

**THE PURDUE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SCIENCE IN  
INDIANAPOLIS CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND DOCUMENTATION  
GUIDELINES FOR  
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT**

**Approved by the SOS Faculty, May 3, 2019**

Approved by the SOS Faculty, May 3, 2016

Approved by the SOS Faculty, April 27, 2015

Approved by the SOS Faculty, April 12, 2013

Approved by the SOS Faculty, March 2, 2012

Original Version: March 1, 1996

Revised: September 2, 2005; February 10, 2012; April 12, 2013;  
April 27, 2015; May 3, 2016

Proposed Revisions 2.27.19

New changes 4.5.19

This version of this document supersedes all previous versions.

This document is a document of the Faculty of the Purdue University School of Science, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. Revision of this document is governed by the Bylaws of that Faculty.

## A. INTRODUCTION

Promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions are among the most important decisions made at IUPUI. The futures of the University, the School of Science, and the individual faculty member are largely determined by these decisions. Thus it is essential that each candidate for promotion, tenure, and reappointment be treated fairly and measured against specific and explicitly stated criteria.

This document establishes specific criteria and documentation guidelines to be used for promotion, tenure, and reappointment in the School of Science, while acknowledging the subjective value judgments and flexibility required by the process. Every faculty member should be apprised of these criteria and guidelines as early as reasonably possible after his/her initial appointment by the Department Chair. Periodic discussions with the faculty member's Department Chair should clarify questions and uncertainties, and prevent misconceptions. Further, the Department Chair will conduct annual reviews of each faculty member, and provide each faculty member with unambiguous written assessments of his/her performance.

For faculty in the School of Science, promotions are awarded by both Purdue University and Indiana University, but tenure is granted by Indiana University either upon concurrence with Purdue on a recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or, alternatively, after consultation with Purdue if promotion is not simultaneously recommended.

### 1. *Indiana University's Academic Handbook*

Criteria for promotion and tenure for Indiana University faculty are provided in Indiana University's *Academic Handbook*.<sup>1</sup> Regarding promotion, the *Handbook* states that:

*Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion criteria. Promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual's contribution to the school / campus missions. The relative weight attached to the criteria above should and must vary accordingly. A candidate for promotion [or tenure] should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be at least satisfactory (research/creative activity; service) or effective (teaching) in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university. In all cases the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.*<sup>2</sup>

With regard to tenure, the *Handbook* states that:

*After the appropriate probationary period, tenure shall be granted to those faculty members ... whose professional characteristics indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. The criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion are similar, but not identical.... Tenure will generally not be*

*conferred unless the faculty member... achieves, or gives strong promise of achieving, promotion in rank within the University.*<sup>3</sup>

The *Handbook* further states that each faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor or below is to be reviewed annually. (The School of Science has further established the policy that all faculty members are to be reviewed annually.) In the annual reappointment consideration of a non-tenured faculty member, performance must be measured against the criteria for promotion and tenure. Only those faculty members judged to have the potential and promise for meeting the criteria for promotion and/or tenure by the end of their probationary periods should be recommended for reappointment.

The purpose of the Third Year Review of tenure-track faculty is to provide a formative assessment (separate from the annual review) of an individual's professional development and prospects for being recommended for tenure at the end of the probationary period. This review will typically occur in the spring semester of the third year of an appointment. The "third year" will coincide with the number of tenure credit years given to the candidate plus years in rank that equal three. For those candidates with 3 or more years of tenure credit, no third year review is required. For example, one year of tenure credit implies the review will occur in the candidates second year. The time line for this review will be appropriate to meeting the deadline announced by the Dean of Faculties Calendar.

## **2. *IUPUI Supplement***

While Indiana University's *Academic Handbook* provides general criteria that apply to all Indiana University faculty, criteria and documentation guidelines that apply specifically to IUPUI faculty are provided by the *IUPUI Supplement*. In addition, the *Supplement* describes the procedures that constitute the promotion and tenure process and the documentation that constitutes the basic promotion and tenure dossier for IUPUI faculty.

## **3. *IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers***

Annually, the Dean of the Faculties distributes updated guidelines for submission of promotion and tenure documents. This document should be consulted for additional information regarding perspectives on the content of promotion and tenure dossiers and the use of the *eDossier* system. In general, when conflicts arise between the Dean of the Faculties Guidelines and those described here, it is recommended that the procedures indicated within the Dean of the Faculties Guidelines should be followed. The standards and criteria herein apply to the School of Science and accurately reflect the historical perspective and evolving opinions of the Unit Committee.

## **4. *The Purdue University Criteria for Professorial Ranks and IU Criteria for Lecturer Ranks***

Criteria for promotion, tenure, and reappointment for Purdue University faculty are provided in the Purdue University *Promotion and Tenure Policy*. This memorandum states that:

*The tasks of university faculty members are to acquire, discover, appraise and disseminate knowledge. They should communicate this knowledge and the manner of its acquisition or discovery to their immediate community of students*

*and scholars, to their profession, and to society at large. Service to the institution, the community, the State, the nation and the world constitutes an important mission of University faculty members. As an institution of higher education with a commitment to excellence and a diversity of missions, Purdue University values creative endeavor, research, and scholarship; teaching in its many forms; and engagement in its many forms, including extension and outreach for example. To be considered for promotion, a faculty member should have demonstrated excellence and scholarly productivity in at least one of these areas: discovery, learning and engagement. Ordinarily, strength should be manifest in more than one of these areas.<sup>4</sup>*

This memorandum further states that:

*Promotion to Assistant Professor:*

*A tenure-track instructor may be promoted to Assistant Professor upon attaining the level of professional accomplishment which would have justified appointment to an assistant professorship.*

*Promotion to Associate Professor:*

*Academic tenure is acquired on promotion to this rank. A successful candidate should have a significant record of accomplishment as a faculty member and show promise of continued professional growth and recognition.*

*Promotion to Professor:*

*Successful candidates should be recognized as authorities in their fields of specialization by external colleagues—national and/or international as may be appropriate in their academic disciplines—and be valued for their intramural contributions as faculty members.*

Indiana University has introduced the ranks of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer applicable to faculty appointments in the School of Science. The IUPUI Supplement states:

*Senior Lecturer:*

*Promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on demonstration of excellence in teaching, with at least satisfactory performance in service. Senior Lecturers are ordinarily expected to provide leadership in teaching and to contribute to course and curriculum development. Senior Lecturers may have organizational and oversight responsibilities for a course, participate in course and curriculum development, and, where appropriate, provide workshops for colleagues. They may oversee and provide mentoring for full and part-time non-tenure track faculty. Senior Lecturers may also make school and campus contributions beyond the classroom, such as campus service or other professional activities related to teaching and service.*

The School of Science expects that candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will have established an excellent record in teaching and have clearly demonstrated a record of scholarly activity applied to teaching and/or pedagogy as an important part of their dossier. With respect to Senior Lecturers, the current IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers states that the standard for excellence (over and above

record of quantity, quality and impact of internal work) is a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in the area of excellence. For elaborations on these expectations in the School of Science for promotion to Senior Lecturer, see Section F.

With respect to Scientist ranks (non-tenure-track), the current IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers states:

*Research professors, scientists and scholars are required to be excellent in research or creative work.*

##### **5. The School of Science Criteria**

The criteria specified by Indiana University's *Academic Handbook*, the *IUPUI Supplement*, and the Purdue University memorandum are minimal criteria which are generally applicable to all schools at Indiana University, IUPUI, and Purdue University regardless of their interests and missions. It is appropriate and desirable that within this framework the School of Science further articulates criteria specific to itself.

The basic, underlying principle of promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions in the School of Science is that of peer review. Thus promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions are to be made substantively at the Department level, where the faculty member's activities are best known and can best be evaluated. It is essential that, while acknowledging the subjective value judgments and flexibility required by individual cases, Department level decisions be made stringently. Subsequent evaluations at higher levels will concentrate on whether stated Department, School of Science, and University criteria have in fact been met and whether the evaluation procedures followed have been satisfactory.

The primary objective of the promotion and tenure process is to retain and reward faculty who are making significant contributions to the Department, the School of Science, and the University. Each candidate is to be evaluated with this primary objective in mind, recognizing the multiplicity of ways in which contributions are made by faculty.

In the School of Science, promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions are made on the basis of scholarship and creative activity in teaching, research, and service. The School's criteria for the candidate's designated Area of Excellence delineated in these guidelines constitute the framework for accomplishments that typically are articulated in more specific detail in departmental criteria and that contribute to the summary evaluation by the review committee concerning excellent performance. The individual criteria **should not be equated with specific accomplishments** to be considered as either necessary or sufficient to assure a successful outcome. They identify collectively the important domains and types of evidence that the promotion and tenure committees evaluate in forming their judgments and recommendations. **In addition, the relative ordering of the criteria does not imply any differential importance and/or weight.** It is important to recognize, regardless of how explicitly the criteria for teaching, research, and service may be stated, that evaluations necessarily involve value judgments which are in part subjective. Evaluators at every level use their own experience, judgment, and expectations to decide whether criteria have in fact been satisfied. In evaluating a candidate's qualifications, flexibility will be exercised in weighting responsibilities and commitments in one area more heavily than in other areas as each candidate's case requires.

