not limited to): 1) former or current mentors, 2) co-authors or scholarly collaborators in the last five years. Exceptions can be made in the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research or service panels. The department chair needs to specifically make the case for including such a reviewer. If in doubt, please contact the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. 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. Reviews deemed to not comply with the "arm's length" criteria will not count toward the six needed reviews.
- **Academic external reviewers must be at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate**, and at a peer (or higher) institution. When there are highly qualified academic reviewers who are considered top experts in the field but they do not meet the rank or peer institution guidelines, the chair must provide sufficient explanation as to why they have been selected as an appropriate reviewer.
- **Non-academic external reviewers** may be included when a clear explanation of the relevance of such a review is presented by the Chair. It is always in the best interest of the candidate to select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible.
- Unit/school practices may vary in regard to who solicits external assessment letters, but the candidate should not solicit or receive his or her own letters. Chairs should indicate how the external reviewers were selected and a sample of the letter sent from the unit/school to external reviewers should be included in the dossier of each candidate. Make sure the <u>External Referee Form</u> is completed and returned by the reviewers (see Appendices).
- General expectations for external assessment vary with type of appointment.

CLASSIFICATION	RANK BEING SOUGHT	EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
Tenure track faculty, research professors, scientists, and scholars	Advancement to full	External independent review is required. • A maximum of 2 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. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. Academic reviewers must be at full rank.
	Advancement to associate	External independent review is required. • A maximum of 2 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. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. Academic reviewers must be at the rank of associate or higher.
Clinical Track	Advancement to full clinical professor	External independent review is required. • A maximum of 2 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. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. Reviewers should be at the rank of full professor. They may be tenured or on clinical track.
	Advancement to associate clinical professor	External independent review is required. • A maximum of 2 peers external to the department or 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. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. Reviewers should be at the rank of associate or higher. They may be tenured or on clinical track.
Lecturers	Advancement to senior lecturer	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.

Librarians	Advancement to full librarian	External independent peer review is required.
		• A maximum of 2 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. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible.
	Advancement to associate librarian	A maximum of 2 letters from campus faculty, librarians, or administrators external to the unit are acceptable; they should be solicited in the same careful way as external assessment letters to ensure independent review.

- 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.
- For further assistance with soliciting letters and for a solicitation template, please consult the appendices.
- When submitted to FAA, 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 (see Returned Dossiers).

INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES

Submission Deadlines
- Candidates submit dossiers for promotion and/or tenure to their department/school. As deadlines vary from one academic unit to another, faculty should contact their department/school directly for submission deadlines.
- For campus level review, units/schools need to submit one electronic copy for each candidate to FAA no later than **Friday, October 31, 2014**.
- If extenuating circumstances exist, a request for a time extension should be sent by **Friday, September 26, 2014** to FAA. Within one week of the extension being approved, the following information for each candidate must be sent electronically to ofaa@iupui.edu:
  - First, Middle and Last name;
  - University ID Number;
  - Area of Excellence;
  - Type of Review (promotion, tenure or both); and
  - Title Sought (does not apply to tenure only candidates).
- Under no circumstances will the deadline extend beyond **Wednesday, November 26, 2014**. Dossiers submitted late (i.e., after November 26, 2014) or not submitted in accord with these guidelines may be returned and consideration deferred until the following year.

Here is an overview of the promotion and/or tenure review year at IUPUI:

Activity	Time Frame
Candidates prepare dossiers	No later than spring of 5th year
Candidates submit dossiers to primary unit	Based on school process: in the School of Medicine, dossiers are due in the departments by late May or early June; in most other schools, they are due in early August. *Check with your department/school for exact dates.*
Schools submit dossiers to FAA	The last Friday of October
Campus committee reviews and evaluates all dossiers	December, January and February – sometimes into early March
Campus committee recommendations are forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer	Immediately following campus committee reviews; early March
Chief Academic Officer reviews cases, completes an independent evaluation and forwards recommendations to the Chancellor	Mid-March
Chancellor reviews cases and confers with the IU and Purdue Presidents on the joint recommendations that are forwarded to the respective Boards of Trustees	Late March
Action by the Boards of Trustees	Mid-April
Promotion takes effect	July 1 (12 month faculty) or August 1 (10 month faculty) to coincide with start of academic year
Tenure takes effect	July 1 of the following academic year

Returned Dossiers
- Dossiers will be checked to ensure that they are complete, prepared in accord with these guidelines (or an appropriate earlier version of the guidelines), and that letters of evaluation (especially external assessment 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/or unit/school level administrators are strongly encouraged to review dossiers to ensure that:
  o materials are in the proper format and order;
  o peer reviews of teaching, research and creative activity, and service have been included;
  o at least six external reviews meet the "arm's length" or independent criteria (see External Assessment);
  o all dossier assertions can be validated by materials available in the appendices upon request; and
  o only required materials are forwarded to FAA.

If there is uncertainty about what may be required, candidates or chairs should confer with the Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs 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. In many cases, it is understood that national reputation depends, in part, on foundational work that may have occurred earlier in the

candidate's career. For faculty, publications and presentations in rank at another institution prior to appointment at IUPUI will be considered part of the candidate's record. The overall pattern of productivity over time will be scrutinized, with emphasis place on recent work and scholarly trajectory.

- 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.
- As of July 1, 2011, tenure track faculty newly hired in the School of Medicine will have a nine-year tenure probationary timeline. See the section entitled Nine-year Tenure Probationary Timeline for School of Medicine.
- For librarians, tenure is based on the entire professional career, including relevant professional positions held prior to coming to Indiana University.
- There is no defined period between associate and full rank, although most candidates seek full rank five to ten years after promotion to the associate rank. 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; administrative roles; or earlier than normal consideration.
- When a case has special circumstances, 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. Agreements regarding the length of a probationary period for a part-time faculty member should be committed to writing in a MOU or letter of appointment.
- In considering candidates for tenure and/or promotion, 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.

