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1. **PURPOSE**

The following guidelines for preparing promotion and tenure dossiers are intended to supplement the guidelines and comments issued each year by the IUPUI Chief Academic Officer. Chairs and candidates should also consult appropriate Indiana University Academic Policies ([http://policies.iu.edu](http://policies.iu.edu/)) and the [*IUPUI Faculty Guide*](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/FCContent/Html/Media/FCContent/committees/handbook/faculty_guide.pdf). The primary intention of these guidelines is to assist candidates and chairs in preparing well-documented dossiers. A well-prepared dossier is crucial to making a successful case for tenure and/or promotion. Chairs are expected to assist faculty in preparing the best possible cases for promotion and tenure through the annual review process and individual counseling throughout the year and not merely the weeks immediately preceding departmental review.

These school guidelines provide detailed information on the responsibilities of candidates for promotion and tenure; the department’s primary committee (i.e., the committee at the department level charged with responsibility for promotion and tenure issues); the department chair; and the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee. The information required for each of these persons and committees, however, is not limited to that described in these guidelines; IUPUI guidelines and IU policies must also be followed. In addition, guidelines are provided below for evaluation of public and applied scholarship, balanced-binned and balanced-integrative cases, external letters of recommendation, and candidates in joint appointments. The intent is to ensure that dossier evaluators at all levels within the school have the information they need to make fair judgments about individuals within a common, shared context reflective of school and campus expectations and University requirements.

In addition to the policies listed on the IU Policies website ([http://policies.iu.edu](http://policies.iu.edu/)) and contained in the *IUPUI Faculty Guide*, the Chief Academic Officer for IUPUI annually issues guidelines for the preparation of dossiers, including the specification of contents and timetables for submission. These campus guidelines are provided to department chairs who are responsible for following them in accord with supplemental directions from the School of Liberal Arts; this document constitutes one such supplement.

All faculty, but especially untenured and other probationary faculty, must be aware of the University’s policies governing “Reappointment and Non-Reappointment during Probationary Period.” The full statement of these policies may be found on the IU Policies website ([http://policies.iu.edu](http://policies.iu.edu/)) and in the [*IUPUI Faculty Guide*](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/FCContent/Html/Media/FCContent/committees/handbook/faculty_guide.pdf). Chairs should review these policies annually and also advise faculty who may not be recommended for reappointment to review it as well.

Note: Throughout this document, the terms “**publication**,” “**publisher**,” and “**published**” shall be understood to refer to work available in printed form (books, articles, applied reports, etc.), work available in electronic media (Internet, computer programs, software, etc.), as well as other forms of scholarly activity as defined by specific disciplines. Electronically published products should be evaluated using criteria comparable to those used for products in print formats; in the case of journals, for example, this might include the peer-review policy, rate of acceptance, circulation and impact, and nature of the editorial board of the journal. In addition, the term “**research**” includes “creative activities.”

The charge, membership, and standing rules of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee are contained within the Bylaws of the School of Liberal Arts.