The School of Science requires that, for promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor, the candidate must perform well in the areas of teaching, research, and service, recognizing that the weighting will be different for each candidate. Promotion to Associate or Full Professor requires excellent performance in at least one of these areas. Unsatisfactory performance in any area will

preclude promotion or award of tenure. Promotion to Senior Lecturer from Lecturer requires excellent performance in teaching and satisfactory performance in service. Promotion to Associate Scientist or Full Scientist requires excellent performance in any of research, teaching, or service as appropriate for the job description of the candidate under consideration.

The School of Science interprets the “balanced case” referred to in the Indiana University *Academic Handbook* criteria for promotion (see Section A.1 above) as applying only to the exceptional Assistant Professor (seeking promotion to Associate Professor) who demonstrates strengths that promise excellent performance in teaching, research, *and* service, or to the exceptional Associate Professor (seeking promotion to Full Professor) who demonstrates strengths that promise excellent performance in teaching, research, *and* service. However, since Purdue University does not recognize the “balanced case” and promotions for Purdue School faculty at IUPUI must be approved by Purdue University, promotions for Purdue School faculty *cannot* be based on the “balanced case” as defined by Indiana University.

## **B. PROCEDURES**

There are several levels of review in the promotion and tenure process. The first is at the Department level by the Primary Committee, the second is by the Department Chair, the third is at the School level by the Unit Committee, the fourth is by the Dean of the School of Science, and the fifth is at the University level by the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee. Subsequent reviews are made by the Dean of Faculties and Executive Vice Chancellor, the Chancellor, the Presidents of Indiana University and Purdue University, and finally the Boards of Trustees of Indiana University and Purdue University.

Once a faculty member becomes a candidate for promotion, tenure, and/or reappointment in the School of Science, they continue to be a candidate until such time as the process is completed, or the faculty member makes a formal written request that they no longer wish to be considered. (Candidates are advised against making negative impressions at all levels through premature candidacy for promotion, tenure, and/or reappointment.)

The tenure and promotion process of a candidate starts with the creation of his/her dossier. The candidate should prepare the promotion and tenure dossier. The overall structure of the dossier must be compliant with the *IUPUI Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* and the eDossier system (please refer to Section I for more details). The completed dossier needs to be uploaded to the eDossier system by the candidate.

### **1. *The Primary Committee***

Each year the Department Chair will establish a Primary Committee comprised of tenured Associate and Full Professors (exclusive of the Department Chair) holding rank within the Department, each of whom is also a regular faculty member employed by the University. Departments may decide that a specific number of Senior Lecturers may serve on the Primary Committee when Lecturers are being considered for reappointment or promotion. In general, faculty members holding administrative appointments outside of the School in which they have to act at the behest of the administration on Tenure and Promotion should not serve on their departmental Primary Committee or the School's Unit Committee. The Primary Committee in the departments will be constituted in one of two ways, consistent with the limitations with respect to Associate and Full Professor numbers stated below: either (1) The Primary Committee will consist

of *all* tenured Associate and Full Professors in the department; or (2) The Primary Committee will consist of elected members from the department, the choice of which will be determined by the voting faculty of the Department. The Department Chair may appoint an additional member, subject to the limitation below, with the concurrence of the elected Primary Committee, for purposes of disciplinary balance or to ensure fairness to the candidates under consideration.

*Limitation:* The Primary Committee must have more Full Professors than Associate Professors (exclusive of the department chair). The Primary Committee will consider all candidates in the Department for promotion, tenure and reappointment to all ranks other than Full Professor. The Full Professors of this committee (exclusive of the Department Chair) will comprise a subcommittee that will consider all candidates in the Department for promotion and tenure to the rank of Full Professor. The Chair of a Department with fewer than four Full Professors (exclusive of the Department Chair) shall notify the Dean, and the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the incomplete Primary Committee, shall appoint additional Full Professors from other Departments in the School of Science to meet the Primary Committee membership requirements. If the voting members of a department wish to have all tenured members of the department comprise the Primary Committee and the number of Associate Professors exceeds the number of Full Professors, the department can petition the Dean to appoint additional Full Professor(s) from the School of Science in consultation with the Department Chair and Primary Committee.

The Primary Committee will elect its own Chair at its first meeting every year. The Primary Committee will meet at the call of either the Committee Chair or the Department Chair throughout the year according to the schedule required for department promotion, tenure and reappointment recommendations provided by the Office of the Dean, School of Science. The Department Chair shall ensure that the Primary committee completes its tasks in a timely manner. The Department Chair may not participate in the deliberations of the case of any candidate, but may be present and answer questions from members of the Primary Committee, and may seek clarification on issues related to the case for the purpose of writing his or her own evaluation. The Department Chair may not vote and may not influence the outcomes of committee votes.

The Primary Committee will consider for promotion, tenure, and reappointment of all probationary faculty, will consider third year reviews of qualifying untenured faculty, and will consider for promotion and reappointment of all Lecturers in accordance with University policy. The deliberations of the Primary Committee are confidential. All votes will be taken by secret ballot. Each Primary Committee vote for tenure or promotion must result in at least four approve/disapprove votes being recorded. If a duly constituted Primary Committee cannot record at least four approve/disapprove votes, as may occur if some members abstain or cannot provide an approve/disapprove vote for any reason, the Dean should seek additional members to appoint to the committee in consultation with the duly constituted committee.

The Primary Committee will complete and sign a written report of its deliberations for each candidate. The report from the Primary Committee should include the vote count for the candidate, and it should make an effort to explain the reasons for negative votes—if any—based on committee discussion. The Primary Committee Chair (or designee) will meet with the candidate **on or before September 14<sup>th</sup>** to deliver a copy of the Primary Committee report and to discuss the results of the committee's deliberations. This report will also be provided to the Department Chair.

Within one week after receiving the Primary Committee report, the Department Chair should

complete his or her report (including the Chair's vote) and provide the report to the candidate in a separate meeting with the Chair to discuss the recommendation.

In the case of a negative recommendation by majority vote of the Primary Committee in a tenure case, it is the obligation of the Primary Committee Chair to discuss the reasons for the action as articulated in the Primary Committee report with the candidate and to inform the candidate about his/her right to a formal request for reconsideration as specified in the Campus Guidelines. In the case of a negative vote for tenure from the Department Chair in which the Chair's vote was the first negative recommendation, it is the obligation of the Chair to discuss the reasons for the negative vote and inform the candidate about his or her right to request reconsideration. In either case, the formal request for reconsideration must be made by the candidate within two weeks of first notification of a negative vote for tenure, consistent with IUPUI campus guidelines. In that case, the reconsideration by the Primary Committee and then the Chair must be completed before dossier can be reviewed by the Unit Committee.

The Department Chair, or his/her designee or designees, will be responsible for adding all relevant administrative documents (e.g., external letters, Primary Committee letter and Chair's letter) to the dossier (created by the candidate) and delivering the dossier to the Dean of the School of Science, via the eDossier system. These documents must be consistent with the most recent IUPUI *Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines For Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*. The dossiers should be delivered to the Dean's office on or before October 1<sup>st</sup>. If a candidate has invoked a reconsideration process after receiving either the Primary Committee report or the Chair's report, the reconsideration process should be completed at that level as provided under Campus guidelines, and the dossier should be forwarded to the Dean's office in an expedited manner with the expectation that it would be received by the Dean's office on or before October 5.

It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to identify any conflicts between the Indiana University, the Purdue University, and the IUPUI promotion processes that will affect their faculty, and to bring these conflicts to the attention of the Chair of the Unit Committee and the Dean of the School of Science as soon as possible. Conflicts *must* be resolved by the Department Chair, the Chair of the Unit Committee, the Dean of the School of Science, and the Dean of Faculties (as necessary) prior to consideration by the Unit Committee.

When a Department Chair, who is not a Full Professor, chooses to seek promotion and/or tenure, the Dean of the School of Science, or his/her designee, will assume all promotion, tenure, and reappointment duties for the Department that would otherwise be handled by the Department Chair until the promotion and tenure process for the Department has been completed for the year.

## **2. *The Unit Committee***

The Unit Committee will be composed of tenured Full Professors, one elected by each Department and up to four appointed annually by the Dean of the School of Science to balance the committee consistent with the Department distribution of candidates to be considered. The Dean should also consider, in his/her appointments to the Unit Committee, faculty who have also been members of the departmental primary committees. In each department, the voting faculty will elect the representative to the Unit Committee, or the Primary Committee will elect this representative if the Primary Committee itself is elected by the voting faculty. It is recommended that the elected representative be a member of the departmental Primary Committee. The term for each Unit Committee member elected by a Department will normally be two years. The Dean of the School of Science will sit on this committee without vote to provide administrative information. The

Dean may not otherwise participate in any way that will influence or affect decisions of the Committee.