Area 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.
  o Candidates determine their area 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 of excellence declared by the candidate. Candidates should select just one area of excellence unless presenting a balanced case. Review committees may comment in their evaluation of the dossiers that one or more additional areas are also excellent.
  o **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. If so, tenure-track faculty have the option of presenting a balanced case dossier. It is understood that peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving a highly satisfactory rating in each area of performance in a balanced case. However, the promotion and/or tenure standards in many departments/units encourage the choosing of one area of excellence. Faculty should be aware of the requirements of their department/unit.
  o Appropriate areas of excellence have been designated for faculty in all categories and are summarized in the Appendices' chart "Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories." 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 also varies, 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.

- o 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, must address the area the candidate advances as representing excellence: teaching, research and creative activity, or service. The area of excellence should be identified on the Routing and Action Form (see Appendices). 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 work represents excellence in more than one area. When an individual's record warrants such a claim, reviewers are encouraged to note such an accomplishment.
- o 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.
- o In addition to having at least one area of excellence (or a balance of strengths at the highly satisfactory level 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.
- o 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. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence.
- Lecturers are required to be excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence.
- Research professors, scientists, and scholars are required to be excellent in research 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

Although new information may be added at any level, once the dossier reaches the campus level, neither the vitae nor the candidate's personal statement may be updated. A candidate may add a note, either about new information or in response to a level of review, for inclusion in the dossier.

If additional materials are submitted during the review process for inclusion and consideration in the dossier:
- The party providing these materials should present them to the department chair, unit/school dean, or Faculty Appointments and Advancement depending on the level at which the dossier is being considered.

- In turn, the administrative officer will ensure that all prior reviewers have an opportunity to consider the 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. Prior reviewers need not take any action as a consequence of reviewing added material; however, they must have an opportunity to reconsider their original recommendations. 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.
- Committees at prior levels may elect to re-vote on the case if circumstances warrant this action.
- 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.
  o It is the responsibility of the persons seeking additional materials to provide such material to all concerned parties.
  o These comments then become a part of the dossier. Such additions must be made only when clearly necessary.
  o Ordinarily there will be very little time allowed for comment, and concerned parties must act within specified deadlines.
- All additions must be submitted electronically as searchable PDFs.
  o If including copies of e-mails, the best practice is to print the original e-mail to PDF and send as an attachment, preserving the authenticity of the communication.
  The new PDF file is added to the candidate's existing PDF portfolio as a new section so subsequent reviewers will know the addition was made during the review process. This does *not* apply to reconsideration documents. (See next section.)

Annual and three-year 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.

Reconsideration
- Under special circumstances, Indiana University policy allows for reconsideration. This policy **applies only to tenure cases where a candidate receives a negative recommendation**.
- 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. Candidates should consult the "Policies Governing Reappointment and Non-Reappointment during Probationary Period" statement in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*. This policy states, in part indicates that the faculty member or librarian who believes that a recommendation or a decision that he or she not be granted tenure has resulted from inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information may offer factual corrections and request reconsideration at the level at which the decision not to recommend tenure was **first** made.
- 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.
- Reconsideration is not an appeals process but an opportunity to correct the record while review is still underway.
- Under unusual circumstances, reconsideration of promotion decisions may be permitted with the approval of the Chief Academic Officer. 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.
- Reconsideration documents should be included in the dossier section for the level of review at which the request was made. Documents should be in chronological order. When adding pages to an existing PDF file, please make sure the new pages are searchable.

Campus Level Reviews and Notification
The IUPUI Promotion and/or Tenure Committee uses a primary and secondary reader system.
- Readers use a summary report form (see Appendices) to present their evaluation/assessment of cases assigned to them for review 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 Promotion and/or Tenure Committee discuss the case and vote. Candidates receive the final vote from the campus committee.
- The Chief Academic Officer or a designee attends all meetings, listens to the discussion of each case, and reads the readers' reports.
- Subsequently, the Chief Academic Officer and Chancellor read each dossier, review all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the next level:
  o For Purdue faculty, recommendations regarding promotion are made to the President and Trustees of Purdue University while recommendations regarding tenure are made to the President and Trustees of Indiana University.
  o For Indiana University faculty and librarians, promotion and/or tenure recommendations are made to the President and Trustees of Indiana University.
- A formal notice of final action is provided to faculty and librarians after the Trustees act on the President's recommendations.
  o In instances where a candidate is not being recommended for promotion, this notification will ordinarily be the only notice of a negative decision.
  o Probationary faculty not recommended for tenure will also receive a notice of non-reappointment from the Chancellor in addition to this notification.

INSTITUTIONAL VALUES
This section addresses the foundational values of IUPUI that are emphasized and rewarded as part of the annual review, three-year review, reappointment, and promotion and/or tenure processes.

Civic Engagement
- As an urban research university, IUPUI has a committed relationship to the local, state, and global community.
- Civic engagement is consequently a significant part of our mission and our intellectual activity.
- Faculty work that contributes to our role as a civically engaged institution, including participation in service learning projects and mentored internships is highly valued and should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.
- The nature of the scholarship and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics should be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documentation.

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.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- IUPUI is committed to providing, nurturing and enhancing a diverse community of learners and scholars in an environment of equity and inclusion.
- Faculty work that contributes to the diversity of learners and scholars at IUPUI and that enhances our environment of equity and inclusion is highly valued and should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

Economic Development of Indiana
- IUPUI is committed to enhancing the economic development of Indiana.
- Faculty work that contributes to enhancing the economic development of Indiana should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

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.

Honors College
- As IUPUI continues to attract high-caliber undergraduate students, the formation of the Honors College offers an intellectual home to many of the brightest students on campus.
- Faculty engagement in teaching honors courses, mentoring honors students and further contributing to the attraction of the best students serves the campus and schools where such students' majors reside and faculty should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

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 Chief Academic Officer 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.