The Unit Committee will meet at least three times each academic year. The first meeting will be called in early September by the Dean of the School of Science -- this meeting could be held virtually if agreed by all the members of the Unit Committee. At its first meeting, the Unit Committee will elect its own Chair, its representative to the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee and at its option, also a Vice Chair. The votes will be by secret ballot. At this meeting the calendar of events for personnel action will be presented by the Dean, and within the framework of this calendar a schedule for the second committee meeting will be established. At the second meeting, the committee will consider all candidates for promotion and/or tenure presented to it in proper form by the Primary Committees. Since it may be impossible to schedule this second meeting at a time when all committee members are free, it is understood that some members may find it necessary to make special arrangements in order to attend this meeting. (This is unarguably the most important yearly meeting of faculty, and thus it must take precedence over all other professional responsibilities.) The Unit Committee will conduct its business on the day initially scheduled for its meeting with the goal of completing all deliberations and voting in a single extended session. However, if needed due to the sheer volume of the cases or exceptional circumstances that preclude completion in a single day, this meeting may be conducted over multiple days so long as there are no significant time lapses between meetings. The dossier of each candidate must be complete and in the proper form at the time of presentation. The third meeting of the Committee will be called by the Unit Committee Chair after the completion of the IUPUI promotion, tenure, and reappointment process to discuss potential modifications to the School of Science promotion, tenure, and reappointment process and to this document. This third meeting will also consider qualifying candidates for Third Year Reviews.

The Unit Committee may also assist the Dean, at his/her request, in considering negative reappointment decisions to ensure that faculty have been treated fairly and equitably.

The Primary Committee of each Department shall, at its request, have the opportunity to discuss the standards used to evaluate whether candidates meet the criteria for promotion and tenure with the Chair of the Unit Committee, the Dean of the School of Science, and the Unit Committee members of its Department (if not already members of its Primary Committee) following the second meeting of the Unit Committee.

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

- a. No meeting of the committee will start until all members are present.
- b. No one can substitute for a member of the committee at any committee meeting.
- c. No visitors are allowed in any committee meeting.
- d. If any member of the committee must leave any meeting of the committee, deliberations of the committee are suspended until all members are again present.
- e. Files of all candidates for promotion and tenure shall be distributed by the Dean and the Chair of the Unit Committee to each member of the Unit Committee at least two weeks in advance of the meeting at which candidates are to be considered. A copy of the most recent version of *The Purdue University School of Science in Indianapolis Criteria, Standards and Documentation Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* shall be distributed to each member of the Unit Committee at the same

time.

- f. The Dean shall be responsible for forwarding all promotion, tenure, and reappointment documents in the proper form from the Unit Committee to the next level in the review process.

### **3. Procedures for Review of Promotion and Tenure Candidates**

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

- a) The sole rules governing the deliberations of the Committee will be the version of *The Purdue University School of Science in Indianapolis Criteria, Standards and Documentation Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment* distributed earlier [see item (e) above]. No other rules will apply. (The purpose of this policy is to decouple discussion of the rules to be followed from discussion of the specific individuals to be considered. All relevant rules must be incorporated into the Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment document prior to the discussion of candidates.)
- b) The candidates to be considered are not in competition with each other: each candidate should be judged on his/her own merit.
- c) The School of Science policy is that promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions are to be made substantively at the Department level, where the faculty member's activities are best known and can best be evaluated. Thus the Primary Committees' decisions must carry serious weight, with Department representatives (to the Unit Committee) being fully prepared to justify decisions in response to questions from the Unit Committee. The Unit Committee's role is to validate that candidates meet stated Department, School of Science, and University criteria, and that the evaluation procedure and decision of the Primary Committee accurately reflect the School of Science criteria for promotion and tenure.
- d) Candidates should not be judged for mistakes and deficiencies in their dossiers before the Committee has had the chance to discuss them. Mistakes and deficiencies naturally occur and naturally generate discussion. The goal of committee discussion should be to identify whether mistakes and deficiencies are inadvertent and can be corrected prior to the next level of review, or whether they are serious and adequate cause for a negative vote.
- e) The general criteria for promotion and tenure to the rank of Associate Professor is a significant record of accomplishment and promise of continued professional growth and recognition; for promotion to the rank of Full Professor the candidate should be recognized as an authority in the appropriate field of specialization by external colleagues. The School of Science requires that for promotion to any professorial rank, the candidate must perform well in the areas of teaching, research, and service, recognizing that the weighting will be different for each candidate. Promotion to Associate Professor requires excellent performance in at least one (but not all) of the areas, and promotion to Full Professor requires sustained excellent performance in at least one of the areas. The remaining areas require performance at least at a satisfactory level. Unsatisfactory performance in any area will preclude promotion or

receipt of tenure. Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires excellent performance in teaching, including a clearly demonstrated record of high quality, effective teaching, effective course and curricular development, and scholarly creation and dissemination of knowledge about teaching and/or pedagogy, along with at least satisfactory performance in service.

- f) It is the duty of the Chair to keep the discussion on track, and the duty of members of the committee to refrain from raising concerns extraneous to any candidate's case.
- g) Each member of this committee is obligated to act professionally and in good faith. Further, each member of this committee is expected to demonstrate respect for every candidate and every other member of the committee. The discussions and decisions of this committee are among the most important at IUPUI. The futures of the University, the School of Science, the Department, and the individual faculty member are largely determined by them. It is essential that each candidate be treated fairly and measured against specific and explicitly stated criteria. The deliberations of the Committee and the documents presented to the Committee are strictly confidential.
- h) Consideration for promotion shall proceed in order, first those cases for promotion from Associate to Full Professor, then those cases for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, in alphabetical order by last name.
- i) Prior to the discussion of any of the cases, the Chair will assign each case with a reader (a member not from the Department or the Primary Committee of the case) who will be responsible to summarize in writing the Unit Committee's deliberation and recommendation on the case.
- j) The discussion of each candidate will be preceded by a brief (approximately 5 minute) presentation of the candidate for promotion (and/or tenure) by a committee member from the candidate's Department who served on the Department Primary Committee. The assigned reader will serve as a second presenter of the case. There is no time limit on the discussion of any candidate. The Committee Vice Chair will preside during deliberations on all candidates from the Department of the Committee Chair.
- k) A vote will be taken on each candidate by secret ballot immediately following the completion of the discussion of the candidate. When promotion and tenure are both being considered, promotion and tenure will be voted on simultaneously but as separate ballot items. The vote(s) on each candidate will be tallied only after all candidates for all ranks have been considered. After voting for the last candidate, ballots will be counted twice for each candidate, and the results announced at that time.
- l) No member of the Unit Committee who voted previously on a candidate's case at the Primary Committee level is permitted to vote again on the same case at the Unit Committee. This assures that each voting member votes only once on the tenure or promotion of any candidate throughout the tenure and promotion process. Unit Committee members who also serve on a Primary Committee (of his or her own department or that of another department) are expected to vote on the candidate as part of the Primary Committee deliberations, where the faculty member's activities are best known and can best be evaluated.
- m) The Committee must provide the Dean with a written summary of its actions,

including the vote count for each candidate considered and a summary of the committee discussion of each candidate, as soon as possible after the committee deliberations. In its written summary the committee must fully describe the discussion associated with a negative or split decision – a commentary that is too sparse may raise doubts in the minds of those at subsequent levels of review as to the rationale behind the decision. Reports will be written and distributed by a designated Unit Committee member for each candidate soon after the conclusion of the committee meeting. These reports will be reviewed by the committee members and feedback given to those designees to ensure a consensus can be reached on the report. As required by campus policy, all Unit Committee members must agree on the contents of these reports: there are no minority reports. The Chair of the Unit Committee will be entrusted with the authority to sign these reports on behalf of all the members of the committee.

- n) The Chair of the Unit Committee (or designee) will provide each candidate with copies of the Unit Committee report. For a candidate who is not recommended, it is the obligation of the Unit Committee Chair and the department representatives to the Unit Committee to discuss with the candidate the reasons for the negative recommendation. If the Unit Committee's majority vote is the first negative recommendation in a tenure case, it is the obligation of the Unit Committee Chair to inform the candidate about his/her right to a formal request for reconsideration as specified in the Campus Guidelines. Any resulting formal request for reconsideration must be made by the candidate within two weeks of being notified of the negative vote, consistent with IUPUI campus guidelines, and the reconsideration process must be completed before the next level of review.
- o) After receiving the Unit Committee report, the Dean will provide his or her letter to each candidate. In the case of a negative recommendation by the Dean, he or she is obligated to discuss the reasons for the negative vote with the candidate. If the Dean's vote is the first negative recommendation in a tenure case, it is the obligation of the Dean to inform the candidate about his/her right to a formal request for reconsideration.
- p) Upon completion of the School-level review, candidate's dossier will be forwarded to the Campus via the eDossier system for review by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. Typically, the deadline for forwarding the dossier to Campus is the last Friday of October. Any case for which there is a reconsideration process that may prevent completion of the process by the last Friday of October, upon notification of the Office of Academic Affairs the campus will waive this deadline and permit submission of the dossier later in November.

#### **4. Third Year Review Procedures**

Third Year Reviews are an important step in the progression of faculty through the ranks, with reviews both by the Primary Committee and by the Unit Committee. An area of excellence must be declared by the candidate at this time. Documentation of the candidate's performance in teaching, research, and service, along with a candidate's statement and CV, should be provided by the candidate following the eDossier format. It is the first significant involvement of the Unit Committee with faculty in a tenure-track rank and serves as an outside review of reports provided by the Primary Committee. While there is no official action required on the Third Year Review, there is an opportunity for the Unit Committee to provide written performance assessments to the candidate and the Primary Committee. As such, the Unit Committee will prepare a report on the

candidate's dossier.

All candidates for Third Year Reviews will be considered using the guidelines set forth above in *Procedures for Review of Promotion and Tenure Candidates*, items a – d, f, g, j, k, and m – o, as appropriate for a Third Year Review. The report of the Unit Committee will be through consensus and address issues in the Primary Committee report and provide formative comments helpful to the Primary Committee, Department Chair, and the candidate.

### **C. CALENDAR OF EVENTS FOR PERSONNEL ACTION**

A *Calendar of Events for Personnel Action* for the academic year is distributed to the School around July 1 by the Office of the Dean, School of Science. While specific dates on this Calendar may vary from year to year, the promotion and tenure process will begin no later than September 1 of each academic year with the formation of the Unit Committee and be completed around April 30 when the President of Indiana University officially notifies those faculty who are promoted or receive tenure as of the beginning of the next academic year.

### **D. SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important decisions made at IUPUI. The futures of the University, the School of Science, and the individual faculty member are largely determined by these decisions. Accordingly, the value of the candidate's contribution to the School's vision of its future direction should be uppermost when making recommendations for promotion and tenure. Faculty whose objectives are consistent with the future of the School should be retained and rewarded.

In recommending promotion and tenure, promotion and tenure committees are stating that they want the candidate to spend the rest of his/her professional career with the School of Science. Such a recommendation is recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the candidate is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. It is important that promotion and tenure be recognized as a selective process and not simply a result of longevity within the School.

Everyone recommended for promotion and tenure must satisfy certain minimum requirements. If an individual can establish all necessary credentials in a short period of time, then they should be eligible for early nomination for promotion and tenure. On the other hand, early recommendation for promotion and tenure, particularly before the sixth year, must involve exemplary cases, and it must be clearly demonstrated that the faculty member has in fact clearly satisfied all necessary requirements for teaching, research, and service. Thus an individual recommended for early promotion and/or tenure must have a strong, clearly recognized and documented case. However, in all cases, the candidate's cumulative (or as specified in the original appointment of the candidate at IUPUI) body of work in rank will be considered for promotion and/or tenure, whether accomplished at IUPUI or at a previous institution.

A tenure decision is normally made on a probationary faculty member in the sixth year of his/her appointment. To be awarded tenure prior to the sixth year of appointment, the Dean of Faculties must be convinced that the faculty member's case is extraordinary; only after this has been done may the Unit Committee consider the case. A request for consideration for earlier-than-normal tenure is to be forwarded by the Dean of the School of Science to the Dean of the Faculties for

approval. Prior to initiating such a request the faculty member must be advised that they will be considered for tenure only once. Specifically, “*A faculty member who applies for early tenure should be forewarned that a candidate for tenure should expect only one full review.*”<sup>5</sup>

The evaluation of each candidate must be based on accomplishments. Recommendation for promotion and tenure must document significant accomplishments sufficient to lead to the conclusion that further accomplishments will be forthcoming. Expectations without accompanying accomplishments are meaningless. For example, unpublished papers or grant proposals being written or research underway are significant only if they extend specific accomplishments already documented. By themselves they are significant only insofar as they are predictors of extensions of accomplishments. Similar considerations apply equally to teaching and service. (The untenured faculty member has almost six years to establish credentials. If credentials cannot be established within this time, it is unlikely that they will ever be established.)

In establishing credentials for promotion and tenure, the most significant material should be work that has been done since the last promotion in rank. While earlier work is of some significance, that work has presumably been used to document a previous promotion or in the hiring decision. It should not be used again as a major criterion for promotion and/or tenure.

It is to no one’s advantage — neither the University’s, the School’s, the Department’s, nor the individual’s — to nominate a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure prematurely. If a case appears questionable to a Primary Committee, the faculty member should be so informed and persuaded not to pursue the case further. Rejection at any level does not help anybody, and, in fact, can generate considerable ill will for all parties involved. The strategy of “send it up and see what the Dean (or the Unit Committee) does” is unfair to everyone concerned.

It is in the best interest of the University and the faculty that full and frank discussion occurs during the deliberations of promotion committees. The confidentiality of remarks made at such meetings must, however, be carefully preserved. Recommendations, positive or negative, may be discussed with the faculty member affected, in a discreet manner and without undue delay, by the appropriate Department Chair or Unit Committee representative(s). There should be no publicity or announcements, however, until the recommendation for promotion and/or tenure has been officially acted upon by the Boards of Trustees of Indiana University and Purdue University.

## **E. EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

The sociological system under which science has developed and prospered over the last two hundred years requires the evaluation of scholarship and creative activity by a community of scientific peers, whether this activity is in teaching, research, service, or any combination of these. There are many ways in which this evaluation can be made.

### **1. Publications**

The primary mechanism for evaluation of scholarship and creative activity is through the publication of peer-reviewed papers. The refereeing process is the foundation of the evaluation of scholarship and creative activity. After publication, papers are available to scientists throughout the world so that they may comment on the ideas, the data, the methodology, the results, the potential applications, and the quality and significance of the work. Thus it is important to publish in

journals which require quality refereeing and which are generally available to the scientific community. In turn, it is important to obtain feedback from knowledgeable scientists and to recognize the importance of meaningful citations to the candidate's published work. Time must be allowed for this system to work.

It is important to evaluate both the journals in which the candidate has published and the refereeing process involved: certain journals have a very good reputation, others do not. Further, simply counting papers is not adequate: some papers are very significant, others less so. In evaluating scholarship and creative activity, it is important to establish the intellectual content of the work. Work that is conceptually new and unique and which breaks new ground is more significant than work that is routine and which simply extends the work of others in a straightforward way. It is important to identify the ultimate importance of the candidate's scholarship and creative activity.

Books and book chapters are important forms of publication. Some books and book chapters present new and novel approaches that advance the view of their subject. Others synthesize and summarize the major findings of whole fields or subfields and serve as catalysts for further creative activity. Books and book chapters should be evaluated using the same standards as those used for journal papers. As with journal papers, it is important to establish the intellectual content of books and book chapters. Books and book chapters that are conceptually new and unique and which break new ground are more significant than books and book chapters that are routine and which simply repeat or extend the work of others in straightforward ways.

Papers that have been submitted to journals should be identified as to the journal with the same information given as with papers already published. Status of the submission should be indicated. Papers in preparation should not be included in the dossier. They may, however, be mentioned in the discussion of interests.

## **2. *Letters of Evaluation***

It is essential that scholarship and creative activity be evaluated both by members of the Department who are knowledgeable in similar areas, and by experts elsewhere. The primary method for obtaining evaluation by experts elsewhere is through letters of evaluation, although comments by referees of papers and proposals, and meaningful citations to papers are also useful and should be provided when available. In addition to the required Letters of Evaluation subject to the conditions below (*a – l*), supplemental letters may be appended that clarify situations, resolve ambiguities, or describe other aspects of the dossier. These supplemental letters do not satisfy the requirements for the minimum number of required letters.

External letters of evaluation (from non-IUPUI campus personnel) are thus required of all professorial candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The rules governing letters of evaluation are as follows:

- a. All letters of evaluation are to be requested by the Department Chair. In no event are letters of evaluation to be requested by the candidate.
- b. The candidate shall have the opportunity to supply names of those who might be asked

for letters of evaluation as well as those who should be excluded. Other names should be suggested by the Primary Committee and/or the Department Chair, and the final list of reviewers should be based on a joint decision by the Primary Committee and the Department Chair. The candidate should not be informed about the identities of the final external reviewers.