Principles of Undergraduate Learning and Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning
- The intellectual foundation of our general education and baccalaureate programs is articulated through the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs).
- The Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGPLs), likewise provide the intellectual foundation of our graduate programs.
- Faculty work that integrates these Principles into the curriculum, improves student understanding of these intellectual skills and ways of knowing, and documents student achievement of these Principles in relation to the discipline, whether through ePort or any other means, should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

Research and Creative Activity in the Urban Environment
- Applied research or creative activity 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.

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 successful application for promotion and/or tenure.
    - Administrative service that uses disciplinary expertise for innovative or successful achievements reviewed by peers may be offered as evidence of achievement of professional service when such work:
        - has been planned and stipulated in advance;
        - 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.

Translational Research
- As an urban research university with a commitment to the local and global community, IUPUI values research that can be translated and applied to the needs of the local and global community.
- IUPUI is the nation's first "translational campus" where research that can directly meet the immediate and future needs of the community is a stated value.
- Faculty engaged in translational research should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

RISE to the IUPUI Challenge
- Experiential learning plays a powerful role in engaging and retaining students, enhancing the likelihood of their persistence to graduation.
- Faculty who mentor students in undergraduate research, international, service learning and work-related experiential learning should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

University College
- With the leadership of University College faculty, IUPUI has made tremendous strides in supporting student success in the first year and beyond.
- Scholarship associated with this work has added to IUPUI's national reputation.
- The campus retention rates have shown steady improvement since the introduction of University College.
- Faculty involved with the important retention and student focused initiatives of University College should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

Public Scholars
- The University and campus recognize the appointment of public scholars and embrace their unique relationships and contributions to the community. Public scholarship is conducted in partnership with identified "publics" to address their needs and concerns. As such, public scholarship tends to be highly collaborative, outcomes-focused and results in final products that benefit and are valued by the community. Scholarly outcomes may include exhibits, curricular products, community projects and websites.
- The nature of public scholarship is diverse and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics should be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documentation.

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 Track[2]	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 Highly satisfactory in all three areas for a balanced case	Letters from independent[5] peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution	Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship Emerging national reputation
Professor Tenure Track[2]	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 Highly satisfactory in all three areas for a balanced case	Letters from independent[5] peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution	Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.
Associate Librarian[3]	Performance	Beyond satisfactory in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and satisfactory in other area	Letters from independent[5] peers outside unit on IUPUI campus	(No Additional requirements)
Librarian[4,6]	Performance	Excellence in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and at least satisfactory in other area	Letters from independent[5] 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 (*Indiana University 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 (*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).

[5] Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.

[6] For more detailed information regarding evaluating librarian performance, please review the "Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance."

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)
Clinical Associate Professor	Teaching or Professional Service	Satisfactory in other area and in University Service	Independent[2] 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	Independent[2] peers external to IUPUI	Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.
Senior Lecturer	Teaching	Satisfactory in University and Professional Service	Independent[2] peers external to IUPUI or department	Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching
Associate Research Professor, Associate Scientist/Scholar	Research	Service expectations, if any, set by unit	Independent[2] peers external to IUPUI	Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline
Senior Research Professor, Senior Scientist/Scholar	Research	Service expectations, if any, set by unit	Independent[2] 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; 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.

[2] Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.

DOCUMENTING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Dimensions of teaching performance	Potential Locations			
	Section I: CV	Section II: Candidate's Statement	Section III: Statement 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 PULs (for UG courses) and PGPLs (for Grad 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	Incomplete lists of formal instruction Incomplete evidence to interpret load Incomplete information about goals of instruction Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative Incomplete information on learning outcomes Absence of peer review evidence or superficial peer commentary not based on systematic review Poor performance on many of the above measures	Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes	Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction	Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes; The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy; Evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice.
Course or Curricular Development	Incomplete evidence of nature of activities or results Incomplete evidence of individual role in outcomes No review by others No evidence on how work is connected with department or campus goals Poor course or curricular design products	Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness	Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes	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. Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence
Mentoring and Advising	Numbers of students mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided Comparative load for unit not indicated Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented Poor performance indicated by data	Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized Student satisfaction indicated by evidence Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear	Important impact and student achievement documented	Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach High accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students 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

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/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice Recognition of high quality of teaching Grants or awards at the department or campus level (For the lecturer category, 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 Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure track faculty.
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: Statement 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 or creative activities which reflect major research accomplishments		List all publications or creative activities and indicate whether in rank and whether refereed	Description in personal statement may also note the most significant publications or creative activities	May contain a more thorough discussion of the most significant published research or creative activities and the status of the journals, other publications, or venues for creative activities	
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 assessment 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 assessment 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 or creative activities	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 or creative activities submitted for publication or performance and their status	Interpretation of candidate's research or creative activities progress and future potential in external assessment letters
Quality of research or creative activities	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 or performer	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 or creative activities	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 and creative activities are major goals of the campus	Evaluations by peers in research centers or other departments/schools may identify achievements in interdisciplinary research and creative activities.
Grants and awards (Review the candidate's funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)	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 assessment 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	Research has not been regularly conducted or there is no evidence of dissemination Evidence comes only from colleagues, collaborators, or ex-students Individual role and level of collaborative work is unspecified Research is of poor quality No research program has been presented	Candidate has performed research that is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice Candidate has disseminated the results of research in scholarly journals and other appropriate venues Research program is clearly articulated	Candidate's work has attracted favorable peer review and peer commentary notes promise Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required	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
Grants and external support (Review the candidate's funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)	No evidence of attempts to seek support	Evidence of attempts, which show promise	Successful grant and external support has been obtained and continuing efforts and promise are documented	Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support, including the degree to which the process was competitive
Peer review	Local and external peer reviews have evaluated the work as unsatisfactory. *[Procedures require internal and external reviews.]*	Departments provide clear information about the stature of journals and the significance of the research publications Departments affirm the candidates' plans for continued research	Regular local and external peer review	Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations, grants, and publications Evidence of national recognition of the quality of work
Scholarly activities, including awards	None are documented	Local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred	Regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred	Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others Departmental evaluations of the stature of the work