- c. A minimum of six letters of evaluation must be received for consideration of tenure and promotion in professorial ranks. Candidates under consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer should have a minimum of six letters of recommendation, all from outside the department and at least one from outside the Unit, and should be from individuals who are in the professorial ranks or who hold an appointment as Senior Lecturer. Letters of evaluation for Senior Lecturer should not be from former mentors or from individuals who have collaborated with the candidate in the last five years. (In anticipation of some letters not being received, enough letters must be requested that the required number of letters are received.) Such collaboration may involve joint grants and joint co-authorship of publications and presentations. For promotion to the rank of Associate or Full Professor, these letters must be from individuals other than former or current advisors, postdoctoral mentors, students, or collaborators in the last five years. Supplementary reference letters, in addition to the required minimum number of letters of evaluation, may be included in evidence section of the dossier so that they best serve the purpose of establishing the candidate's contribution to joint work. These additional letters may come from former or current advisors, postdoctoral mentors, or collaborators of the candidate.
- d. Evaluators should be selected on the basis of their ability to comment on the candidate's professional accomplishments. One effective way to verify that an Assistant Professor has established a significant record of accomplishment and shows promise of continued professional growth and recognition, and that an Associate Professor is recognized as an authority in his/her field of specialization by external colleagues, national and/or international as may be appropriate in their academic discipline, is by means of letters of evaluation. Accordingly it is important, for candidates under consideration for promotion and tenure in professorial ranks, to avoid soliciting letters from evaluators who served during an overlapping period at institutions where the candidate has been located. Scientists elsewhere should have the candidate's documentation that allows for an accurate evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research, and or service (as appropriate). In order to demonstrate the highest level of credibility, all issues of potential conflict of interest are mitigated by carefully adhering to these guidelines.
- e. Although letters of evaluation are not normally disclosed to candidates, an Indiana state law permits employees to gain access to their personnel files. Potential evaluators will be informed of this policy even if the candidate signs a waiver relinquishing his/her right to see the letters of evaluation. Should a potential evaluator critical to the review of a case be willing to write contingent on confidentiality and/or anonymity to the candidate, but should the candidate be unwilling to sign a waiver, the potential evaluator will not be solicited and the circumstances surrounding the incident will be noted in the dossier (the anonymity of the evaluator being maintained, if so requested).

- f. For candidates under consideration for promotion and tenure in professorial ranks, individuals writing the mandatory six letters of evaluation may not include IUPUI personnel.
- g. All letters of evaluation applying to professorial ranks must be requested using the letter of solicitation provided in Appendix A. All letters of evaluation applying to Lecturer ranks must be requested using the letter of solicitation provided in Appendix C. Modifications of this letter, beyond use of the options indicated, may not be made. Initial verbal requests for letters of evaluation may be made to secure commitments, but formal requests for letters of evaluation must be made using the letter of solicitation provided in Appendix A or C as appropriate.
- h. All letters should be requested at the same time. Additional letters may not be requested following receipt of a negative evaluation, and (unless there is a good reason) letters used in one year should not be used in another. If additional letters must be sought because an evaluator cannot meet his/her commitment, the situation should be explained. The request for letters should be made early enough that all letters are received by September 1 of the year in which the candidate is to be considered.
- i. All letters solicited and received, as well as a sample request letter, must be included in the promotion and tenure file and dossier. Neither the candidate nor subsequent reviewers may exclude letters. Extracts or summaries cannot be used as they may be misunderstood or misinterpreted.
- j. Brief biographical sketches of all individuals who have been formally asked to write letters of evaluation must be included. These sketches must be sufficient to establish the authority of the evaluator in relation to the specific case under review. For non-academic evaluators, their ability to accurately assess the candidate's record should be described. Ordinarily, two or three sentences should suffice. These biographical sketches are not to be written by the candidate.
- k. For candidates under consideration for promotion and tenure in professorial ranks, the majority of the mandatory six letters of evaluation (at least four of the six) must come from individuals who have or who have had academic appointments. All letters must come from individuals who have or have had at least the rank, or comparable position, for which the candidate is being considered. The six required letters for candidates under consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer must be from individuals holding either a professorial or Senior Lecturer rank. Evaluators who do not hold academic appointments must have established a demonstrable professional expertise that allows them to evaluate the evidence presented to them.
- l. An External Referee Form will be included with each letter sent to external evaluators (see Appendix B)

### 3. *Professional Presentations*

Invited presentations reflect a national and/or international reputation and are thus a useful indicator of professional stature. However, this requires the presentations to be other than local, and other than at places where the candidate has studied, been employed, or been interviewing for a position. An explanation of the circumstances surrounding invited presentations is useful in establishing their significance.

Presentations at meetings (such as conferences, workshops, and institutes) are useful, particularly insofar as they are an important means by which to disseminate information and establish a professional reputation. In some disciplines, papers submitted to meetings generally do not go through the same refereeing process as papers submitted to quality journals; in those disciplines the criteria for acceptance is generally quite different. In fact, in many such cases only summaries are required for review. Should the situation be different, either due to accepted practices of a discipline or if a case can be made for a different weighting, such publications should be treated differently and this should be clearly indicated and explained. Presentations accepted by abstract are generally not of great significance. Should the situation be different, it should be clearly indicated and explained.

#### **4. *Grants and Contracts***

External grants and contracts are extremely important in furthering the teaching, research, and/or service of the faculty member and establishing the professional reputation of the faculty member and the School of Science. In almost all cases, external funding facilitates the research enterprise with positive consequences on the quality and quantity of work, the efficacy of student training, and ability to disseminate the results of our work. Insofar as external grants and contracts require evaluation of work that has been done and work that is to be done, one of the best ways to establish that the candidate has established a national and/or international reputation in teaching, research, and/or service is through the acquisition of an external grant or contract. On the other hand, the significance of a grant or contract is also important: a grant or contract that is scholarly with conceptual and intellectual content is more significant than one that is simply routine and pedestrian. Thus it is important to qualify the intellectual content and significance of external grants and contracts. For a grant with more than one principal investigator, the specific contributions of the candidate and his or her role should be described. It is strongly advised that supplemental letters from external collaborators should clarify the contributions and role of the candidate. Grants are a means to an end, not an end to themselves. Although grants are very important evidence of scholarship, their specific weight as an evaluation criterion varies between and within disciplines. Grants and contracts are more difficult to obtain in some fields than in others. Whether or not grant and contract support have been obtained, one of the most important ingredients in obtaining external grants and contracts is perseverance. A history of application and positive referee comments demonstrates such perseverance.

While internal grants (grants supported by Indiana University, Purdue University, and/or IUPUI) are useful, they should not be viewed as an end in themselves. Indeed, internal grants are generally awarded so that investigators can write external grant proposals, and a faculty member who has been awarded an internal grant is generally expected to produce a proposal or other similar product to an external agency. Citation of an internal grant thus requires not only evaluation of the internal

grant, but also reference to the resulting proposal or product, and referee comments if the resulting proposal or product was not funded.

#### **5. Collaborative Scholarship**

The School of Science tenures and promotes individuals, not research projects. From that perspective, documentation and recognition of the development of effective and significant collaborations by a candidate, where appropriate, is an important component of the tenure and promotion review process. Collaborative efforts are essential in the modern era of research and scholarship in the sciences, and the competitive success of individual faculty may often depend on his/her ability to engage in collaborative efforts. The School of Science not only recognizes the importance of collaborative creative/scholarly activity (e.g., combined grants, co-authored publications, jointly-created products, etc.) but also strongly encourages such activities whenever they are relevant. In cases of collaborative activity, the candidate should carefully document his/her role and specific contributions to the collaborations, how his/her contributions are essential to the ongoing success of the collaborative effort, and how such collaborations fit into and/or enhance the candidate's research career/plans. For example, the candidate may highlight the extent to which his/her role and expertise directly contributed to critical progress/results over the course of the collaborative project, or provided a necessary function that was essential to the success of the collaborative project. In some disciplinary traditions or team approaches, productive scholarship may emerge from group processes characterized more by shared intellectual or conceptual engagement than by identifiable complementary individual contributions. If this is the case, the candidate should clearly indicate such scenarios. The documentation of collaborative achievements can be part of the narrative of the candidate's statement and/or it can be included in the supporting evidence in the section of his/her chosen Area of Excellence. If collaborative work is an important aspect of the candidate's scholarly activity, the candidate is encouraged to, but not required to, solicit and include letters from key collaborators as part of the supporting evidence in the Area of Excellence section; those letters should describe, from the collaborator's perspective, the candidate's essential role and contributions to the joint project(s).

#### **6. Other Forms of Scholarship**

There are many acceptable forms of scholarship and creative activity beyond publications, professional presentations at meetings, and grants and contracts; included in this category are software development and other derivatives of new and emerging technologies, as well as various activities associated with service. As with the more traditional forms of scholarship and creative activity, the evaluation of such work is essential. Work must be evaluated by experts in the field. The quality, significance, and intellectual content of the work must be established. Work that is conceptually new and unique and which breaks new ground is more significant than work that is routine and which simply extends the work of others in routine and straightforward ways. It is important to identify the ultimate importance of the candidate's scholarship and creative activity.

The general criteria for evaluation of achievements in teaching, research and service are presented

in sections F, G and H. **These are not checklists; some criteria are more important than others, and differences in emphasis may depend on the discipline.** Failure to satisfy a single criterion does not necessarily mean that the performance standard has not been met. Departments are advised to provide guidelines describing the relative weights attached to each of the criteria and any additional, specific evidence of performance which is common to the candidate's area of excellence.

## F. CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

In higher education, **Scholarly Teaching** can be broadly defined as consulting the literature related to teaching in one's discipline, using and applying that scholarship in one's courses, and consulting with peers and/or Centers for Teaching and Learning to improve teaching and learning. **The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)** can broadly be defined as asking questions related to student learning, conducting systematic inquiry related to teaching and learning, and making the results visible to a community through public dissemination and/or peer reviewed scholarship. **Discipline-Based Educational Research (DBER)** can be broadly defined as scholarly research into understanding how people learn the concepts, practices and ways of thinking in each of the various STEM disciplines. [*National Academy Press*]

While recognizing that teaching is, in part, an art — that excellent teaching is not totally quantifiable nor can it be defined narrowly — the School of Science has established the following criteria for teaching, which uses the abovementioned and widely accepted definitions, in conjunction with the promotion and tenure process. The relative weights of these criteria vary according to disciplinary norms described in departmental guidelines.

### 1. *Satisfactory Performance*

*Satisfactory performance is evidenced by:*

- a. Student satisfaction measurements that are consistently favorable. (Some form of student satisfaction measurement is mandatory in every course taught by the candidate)
- b. Peer reviews documenting satisfactory teaching. For promotion to Associate Professor, at least two reviews must be completed during the evaluation period to document continued satisfactory teaching performance or improvement toward satisfactory teaching performance. At least one such peer review is recommended prior to the third-year review. For promotion to Full Professor, at least one review should be completed during the evaluation period that documents continued satisfactory teaching performance. The department Chair and faculty member, together, will identify the course(s) to review, and an appropriate reviewer, taking into account factors such as reviewer expertise, potential conflicts for the candidate or reviewer, and consideration of internal (i.e., in the department) versus external (i.e., outside the department such as the Center for Teaching and Learning) faculty affiliation. The completed review, using the Classroom Observation Report, will be shared with the candidate and the Department Chair. The candidate will determine how best to represent the content of these peer reviews in the body of the dossier. However, copies of at least the minimum number of completed Classroom Observation Reports must be included in the appendix.
- c. A record demonstrating that a reasonable teaching load and a fair share of the

Department's teaching responsibility has been carried.

- d. A record demonstrating quality teaching. In addition to favorable peer evaluations of classroom performance, contributions to new course development and improvement of course materials may be included.

2. ***Excellent Performance for Promotion to Senior Lecturer***

Promotion to Senior Lecturer requires excellent performance in teaching, together with at least satisfactory performance in service. Excellence in teaching includes a clearly demonstrated record of high quality, effective teaching and innovative course or curricular development. Emphasis is on the Lecturer's development of scholarly teaching practices, informed by the literature concerning effective teaching and shaped through the Lecturer's analysis of his or her teaching experience together with peer review of teaching and student evaluations. Success in scholarly teaching may be **demonstrated by creation, implementation, and documentation of effective and innovative teaching practices and by local or regional dissemination of knowledge and best practices of teaching and/or pedagogy.** Expectations about the quantity of dissemination of scholarly products should be commensurate with the assigned teaching load of the Lecturer. *Exemplary evidence for excellence in teaching at this level may include the following. The following is not a checklist; some criteria are more important than others, and differences in emphasis may depend on the discipline.*

**The following criteria (a-f) may apply to all ranks for Excellence in Teaching:**

- a. Documentation that the candidate meets the teaching load designated by their department, as appropriate for his or her appointment.
- b. Summaries and analyses of student evaluation of teaching data for each course taught in rank, provided in sufficient detail to allow determination of the students' perception of the candidate's effectiveness as a classroom teacher.
- c. Provision of rigorous peer evaluations, following the prevalent policies and procedures at the school or department level, and responses to peer review to document the candidate's continuing efforts to improve in teaching.
- d. Evidence that positive student learning outcomes are achieved. Such evidence may include assessment data as well as self-reflection and critique.
- e. Evidence of substantial contributions to mentoring of students. Such evidence may include directing independent studies, research, or service learning projects; serving on student academic committees; directing internship or mentoring programs; student advising; recognition from the School mentoring data.
- f. Evidence of scholarly development and implementation of innovative or advanced pedagogical methodologies, grounded in theory and appropriate for the candidate's disciplinary teaching responsibilities. Such innovations may include active learning, team learning, use of learning spaces, technology assisted learning, online/hybrid education models. Documented efforts to recruit, retain, or provide success-driven interventions to broaden full participation of all at-risk students, including first generation students and traditionally underrepresented minority students, will be especially valued.

**[In addition to criteria a-f above, the following may apply to promotion to Senior Lecturer]**

- g. Documentation of substantial efforts in course or curriculum enhancement or development. These may include leadership roles in developing innovative, timely new courses or programs that improve the educational mission of the Department or School, or initiating new degrees, concentrations, minors, or certificates that improve educational quality or expand the population of students being educated. These may include outreach educational efforts with K-12 schools and/or community colleges, or involvement with national educational outreach programs.

- h. Documentation of scholarly teaching and peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching:
  - Local or regional dissemination of scholarly educational artifacts (e.g., abstracts, book chapters, conference proceedings, course materials, educational software, digital media, handbooks, manuals, papers, professional blogs addressing advances in teaching and pedagogy, or textbooks).
  - Local or regional presentations at conferences, workshops, training sessions, or professional meetings that promote dissemination of educational best practices or scholarly innovation.
- i. Success in obtaining internal or external grant support for educational initiatives, infrastructure, course improvements, or student development.
- j. Local or regional awards or recognition for excellence in teaching.

3. ***Excellent Performance for Promotion to Associate Professor***

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor with Teaching as the Area of Excellence requires evidence of an emerging national reputation for excellent performance in teaching, together with at least satisfactory performance in research and service. Excellence in teaching includes a clearly demonstrated record of high quality, effective teaching, innovative course and curricular development, **creation of peer-reviewed scholarship and dissemination of knowledge about teaching and/or pedagogy**, and success in obtaining peer-reviewed external grant support. *Exemplary evidence for excellence in teaching at this level may include the following. The following is not a checklist; some criteria are more important than others, and differences in emphasis may depend on the discipline.*

**The following criteria (a-f) may apply to all ranks for Excellence in Teaching:**

- a. Documentation that the candidate meets the teaching load designated by their department, as appropriate for his or her appointment.
- b. Summaries and analyses of student evaluation of teaching data for each course taught in rank, provided in sufficient detail to allow determination of the students' perception of the candidate's effectiveness as a classroom teacher.
- c. Provision of rigorous peer evaluations, following the prevalent policies and procedures at the school or department level, and responses to peer review to document the candidate's continuing efforts to improve in teaching.
- d. Evidence that positive student learning outcomes are achieved. Such evidence may include assessment data as well as self-reflection and critique.
- e. Evidence of substantial contributions to mentoring of students. Such evidence may include directing independent studies, research, or service learning projects; serving on student academic committees; directing internship or mentoring programs; student advising; recognition from the School mentoring data.
- f. Evidence of scholarly development and implementation of innovative or advanced pedagogical methodologies, grounded in theory and appropriate for the candidate's disciplinary teaching responsibilities. Such innovations may include active learning, team learning, use of learning spaces, technology assisted learning, online/hybrid education models. Documented efforts to recruit, retain, or provide success-driven interventions to broaden full participation of all at-risk students, including first generation students and traditionally underrepresented minority students, will be especially valued.

**[In addition to criteria a-f above, the following may apply to Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor]**

- g. Documentation of substantial efforts in course or curriculum enhancement or development. These may include leadership roles in developing innovative, timely new courses or programs that improve the educational mission of the Department or School, or initiating new degrees, concentrations, minors, or certificates that improve educational quality or expand the population of students being educated. These may include outreach educational efforts with K-12 schools and/or community colleges or involvement with national

- educational outreach programs.
- h. An upward trajectory of peer-reviewed scholarly artifacts in venues with national/international scope, consistent with an emerging national reputation for excellence in teaching and education. Such artifacts may include archival journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, books, book chapters, or disciplinary textbooks, handbooks, or manuals, digital media, or professional blogs addressing advances in teaching and pedagogy. Such publications may include Discipline-Based Educational Research (DBER) or more applied case studies on pedagogical methods, or research-based practices in education.
  - i. Presentations that promote dissemination of educational best practices and scholarly innovation at regional and national conferences, workshops, training sessions, or professional meetings.
  - j. Success in obtaining peer-reviewed external grant support for teaching, educational innovation, or student development is typically important for furthering the faculty member's program of scholarship in teaching and establishing his/her emerging national reputation (see Section E.4). In the case of collaborative grants with multiple investigators, the intellectual contributions made by the candidate must be clearly articulated.
  - k. Awards or recognition for excellence or leadership in teaching at the local, regional or national level indicative of an emerging national reputation for excellence.

4. ***Excellent Performance for Promotion to Full Professor***

Promotion to Full Professor with Teaching as the Area of Excellence requires evidence of a sustained national reputation for excellent performance in teaching, together with at least satisfactory performance in research and service. Excellence in teaching includes a sustained record of high quality, effective teaching, innovative course and curricular development, and **scholarly creation of peer-reviewed scholarship and dissemination of knowledge about teaching and/or pedagogy**, and success in obtaining peer-reviewed external grant support. *Exemplary evidence for excellence in teaching at this level may include the following. The following is not a checklist; some criteria are more important than others, and differences in emphasis may depend on the discipline.*

**The following criteria (a-f) may apply to all ranks for Excellence in Teaching:**

- a. Documentation that the candidate meets the teaching load designated by their department, as appropriate for his or her appointment.
- b. Summaries and analyses of student evaluation of teaching data for each course taught in rank, provided in sufficient detail to allow determination of the students' perception of the candidate's effectiveness as a classroom teacher.
- c. Provision of rigorous peer evaluations, following the prevalent policies and procedures at the school or department level, and responses to peer review to document the candidate's continuing efforts to improve in teaching.
- d. Evidence that positive student learning outcomes are achieved. Such evidence may include assessment data as well as self-reflection and critique.
- e. Evidence of substantial contributions to mentoring of students. Such evidence may include directing independent studies, research, or service learning projects; serving on student academic committees; directing internship or mentoring programs; student advising; recognition from the School mentoring data.
- f. Evidence of scholarly development and implementation of innovative or advanced pedagogical methodologies, grounded in theory and appropriate for the candidate's disciplinary teaching responsibilities. Such innovations may include active learning, team learning, use of learning spaces, technology assisted learning, online/hybrid education models. Documented efforts to recruit, retain, or provide success-driven interventions to broaden full participation of all at-risk students, including first generation students and traditionally underrepresented minority students, will be especially valued.