DOCUMENTING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Evidence Required	Potential Locations				
	Section I: CV	**Section I: Reference 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 assessment letters evaluate the achievement evident in the products of research.
Significance and impact of professional service	List of community, disciplinary/profes-sional, 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 assessment 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 Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required	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: Reference 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 solicited external assessment 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 assessment 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 assessment 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_____ **University ID#**_____

Area of Excellence_____

School_____ **Department**_____

<div align="center">

FACULTY PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER
UNIT/SCHOOL REVIEW FORM AND CHECKLIST
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

</div>

At the unit/school level, a person well-informed about requirements for promotion and/or tenure dossiers should:
- review the candidate's full dossier;
- ensure that all required materials are included;
- place materials in the proper order;
- remove unnecessary items;
- complete this checklist; and
- provide his or her contact information in case campus-level reviewers have questions about the content or form of the dossier.

The well-informed, unit/school level person may be an administrative assistant, designated faculty member, or other person specified by the dean. This person is required to sign the bottom of this checklist indicating that to the best of his or her ability the requirements for dossier preparation have been met. **This person should refer to the Dossier Format section (page 13) for explicit rules about dossier contents.**

CHECKLIST:

Note: Not every item is required in every case, but most items are required in most cases.

☐ Submit electronic copy of the dossier in PDF Portfolio format to Faculty Appointments and Advancement:
- Each section constitutes one separate, searchable PDF file.
- Each PDF file shall be labeled with the Candidate's Last Name, the dossier section number and section title, for example:
  - o   Smith 01 Transaction Forms
  - o   Smith 02 Review Level 2
  - o   Smith 03 Review Level 1
  - o   Smith 04 External Assessments
  - o   Smith 05 Reference Letters
  - o   Smith 06 Candidate's Statement (etc.)
- Each PDF Portfolio shall be labeled with the Candidate's Name and the School's HRMS Code, for example:
  - o   Smith, John – MED
  - o   Doe, Jane - LART
- Coversheets, section tabs and tables of contents are not necessary. If a table of contents is included, it should be its own section and the PDF file labeled accordingly. (For example, "Smith Table of Contents.")

SECTION 01: Transaction Forms
☐ *Completed School/Unit Review Form and Checklist
☐ *Routing and Action Form

SECTION 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)
☐ *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 unit/school's dean or appropriate representative
☐ *Unit/School Committee's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's work
☐ If a candidate has an adjunct or joint appointment in another school, recommendation from that school's committee (optional—decided by that school)

SECTION 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)
☐ *Chair's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's work
☐ *Primary/Department Committee's recommendation and evaluation (including statement concerning candidate's potential for continued development)

SECTION 04: External Assessments
☐ *A sample external assessment solicitation letter
☐ *A list containing brief statements on expertise of referees (see External Referee List for format)
☐ *Completed External Referee Forms and external assessment letters in the order they appear on the referee list *(i.e., Form A, Letter A, Form B, Letter B, etc.)*

SECTION 05: Reference Letters
☐ *A sample reference solicitation letter sent for candidate, if applicable
☐ *All letters received

SECTION 06: Candidate's Statement
- [ ] *Candidate's own statement on work (a narrative assessing accomplishments and including plans for future work in all areas, a maximum of 5 single-spaced pages)

SECTION 07: Teaching
- [ ] Teaching Statement (a narrative that analyzes the teaching area and is only to be included if this is candidate's area of excellence, a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages)
- [ ] Teaching load information; graduate committees served on or chaired
- [ ] Peer evaluation of teaching
- [ ] Student evaluation of teaching (in aggregated format)
- [ ] Evidence of student learning and match with unit and IUPUI student outcome goals
- [ ] Evidence of scholarly dissemination of work and leadership on teaching
- [ ] Evidence of undergraduate or graduate student research or mentoring
- [ ] Evidence of quality of course development or innovation efforts
- [ ] Evidence of teaching development efforts

SECTION 08: Research or Creative Activity
- [ ] Research and Creative Activity Statement (a narrative that analyzes the research or creative activity area and is to only be included if this is candidate's area of excellence, a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages)
- [ ] Peer evaluation of research or creative activity
- [ ] Evidence of scholarly products and presentations
- [ ] Research load information; amount of time devoted to research
- [ ] Documentation of individual contributions to collaborative work

SECTION 09: Professional and University Service
- [ ] Service Statement (a narrative that analyzes the service area and is to only be included if this is candidate's area of excellence, a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages)
- [ ] 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

SECTION 10: Assessment/Curriculum Vitae
- [ ] Assessment of dissemination outlets, such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance by Chair (or Chair Designee)
- [ ] *Copy of candidate's *curriculum vitae*

SECTION 11: Appendices
- [ ] As determined by candidate and department/unit
  Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested. If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in the electronic copies sent to FAA; however, this is *not* required.

These materials will be retained by Faculty Appointments and Advancement for permanent file.

The following certification may not be provided by the candidate.
I have reviewed this candidate's dossier and certify that the materials checked off above are included. To the best of my knowledge, this candidate's dossier meets all the requirements for dossier preparation.

Reviewer's Signature   Reviewer's Title

Telephone   E-mail   Date

Candidate_____   **University ID#**_____

Area of Excellence_____

School_____   **Department**_____

LIBRARIAN PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER
UNIT/SCHOOL REVIEW FORM AND CHECKLIST
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

At the unit/school level, a person well-informed about requirements for promotion and/or tenure dossiers should:
- review the candidate's full dossier;
- ensure that all required materials are included;
- place materials in the proper order;
- remove unnecessary items;
- complete this checklist; and
- provide his or her contact information in case campus-level reviewers have questions about the content or form of the dossier.