**[In addition to criteria a-f above, the following may apply to Promotion to Full Professor]**

- g. Documentation of leadership in course or curriculum enhancement or development. These may include developing innovative, timely new courses or programs that improve the educational mission of the Department or School, coordinating major reorganization of curriculum or large service courses, or initiating new degrees, concentrations, minors, or certificates that improve educational quality or expand the population of students being educated. Other forms of leadership may be evident from participation in national programs of educational outreach or in groups that advance policies and standards of science education.
- h. Consistent dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarly artifacts with broad impact in venues with national/international scope indicative of a sustained national and international reputation for excellence in teaching and education. Such artifacts may include archival journals, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, books, book chapters, or disciplinary textbooks, handbooks, or manuals, digital media, or professional blogs addressing advances in teaching and pedagogy. Such publications may include Discipline-Based Educational Research (DBER) or more applied case studies on pedagogical methods, or research-based practices in education.
- i. Presentations and invited talks that promote dissemination of educational best practices and scholarly innovation at national and international conferences, institutions, or organizational venues with a national or international scope.
- j. Success in obtaining significant peer-reviewed external grant support for teaching, educational innovation, or student development from agencies, organizations, or foundations with a national scope is typically important for advancing the faculty member's program of scholarship in teaching and establishing his or her sustained national reputation excellence (see Section E.4). In the case of collaborative grants with multiple investigators, the intellectual contributions made by the candidate must be clearly articulated.
- k. Significant awards or recognition for excellence or leadership in teaching at the local, national, or international levels indicative of a reputation for sustained excellence.

Note that promotion to Full Professor implies that the candidate is recognized by his/her peers as a nationally and/or internationally recognized authority in his/her field of specialization.

## **G. CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH**

While recognizing that research (like teaching) is, in part, an art — that excellent research is not totally quantifiable nor can it be defined narrowly — the School of Science has established the following criteria for research in conjunction with the promotion and tenure process. The relative weights of these criteria vary according to disciplinary norms described in departmental guidelines.

### ***1. Satisfactory Performance***

*Satisfactory performance is evidenced by:*

- a. A productive research program evidenced by publications and citations to the candidate's research in the literature.
- b. A record demonstrating continued development as a researcher.
- c. A record of involvement in the research program of the Department.

- d. Some form of peer evaluation demonstrating research excellence.
- e. Involvement in mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

**2. *Excellent Performance for Promotion to Associate Professor***

*Excellent performance at this level is evidenced by:*

- a. A research program that has achieved emerging national recognition for its contributions to a particular field. While breadth of scope is important, the emphasis here is on contributions to a single field.
- b. A substantial list of published materials in this field. A list need not be long to be substantial: quality is as important as quantity. Published materials must represent substantial work in the field.
- c. Success in obtaining significant peer-reviewed external grant support for research is typically important for furthering the faculty member's program of research and establishing his or her emerging national reputation of research excellence (see Section E.4). Although grants typically are very important evidence of scholarship in many areas of science, the importance of grant funding in establishing a research program that achieves an emerging national reputation of research excellence varies between and within disciplines and should be substantively established at the Department level. In the case of collaborative grants with multiple investigators, the intellectual contributions made by the candidate must be clearly articulated.
- d. A record demonstrating continuing development as a researcher.
- e. A record demonstrating substantial involvement in the research program of the Department.
- f. Some form of peer evaluation demonstrating research excellence.
- g. National honors and/or awards recognizing research excellence, and national offices or leadership roles in research.
- h. Substantive involvement in mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

**3. *Excellent Performance for Promotion to Full Professor***

*Excellent performance at this level is evidenced by:*

- a. A research program that has achieved national and international recognition for its seminal and sustained contributions to a particular field. While breadth of scope is important, the emphasis here is on profound contributions to a single field.
- b. A substantial and consistent list of published materials in this field. A list need not be long to be substantial: quality is as important as quantity. Published materials must represent distinguished work in the field.
- c. Success in obtaining significant peer-reviewed external grant support for research is typically important for advancing the faculty member's program of research and establishing his or her sustained national reputation of research excellence (see Section E.4). Although grants typically are very important evidence of scholarship in many areas of science, the importance of grant funding in maintaining a research program that achieves a sustained national and international reputation of research excellence varies between and within disciplines and should be substantively established at the Department level. In the case of collaborative grants with multiple investigators, the intellectual contributions made by the candidate must be clearly articulated.
- d. A record demonstrating sustained development as a researcher.
- e. A record demonstrating a leadership role in the research program of the Department.
- f. Some form of peer evaluation demonstrating distinction in research.
- g. National and/or international honors and/or awards recognizing research excellence, invited presentations, and national and/or international offices or leadership roles in

- research.
- h. Substantive and profound involvement in mentoring undergraduate and graduate research.

Note that promotion to Full Professor implies that the candidate is recognized by his/her peers as a nationally and/or internationally recognized authority in his/her field of specialization.

## H. CRITERIA FOR SERVICE

Service can be defined in several ways. In higher education three broad categories of activities have come to be labeled and accepted as service:

- a. *College or University Service*: committee or other governance activities internal to the Department, college, School, or campus — related to program development and institutional policy.
- b. *Professional Service*: committee, editorial, or other work for national and/or regional professional associations and/or academic disciplines.
- c. *Public Service*: professional activities other than basic research and teaching involving direct relationships with groups external to the academic community.

While the faculty member who donates time and expertise to various professional or public groups, organizations, and agencies is viewed as engaging in professional or public service, the faculty member who is paid for such activities (beyond expenses) is not viewed as engaging in professional/public service. Excluded from public service activities are nonprofessional activities such as activities in Scouting or civic, religious and business organizations.

The School of Science has established the following criteria for service. The relative weights of these criteria vary according to disciplinary norms described in departmental guidelines.

### 1. ***Satisfactory Performance***

Satisfactory performance is indicated by the faculty member performing his/her fair share of department service. This will typically include membership on Department and School committees, as well as occasionally chairing a committee. Other typical service, depending on the Department, may include student advising and recruiting, occasional administrative responsibility for a Department or School program or special event, and occasional representation of the Department or School to other units or levels in the University. In other words, in order to claim satisfactory performance the candidate must demonstrate that he/she has been an active participant in the service of the Department.

### 2. ***Highly Satisfactory Performance***

Highly satisfactory performance assumes a higher level of activity than satisfactory performance. However, what distinguishes these two levels is not mere accumulation, but rather impact. This level of performance amounts to more than one's simple share of service responsibility; it calls for a special contribution. In order to claim substantial performance the candidate must demonstrate that he or she has been an outstanding citizen and true leader in the Department, a good citizen and potential leader in the broader domains of the School and University, and demonstrates the potential for national service leadership. Substantial performance should be evidenced by:

- a. Frequent leadership roles on Department and School committees and councils.

This includes chairing various groups and performing significant service to such groups.

- b. Demonstrated initiative in the development of new programs, special events, and other academic activities.
- c. Membership and occasional leadership on University committees and councils.
- d. Regular administrative responsibilities for Department needs, programs, and special events, and regular or occasional responsibility for School needs.
- e. An active role in student-related activities such as recruiting and counseling.
- f. Service to business and industry.
- g. Public service to the community.
- h. Service to local, state and other governmental offices or agencies.
- i. Service to professional societies, such as committee memberships or the organization of meetings and conferences.
- j. Service to the academic discipline in terms of frequent activity as a referee or reviewer, or a junior editor of a scientific publication.

### 3. ***Excellent Performance***

Excellent performance goes beyond highly satisfactory performance in impact. Whereas highly satisfactory performance reflects a special contribution with demonstrated impact, excellent performance calls for a contribution that is unique. To qualify as excellent performance the candidate must give evidence of considerable influence at the Department, School, and University levels, and must have clear visibility in state, regional, and national circles. Excellent performance should be evidenced by:

- a. A leadership role on committees and councils, especially at the School and University levels, as well as in the Department.
- b. Leadership and administrative responsibility for major programs and special events, especially at the School and University levels.
- c. A major role in student-related activities such as recruiting, retention, and counseling.
- d. Frequent initiatives in the development of new academic programs and special events.
- e. Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations. This might include grant review.
- f. Initiative and leadership in public service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies.
- g. Close and active service relationships with business and industry, perhaps in the form of the initiation and administration of research partnerships with the private sector.
- h. Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at the national level.
- i. Service to an academic discipline in terms of the editorship of a major scientific publication, or office of a federal agency or foundation having to do with the sciences.