The well-informed, unit/school level person may be an administrative assistant, designated faculty member, librarian, or other person specified by the dean. This person is required to sign the bottom of this checklist indicating that to the best of his or her ability the requirements for dossier preparation have been met. **This person should refer to Dossier Format section (page 13) for explicit rules about dossier contents.**

CHECKLIST:

Note: Not every item is required in every case, but most items are required in most cases.

☐ Submit electronic copy of the dossier in PDF Portfolio format to Faculty Appointments and Advancement:
- Each section constitutes one separate, searchable PDF file.
- Each PDF file shall be labeled with the Candidate's Last Name, the dossier section number and section title, for example:
  - Smith Section 01 Transaction Forms
  - Smith Section 02 Review Level 2
  - Smith Section 03 Review Level 1
  - Smith Section 04 External Assessments
  - Smith 05 Reference Letters
  - Smith 06 Candidate's Statement (etc.)
- Each PDF Portfolio shall be labeled with the Candidate's Name and the School's HRMS Code, for example:
  - Smith, John – MED
  - Doe, Jane - LART
- Coversheets, section tabs and tables of contents are not necessary. If a table of contents is included, it should be its own section and the PDF file labeled accordingly. (For example, "Smith Table of Contents.")

SECTION 01: Transaction Forms
☐ *Completed School/Unit Review Form and Checklist
☐ *Routing and Action Form

SECTION 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)
☐ *Dean's recommendation and summary evaluation of candidate's work (either the dean of IUPUI University Library or the dean of the professional school, as appropriate)
☐ If a candidate has an adjunct or joint appointment, letter of recommendation from that unit/school's dean or appropriate representative
☐ *IUPUI Librarians Promotion and/or Tenure Committee's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's work

SECTION 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)
☐ *Library Director's or Team Leader's recommendation and evaluation of candidate's work
☐ *Primary Peer Review Committee's recommendation and evaluation (including statement concerning candidate's potential for continued development)
☐ If a candidate has joint appointments, recommendation from those Peer Review Committees (optional)

SECTION 04: External Assessments
☐ *A sample external assessment solicitation letter
☐ *A list containing statements of expertise of referees (see External Referee List for format)
☐ *External assessment letters of evaluation and completed External Referee Forms in the order they appear on the referee list *(i.e., Form A, Letter A, Form B, Letter B, etc.)*

SECTION 05: Reference Letters

☐ *A sample reference solicitation letter sent for candidate, if applicable
☐ *All letters received

SECTION 06: Candidate's Statement

☐ *Candidate's own statement on work (a narrative assessing accomplishments and including plans for future work in all areas, a <u>maximum of 5 single-spaced pages)</u>

SECTION 07: Performance

☐ Narrative statement describing performance activities and their cumulative impact on repeated activities, <u>a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages</u>
☐ Position description(s) detailing performance responsibilities
☐ Evidence of quality or impact by patrons, faculty or other recipients of librarian performance.
☐ Other documentation addressing the quality of performance

SECTION 08: Professional Development

☐ If selected as your secondary area, a narrative statement describing the impact of activities on professional development, <u>a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages</u>

SECTION 09: Service

☐ If selected as your secondary area, a narrative statement describing the impact of activities on service, <u>a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages</u>

SECTION 10: Assessment/Curriculum Vitae

☐ Assessment of dissemination outlets, such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance by Library Director or Team Leader (or Designee)
☐ *Copy of candidate's *curriculum vitae*

SECTION 11: Appendices

☐ Supporting documents for performance
☐ Supporting documents for professional development
☐ Supporting documents for service
Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested. If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in the electronic copies sent to FAA; however, this is *not* required.

These materials will be retained by Faculty Appointments and Advancement for permanent file.

The following certification may <u>not</u> be provided by the candidate.
I have reviewed this candidate's dossier and certify that the materials checked off above are included. To the best of my knowledge, this candidate's dossier meets all the requirements for dossier preparation.

_____   _____
Reviewer's Signature   Reviewer's Title

_____   _____   _____
Telephone   E-mail   Date

FACULTY ROUTING AND ACTION FORM
FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

Full Name   **University ID#:**

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)**:**

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 Chief Academic Officer and in accord with unit/school and primary/department guidelines.

Signature of Candidate   Date

The upper portion of this routing form should be completed <u>before</u> the dossier is evaluated at the primary/department or unit/school level.

Review Process
As applicable, the Primary/Department Committee, Chairperson/Executive Associate Dean, Unit/School 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 _____ Absent _____   ———

   Department Chairperson Approval _____ Disapproval _____   ———

   Unit Committee   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   Abstention _____ Absent _____   ———

   Dean   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   ———

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

   Primary Committee   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   Abstention _____ Absent _____   ———

   Department Chairperson Approval _____ Disapproval _____   ———

   Unit Committee   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   Abstention _____ Absent _____   ———

   Dean   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   ———

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY LIBRARIAN ROUTING AND ACTION FORM
FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

Full Name   **University ID#:**

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)**:**

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 Chief Academic Officer and in accord with unit/school and primary/department guidelines.

Signature of Candidate   Date

The upper portion of this routing form should be completed <u>before</u> the dossier is evaluated at the primary/department or unit/school level.

Review Process
As applicable, the Primary Peer Review Committee, Team Leader, IUPUI Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Dean of University Libraries 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 _____ Absent _____   _____

  Team Leader   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   _____

  IUPUI Librarian   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   Abstention _____ Absent _____   _____
  Committee

  Dean   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   _____

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

  Primary Committee   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   Abstention _____ Absent _____   _____

  Team Leader   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   _____

  IUPUI Librarian   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   Abstention _____ Absent _____   _____
  Committee

  Dean   Approval _____ Disapproval _____   _____

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL LIBRARIES
LIBRARIAN ROUTING AND ACTION FORM
FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE REVIEW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS
2014-15 ACADEMIC YEAR

Full Name: **University ID#:**

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)**:**

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 Chief Academic Officer and in accord with unit/school and primary/department guidelines.

Signature of Candidate   Date

The upper portion of this routing form should be completed <u>before</u> the dossier is evaluated at the primary/department or unit/school level.

Review Process
As applicable, the Primary Peer Review Committee, Library Director, IUPUI Librarians Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Dean of Professional School 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 _____	Absent _____	_____
Library Director	Approval _____	Disapproval _____			_____
IUPUI Librarian Committee	Approval _____	Disapproval _____	Abstention _____	Absent _____	_____
Dean	Approval _____	Disapproval _____			_____

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

Primary Committee	Approval _____	Disapproval _____	Abstention _____	Absent _____	_____
Library Director	Approval _____	Disapproval _____			_____
IUPUI Librarian Committee	Approval _____	Disapproval _____	Abstention _____	Absent _____	_____
Dean	Approval _____	Disapproval _____			_____

<div align="center">

IUPUI *CURRICULUM VITAE* FORMAT
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIERS

</div>

PREAMBLE: Preferably, all entries should be listed in reverse chronology with the most recent entries listed first. If your discipline's convention is for chronological listing, that is acceptable but please be consistent. For tenure and promotion dossiers, the candidate's complete career history should be included. In rank activities and accomplishments should be indicated by using an asterisk *. Omit headings that do not apply to your career. If you have additional categories, place them in the most logical area, consistent with this vitae format. Adherence to the following format will foster consistency as well as facilitate effective and efficient dossier review.

As long as you include all the requested information in the order presented on this sample, you are not required to use the tabbed or tabled format provided on the Resources page of our website.

<div align="center">

Name and Contact Information

</div>

EDUCATION:
POSTDOCTORAL

Institution	Degree	Date Awarded

GRADUATE

Institution	Degree	Date Awarded

UNDERGRADUATE

Institution	Degree	Date Awarded

FURTHER EDUCATION: (Advanced and Specialty Training, Fellowships, Institutes)

Institution	Credential	Date Awarded

APPOINTMENTS:
ACADEMIC (i.e. academic appointments, including academic administrative roles)

Institution	Rank/Title	Inclusive Dates

NON-ACADEMIC (i.e. administrative, hospital or corporate appointments, consultantships)

Institution/Entity	Title	Inclusive Dates

LICENSURE, CERTIFICATION, SPECIALTY BOARD STATUS (as applicable for discipline):

Credential	Number	Inclusive Dates

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS:

Organization	Inclusive Dates

PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND AWARDS:
TEACHING

Award Name	Granted By	Date Awarded

RESEARCH
Award Name   Granted By   Date Awarded

SERVICE
Award Name   Granted By   Date Awarded

OVERALL/OTHER
Award Name   Granted By   Date Awarded

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: List courses, workshops or training programs attended to enhance your performance in any area of academic work.
Course/Workshop Title   Provider   Date

LIBRARIAN 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.

TEACHING:

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS: List the course number, brief title, format (i.e. lecture, lab, clinic, online); your role (course director, lecturer), year and term, enrollment and other information that specifically pertains to your discipline (i.e. contact hours, hours of lab instruction, time instructing students on wards or clinics, course-related advising.) Mean teaching evaluation scores may be included.

UNDERGRADUATE
Course #	Short Title	Format	Role	Term	Enrollment

GRADUATE
Course #	Short Title	Format	Role	Term	Enrollment

POSTGRADUATE
Course #	Short Title	Format	Role	Term	Enrollment

CONTINUING EDUCATION
Course #	Short Title	Format	Role	Term	Enrollment

MENTORING: List mentoring activities that pertain to your discipline such as thesis or advisory committees, students on research rotations, postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars, advisor to graduating students, mentor for peer and self-assessment review, faculty mentoring committees. Name the individual, identify your role and provide inclusive dates.
Individual   Role   Inclusive Dates

TEACHING ADMINISTRATION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: List activities focused on enhancing the teaching and learning environment.

GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS IN TEACHING: Organize grants to differentiate active from pending/under review. Include your history of past grant support. If a record of effort to obtain funding is expected in your discipline and/or rank, include proposal submitted but not funded.

ACTIVE TEACHING GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

COMPLETED TEACHING GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

PENDING TEACHING GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

SUBMITTED BUT NOT FUNDED TEACHING GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

INVITED PRESENTATIONS – TEACHING

LOCAL

Title	Organization	Date

REGIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

NATIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

INTERNATIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS IN RESEARCH: Organize grants to differentiate active from pending/under review. Include your history of past grant support. If a record of effort to obtain funding is expected in your discipline and/or rank, include proposal submitted but not funded.

ACTIVE RESEARCH GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

COMPLETED RESEARCH GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

PENDING RESEARCH GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

SUBMITTED BUT NOT FUNDED RESEARCH GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

INVITED PRESENTATIONS – RESEARCH
LOCAL

Title	Organization	Date

REGIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

NATIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

INTERNATIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

SERVICE:

Distinguish between service to the University and service to your professional discipline. If a service activity spans academic levels (i.e. Department, School, Campus, University) list it once. Identify your role in leadership (i.e. member, co-chair, chair).

UNIVERSITY SERVICE:
DEPARTMENT

Activity	Role	Inclusive Dates

SCHOOL

Activity	Role	Inclusive Dates

CAMPUS

Activity	Role	Inclusive Dates

UNIVERSITY

Activity	Role	Inclusive Dates

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:
LOCAL

Organization	Activity	Inclusive Dates

REGIONAL

Organization	Activity	Inclusive Dates

NATIONAL

Organization	Activity	Inclusive Dates

INTERNATIONAL

Organization	Activity	Inclusive Dates

PATIENT CARE/CLINICAL SERVICE: List activities in service to patients, indicating position, clinical venue and inclusive dates. Include role in administrative, organizational and team activities that improve the environment for clinical care. If the activities extend beyond the local level, indicate the sphere or extent of impact (i.e. regional, national, international).

GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS IN SERVICE: Organize grants to differentiate active from pending/under review. Include your history of past grant support. If a record of effort to obtain funding is expected in your discipline and/or rank, include proposal submitted but not funded.