## I. **PREPARATION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIERS**

Within the framework of the general criteria and documentation guidelines for teaching, research, and service described in the *IUPUI Supplement* and the *Dean of the Faculties' Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*, the School of Science has established further criteria and documentation guidelines. These documentation guidelines are described in the next several sections.

**General Items:**

1. Promotion and tenure dossiers should be prepared by the candidates and the Department Chair, or his/her designee or designees. The overall structure of the dossier must be compliant with the *IUPUI Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* and the eDossier system. The completed dossier needs to be uploaded to the eDossier system by the candidate (the candidate's part), the Department Chair or Chair's designee (the Chair's part), and the Dean or Dean's designee (the Dean's part) after conclusion of each level (e.g., Department and Unit) of the P&T process.
2. Dossiers should be as concise, specific, and focused as possible. Meaningless and insignificant items should be avoided. Candidates are encouraged to keep detailed records of their teaching, research, and service activities in files which will be the basis for their evaluation by the Primary Committee and for preparation of the dossier; the dossier forwarded to the Unit Committee is expected to summarize these activities.
3. While some items and activities can be interpreted as evidence of scholarship and creative activity in more than one of the areas of teaching, research, and service, they should be cited in the dossier in only one context. This does not mean that a dossier cannot support multiple areas of accomplishment; it can. It simply means that care must be taken in assembling the dossier so that the justification of excellence in one area is clearly established and the dossier remains focused.
4. Evaluation of the candidate's record is very important. Dossiers should include evaluations of the candidate's record in teaching, research, and service, the quality and significance of papers published, journals in which papers appear, the candidate's contributions to joint papers, and the individuals who have been asked to write letters of evaluation. Where consulting activities are cited, an evaluation of the candidate's involvement and the creative nature and/or significance of the consulting should be included. Quantitation in the absence of qualitative evaluation is not meaningful. Evaluation is discussed further in the next section.
5. Evidence of a national and/or international reputation and recognition of the candidate as an authority in a field of specialization should be established for promotion to Full Professor. For promotion to Associate Professor, evidence should be provided that such recognition is beginning to be established.

Footnotes:

<sup>1</sup>

<http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/policies/academic-handbook/>; version March, 2011.

<sup>2</sup>

*Ibid.*, part 2, section 3.2.1.

<sup>3</sup>

*Ibid., part 2, section 3.1.2.*

<sup>4</sup>*Memorandum September 23, 2011; <http://www.purdue.edu/provost/faculty/promotion.html>*

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid., part 2, section 3.1.2.*

## APPENDIX A

### *THE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE LETTER OF SOLICITATION. PROFESSORIAL RANKS.*

*This appendix contains letters to be used to solicit input from reviewers for candidates under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The Guidelines for use of these letters are contained in Section F. These letters cannot be modified or otherwise changed other than as described below.*

Date:

Dear \_\_\_\_\_;

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is under consideration for \_\_\_\_\_<sup>6</sup> to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_<sup>7</sup> in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_<sup>8</sup> within the School of Science of Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). We are an urban research university that values the commitment of faculty to the highest standards of research and scholarly activity, teaching and learning, and service and civic engagement.

The primary area in which Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for advancement is excellence in \_\_\_\_\_<sup>9</sup> with satisfactory performance in \_\_\_\_\_<sup>10</sup>. Within this context, we would appreciate your candid evaluation of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s scholarship and creative activity. We are particularly interested in your evaluation of the quality, significance and impact of *his* or *her* work, and the quality of the journals in which it is published. To assist you in your evaluation we are enclosing Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s curriculum vitae and copies of *his* or *her* publications in rank. We would, of course, appreciate any other comments you would like to make regarding Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching, research, and/or service.

Since we are obligated to provide a short biographical sketch of you to promotion committee members, we would appreciate a copy of your curriculum vitae.<sup>11</sup> Also, please complete the enclosed External Referee Form and return it with your review summary.

We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and appreciate your assistance in this matter. Although letters of evaluation are not normally disclosed to candidates, an Indiana state law permits employees to gain access to their personnel files. If this in any way<sup>12</sup> influences your ability to write a candid evaluation, please let us know as soon as possible.

To complete Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s dossier, we would appreciate receiving your comments by \_\_\_\_\_<sup>13</sup> of this year.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Yours truly,

(Signed by the Department Chair)

Enclosure(s)

Footnotes:

<sup>6</sup> Fill in with *tenure and promotion* or *promotion*

<sup>7</sup> Fill in with *Associate Professor* or *Full*

*Professor* <sup>8</sup> Fill in with department name

<sup>9</sup> Fill in with *teaching, research, or service*, or some combination of these.

<sup>10</sup> Fill in with *teaching, research, or service*, or some combination of these.

<sup>11</sup> This sentence may be deleted if desired if the biographical sketch can be otherwise written.

<sup>12</sup> If the candidate has signed a waiver relinquishing their right to see the letters of evaluation, this sentence should be appended to this paragraph: “Dr./Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ has, however, signed a waiver relinquishing his/her right to see his/her letters of evaluation.”

<sup>13</sup> Enter appropriate return date: recommend “mid-August” in order to receive all required letters in time for Unit Committee meeting.

**APPENDIX B**

*This appendix contains the Mandatory External Referee Form which is to be sent to the external reviewers along with the solicitation letter. All external reviewers will be asked to complete it so as to assure that they all meet the criteria described in section E.2.*

**EXTERNAL REFEREE FORM**

**TO:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FROM:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SUBJECT:** \_\_\_\_\_

**RELATIONSHIP TO** \_\_\_\_\_ **CANDIDATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CANDIDATE:** \_\_\_\_\_

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

1. Present or past colleague at same institution as a student, post-doctoral fellow, or faculty member: \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No
2. Past mentor: \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No
3. Co-authored scholarly work/grants in the last 5 years: \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No
4. Other, please specify:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Knowledge of candidate's work primarily based on: *Circle 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 \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

### THE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE LETTER OF SOLICITATION. SENIOR LECTURER.

*This appendix contains letters to be used to solicit input from reviewers for Lecturers under consideration for promotion. The Guidelines for use of these letters are contained in Section F. These letters cannot be modified or otherwise changed other than as described below.*

Date

Dear \_\_\_\_\_;

\_\_\_\_\_, currently a Lecturer in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_<sup>8</sup>, is under consideration for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer within the School of Science of Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). We are an urban research university that values the commitment of faculty to the highest standards of teaching and learning, and service and civic engagement. Lecturers are part of this vital mission, largely addressing excellence in the area of teaching.

On our campus, Lecturers are expected to have a primary focus on teaching, with a demonstrated record of scholarship in teaching and/or pedagogy. They are also expected to have satisfactory performance in service. Within this context, we would appreciate your candid evaluation of Dr./Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching scholarship and creative activity. We are particularly interested in your evaluation of the quality, significance and impact of *his* or *her* work. To assist you in your evaluation we are enclosing Dr./Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_'s curriculum vitae and a copy of his/her teaching dossier. We would, of course, appreciate any other comments you would like to make regarding Dr./Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_'s record of accomplishment.

Since we are obligated to provide a short biographical sketch of you to promotion committee members, we would appreciate a copy of your curriculum vitae.<sup>11</sup>

We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and appreciate your assistance in this matter. Although letters of evaluation are not normally disclosed to candidates, an Indiana state law permits employees to gain access to their personnel files. If this in any way influences your ability to write a candid evaluation, please let us know as soon as possible.<sup>12</sup>

To complete Dr./Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_'s dossier, we would appreciate receiving your comments by \_\_\_\_\_<sup>13</sup> of this year.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed by the Department Chair)

Enclosure(s)

## APPENDIX D

### *THE FORMAT OF A TYPICAL SCHOOL OF SCIENCE PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIER*

What follows is a brief and unofficial summary of the format of a typical School of Science promotion and tenure dossier. The intention of this summary is to provide a broad view of the promotion and tenure dossier: for complete and official details, refer to the main body of this document--however whenever possible the format should follow the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Dossier preparation. **Note that all dossiers are required to be submitted electronically—see Campus Guidelines for further instructions.**

- 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.)
- Each section constitutes one searchable PDF file.
- Each PDF file shall be labeled with the candidate's name and the dossier section number, for example:
  - Smith, Joan Section 01
  - Smith, Joan Section 02

The typical dossier has ten sections: Sections 00-09, and the appendices in Section 10 (if applicable). Dossiers should not ordinarily be more than 50 pages in length, exclusive of all mandatory material in Section 00-03, Section 09 and the Appendices. Only one side of each page may be used. Pages must be single-spaced, typed in a 12-point font, and have 1 inch margins on each side. Pages must be numbered in ascending numerical order using Arabic numerals. (Page numbering should not begin anew at the beginning of each section/appendix.) Since the materials added in Section 01 are added after the document has been initiated, numbering of dossier pages should begin with Section 04.