ACTIVE SERVICE GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

COMPLETED SERVICE GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

PENDING SERVICE GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

SUBMITTED BUT NOT FUNDED SERVICE GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS

Title	Granting Agency	Role	% Effort	Amount	Dates

INVITED PRESENTATIONS – SERVICE

LOCAL

Title	Organization	Date

REGIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

NATIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

INTERNATIONAL

Title	Organization	Date

PUBLICATIONS: List all publications in a format consistent with your disciplinary style standards (e.g. APA), listing all authors in the order in which they appear in the publication. **Bold your name in citations where multiple authors are listed.** All works must be retrievable. Sort publications by the following categories: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, Service and also by refereed and non-refereed. Separate articles, proceedings papers, books, book chapters, invited reviews, letters to the editor, editorials, book reviews, invited commentaries and abstracts (including professional standards, protocols, software, multimedia presentations, films or videos and other scholarly/creative works designed for electronic technologies). **Mark in-rank publications with an asterisk * and those as a mentor with a dagger †.** The nature and extent of the your contribution should be presented in the candidate's statement or in the documentation of teaching, research/creative activity or service and not in the CV. List only works that are published, accepted or "in-press." Work submitted, under editorial review or in preparation should not be listed but rather may be reported in the candidate's statement. Candidates for the Three-Year Review and for promotion to Associate Professor should briefly

annotate entries to explain the nature and extent of their contribution. If additional explanatory information is needed, include this in an appendix to the dossier.

TEACHING
Refereed

Non-refereed

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY
Refereed

Non-refereed

SERVICE
Refereed

Non-refereed

_____   _____
(Date)   (Signature of Candidate)

INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY AT INDIANAPOLIS
CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER'S COMMENTS
REGARDING OUTSIDE LETTERS

Practices and procedures for obtaining outside letters of review vary among the departments and schools. External assessment letters are required for all promotion and/or tenure 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 letters of reference 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 assessment 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 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. **It is extremely important that the proper area of excellence is reflected in the request letter. If the wrong area is indicated, this could result in procedural challenges**.

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. The candidate should not be the person to write the statements of qualification of external reviewers. 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. Include the External Referee Forms in your request for referees and ask that they complete the form to assure that reviewers meet our "arm's length" criteria.

11. Evaluators should be asked not 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 may be 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, especially in light of the move toward more on-line publication venues.

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 assessment 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; however, they should still be signed, dated and on letterhead.

EXTERNAL REFEREE LIST FOR [Candidate's Name]

Name of External Referee 1

Rank of External Referee 1

Institution External Referee 1

    Brief bio about External Referee 1's qualifications

Name of External Referee 2

Rank of External Referee 2

Institution External Referee 2

    Brief bio about External Referee 2's qualifications

Name of External Referee 3

Rank of External Referee 3

Institution External Referee 3

    Brief bio about External Referee 3's qualifications

Name of External Referee 4

Rank of External Referee 4

Institution External Referee 4

    Brief bio about External Referee 4's qualifications

Name of External Referee 5

Rank of External Referee 5

Institution External Referee 5

    Brief bio about External Referee 5's qualifications

Name of External Referee 6

Rank of External Referee 6

Institution External Referee 6

    Brief bio about External Referee 6's qualifications

Please use the format above when creating a candidate's External Referee List. This is the minimum amount of information required by IUPUI and the IU President's Office.

IUPUI INDIANA UNIVERSITY PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS

EXTERNAL REFEREE FORM

Please return this form with your letter.

TO:　　　　　IUPUI Administrator's Name

FROM:　　　　External Reviewer's Name

SUBJECT:　　　Relationship to Candidate

CANDIDATE:　　Faculty Member up for P&T's Name

Relationship to the candidate and his/her work:　　　　　*Check your response*

1. Past and/or present student, trainee or colleague at same institution at which you had a direct or significant role in their development ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Family or close friendship ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Co-authored scholarly work/grants in the last 5 years (with the exception of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research or service panels) ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Other, please specify:

_____

_____

Knowledge of candidate's work primarily based on:　　　　*Check your response*

1. His/her publications and CV ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Scholarly presentations ☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Personal knowledge and discussions ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Participated on review panels (study section, advisory boards, etc.) ☐ Yes ☐ No

_____

External Reviewer's Signature　　　　　　　　　　Date

SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR FACULTY

(Schools may develop their own letters, but they should use the same format and general content to contact all persons asked to provide evaluations. Pay special attention that the letter asks the reviewers to comment on the appropriate area of excellence being sought by each specific candidate.)

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). We would be particularly grateful for your comments on the depth and significance of Professor _____'s work and its impact in your field. To assist in this evaluation, we are providing a packet of relevant materials, including *(his/her)* curriculum vitae; a copy of *(his/her)* personal statement; copies of selected recent publications and teaching materials; and our criteria for (*promotion and/or tenure*).

Professor _____ has identified *(research/creative activity, teaching, service)* as *(his/her)* area of excellence and therefore this is the area where evaluation by peers is most important. *[**OR:** Professor _____ has indicated a balanced case, which should be supported by evidence of highly satisfactory performance in all three areas, research, teaching and service, in keeping with Indiana University's policy on balanced cases.]*

Please comment on Professor _____'s research as well as other scholarly work in _____(the area of excellence) . We welcome your evaluation of the quality of the publications and journals that have been listed, as well as comments on any creative work or exhibition media. IUPUI is dedicated to multidisciplinary research. Please keep this in mind as you review this candidate's scholarship. Comments on teaching might include your evaluations of course syllabi, examinations, other teaching materials, and publications on teaching, as well as any personal experience you may have of *(his/her)* teaching. For excellence in service, please comment on both service activities and the candidate's scholarship of service. We would also appreciate any comments you might care to make concerning Professor _____'s contributions to professional organizations or to *(his/her)* discipline through professional service activities or publications.

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

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the <u>External Referee Form</u> and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vitae or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments.

We hope you understand how much we appreciate your assistance as we consider Professor _____'s candidacy. It is important for us to understand *(his/her)* contributions from a perspective beyond our campus. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes, and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. (*This paragraph is mandatory language for all letters requesting external peer evaluation for promotion and/or tenure and may not be altered*.)

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

Sincerely,

SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR LIBRARIANS

(Schools may develop their own letters, but they should use the same format and general content to contact all persons asked to provide evaluations. Pay special attention that the letter asks the reviewers to comment on the appropriate area of excellence being sought by each specific candidate.)

Dear _____:

_____ is being considered for promotion to the rank of Librarian at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). We would be particularly grateful for your evaluation of _____'s contribution to and standing in the profession. To assist in this evaluation, we are providing a packet of relevant materials, including *(his/her)* curriculum vitae; a copy of *(his/her)* personal statement; other pertinent materials; and our criteria for (*promotion and/or tenure).*

For promotion to the rank of Librarian from Associate Librarian at IUPUI, the candidate must meet established university criteria.

Primarily:	Superior performance – the candidate must show evidence of performance that is achieved by few others at IUPUI.
Secondarily:	Either – Excellence in professional development – the candidate must show a continued significant contribution at the state, regional, national, or international level.
	Or – Excellence in service – the candidate must show a continued significant contribution at the community, state, regional, national, or international level.
Tertiary:	For either area not chosen as secondary, performance must be at least satisfactory.

In order to evaluate objectively the criterion of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession, we depend heavily upon the opinions of prominent colleagues outside IUPUI who are knowledgeable in the field of specialization of the candidate. Your frank appraisal of the candidate's contributions to the profession is very important. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes, and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the <u>External Referee Form</u> and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vitae or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments.

Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. (*This paragraph is mandatory language for all letters requesting external peer evaluation for promotion and/or tenure and may not be altered.*)

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

Sincerely,

CANDIDATE REVIEW FORM

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

CANDIDATE PROFILE SUMMARY

Candidate Name:	Primary Reviewer:
Department:	Secondary Reviewer:
School:	Highest Degree:
Initial IUPUI Appointment Yr:	Year Highest Degree Achvd:
Current Rank:	Institution:
Year Current Rank Achvd:	Rank Sought:

Candidate for Promotion:	Candidate for Tenure:

Area of Excellence Declared by Candidate:

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 or Creative Activity." For "All Read" cases, please omit this rating.

Summary Global Rank

Teaching:		**Research or Creative Activity**:		**Professional Service**:	
Excellent	☐	Excellent	☐	Excellent	☐
Highly Satisfactory	☐	Highly Satisfactory	☐	Highly Satisfactory	☐
Satisfactory	☐	Satisfactory	☐	Satisfactory	☐
Unsatisfactory	☐	Unsatisfactory	☐	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)	
A. Peer Evaluations		
1. Class visits by peers	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Peer review of materials	Yes ☐	No ☐
B. Scholarship		
1. **Scholarly Products**	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. National/international presentations	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. Course/curriculum/procedure development	Yes ☐	No ☐
C. Student Evaluation		
1. Evidence over several terms	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Normed for dept/school	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. Mentee/alumni comments	Yes ☐	No ☐
D. Effective and Appropriate Methods	Yes ☐	No ☐
E. Student Learning		
1. Student outcomes/results	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Clear course goals	Yes ☐	No ☐
F. Teaching Awards		
1. State/national	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. University/campus	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. School/department	Yes ☐	No ☐
G. Plan for Increasing Future Teaching Effectiveness	Yes ☐	No ☐
H. Teaching Load		
1. Appropriate for dept/school	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Appropriate for emphasis	Yes ☐	No ☐
I. Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation?	Yes ☐	No ☐
J. Reviewer's Comments on Teaching:		

II.   RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

Criteria	Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one)	
A. External Peer Evaluations	Yes ☐	No ☐
B. Scholarly Products		
1. Stature of journals/works/galleries	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Refereed	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. Rate of productivity	Yes ☐	No ☐
C. Grants Received		
1. Number in rank	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Total amount in rank	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. Source of grants	Yes ☐	No ☐

D. Research Focus Goals			
1. Progress towards goals	Yes ☐	No ☐	
2. Future plans	Yes ☐	No ☐	
E. Research Load			
1. Appropriate for dept/school	Yes ☐	No ☐	
2. Appropriate for emphasis	Yes ☐	No ☐	
F. Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation?	Yes ☐	No ☐	
G. Reviewer's Comments on Research/Creative Activity:			

III. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

Criteria	Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one)	
A. Contributions/Scholarship		
1. Service to patients/clients/others	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Administrative: Hospitals/clinics/courts/others	Yes ☐	No ☐
3. **Scholarly Products**	Yes ☐	No ☐
B. Professional Service to Community		
1. Peer reviewed	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Other evidence	Yes ☐	No ☐
C. Regional/National/International Professional Organizations		
1. Offices held	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Other professional service	Yes ☐	No ☐
D. Professional Service Load		
1. Appropriate for dept/school	Yes ☐	No ☐
2. Appropriate for Emphasis	Yes ☐	No ☐
E. Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation?	Yes ☐	No ☐
F. Reviewer's Comments on Professional Service:		

IV. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

A. Is there sufficient evidence of satisfactory University service?	Yes ☐	No ☐
B. Is there sufficient evidence of high standards of professional conduct across teaching, research and creative activity, and service?	Yes ☐	No ☐
C. Reviewer's Comments on University Service:		

V. DOSSIER OVERALL

A. Do you have any comments to go back to the chair or dean about issues raised in reviewing this dossier?	Yes ☐	No ☐
B. Comments to chair or dean:		
C. Overall Comments on Dossier Overall:		

INDEX

A

B

C

D

L

M

N

O

P

R

Routing and Action Form · 8, 11, 12, 13, 31, 48, 52, 53, 54

S

T

U

W