1. **REVIEW PROCESS**
2. Immediately upon assuming their duties, all newly-hired tenured or tenure-eligible faculty, lecturers, and other full-time faculty regardless of rank or appointment, will receive from their respective department chairs copies of six documents:
	1. The promotion and tenure guidelines and criteria adopted by their respective departments.
	2. The SLA Promotion and Tenure “Criteria Statement”, SLA Promotion Criteria for Lecturers, or the SLA Policy on Clinical Faculty Promotion, as appropriate.
	3. The SLA Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (i.e., this document).
	4. IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers
	5. For tenure-track faculty, a Tenure Timetable, as appropriate, which clearly states the expected year in which a tenure eligible faculty member will be put forward for tenure. For clinical assistant professors, a Promotion Timetable, as appropriate, which clearly states the expected year they will be required to go forward for promotion, per school guidelines.
	6. SLA Faculty Work Document
3. All persons who are or will be associated with the tenure and promotion process of the School of Liberal Arts, including candidates, chairs, members of relevant committees, and the dean, should review these documents carefully.
4. The specific qualifications required for tenure and/or promotion are indicated in the departmental promotion and tenure documents and in the appropriate SLA promotion document for the respective academic appointments (i.e., tenure-, lecturer-, and clinical-lines). At IUPUI, tenure acknowledges documented achievement in light of its promise for the future; the candidate’s entire academic record is considered for tenure. Promotion is recognition of achievement in rank; both tenured and non-tenure track faculty may seek promotion in rank when their achievements warrant this recognition. For tenure-track faculty going from assistant to associate rank, promotion and tenure are sought simultaneously.
5. In preparing dossiers, it is important to remember the audiences that will be evaluating them. There are six campus levels of review. All reviewers, whether colleagues in the department and School of Liberal Arts, administrators at various levels, or faculty from other academic units of IUPUI, will come to the dossiers with their own sets of presumptions and assumptions. They will inevitably be less swayed by assertions and claims of excellence than by demonstrations of unambiguous evidence. Selective statements, whether coming from a student, a colleague, a community leader, or a nationally prominent individual, should be supported by demonstrable evidence such as peer evaluations, student evaluations, and professional assessments.
6. At each stage in the review process within the school (primary committee, chair, school P&T committee, dean) candidates are to be informed, within one week, of the recommendations made regarding their tenure and/or promotion and provided with copies of the recommendations at each level. Letters from committees shall include a record of the committee’s numerical vote. However, the votes of particular members of the committee, as well as their individual judgments and comments, shall be kept confidential. Candidates will indicate that they have received and read these documents by signing an acknowledgement of receipt for each document and returning them to the appropriate level (the chair for primary committee and chair recommendations, the dean’s office for school P&T committee and dean recommendations), along with any comment or reply they may wish to add to the eDossier in their “Supplemental Folder”. The eDossier must be forwarded to the next appropriate review level by the dates specified by the dean’s office. [See Section XII “Guidelines and Procedures for Negative and Divergent Recommendations for Tenure and/or Promotion,” as appropriate.]
7. Should a candidate believe that procedures have not been followed by the primary committee, a written appeal may be directed to the department chair. Should a candidate believe that procedures have not been followed by the department chair or by the SLA Promotion and Tenure committee, a written appeal may be directed to the dean.
8. At all levels, discussions in committee are confidential.
9. Because candidates are provided copies of the recommendations at each level, it is essential that direct quotations, if included in recommendation letters, **NOT** be attributed to an external reviewer by name.
10. The standard timeline for the P&T process is given in Appendix 10.
11. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CANDIDATE**

It is the responsibility of candidates to document their accomplishments during the probationary period and while in rank in preparation for promotion and/or tenure.

Tenure-line faculty are responsible for demonstrating at least satisfactory performance in all three of the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. School expectations for each of these three areas are outlined in the School Faculty Work Document. Consideration for promotion or tenure, however, requires demonstrated excellence in one of three ways: (1) documenting excellence in at least one of the three areas of faculty work (research, teaching and service) and satisfactory performance in the other two, (2) documenting evidence of balanced strengths that show excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university (the “balanced-binned case”, see Section X below), or (3) documenting overall excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities (the “balanced-integrative case”, see Section XI below). Consideration of promotion of lecturers to the rank of senior lecturer or teaching professor is based on demonstrated excellence in teaching, with at least satisfactory performance in service. Consideration of promotion of clinical faculty is based on demonstrated excellence in either teaching or service, with at least satisfactory performance in the other area, or on a balanced case that is highly satisfactory in both service and teaching. Except for promotion to senior lecturer, peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required for all promotions, as appropriate for the appointment and the area of excellence. Criteria for tenure and promotions are stated on the IU Policies website (http://policies.iu.edu), in the IUPUI Faculty Guide, in the *IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*, and in department criteria and school guidelines for promotion and tenure.

There is no single way to show excellence in any area, but the case for excellence in scholarship is made by presenting evidence of quality, impact, and quantity appropriate for the faculty line and rank. For every kind of scholarship, a candidate must demonstrate how their work fits within the standards for scholarship appropriate to their field and address the extent to which methodology (or methodologies), evidence, audience, and type of scholarly products meet the standards of their field or fields. It is incumbent upon the candidate for promotion and/or tenure to identify the specific area(s) of scholarship in which they are claiming excellence and to provide tangible evidence that strongly supports the claims being made.

Options for promotion vary by faculty line, reflecting the different responsibilities of each type of faculty line. These options are summarized in the following table and described in detail in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines with additional guidance offered in the sections and appendices that follow. Note that evidence required to show excellence in an option for one rank will differ for another rank (e.g., evidence for excellence in teaching for promotion to professor vs. promotion to senior lecturer).



***A. School Requirements for the CV***

Guidelines for the IUPUI *Curriculum Vitae* format given in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines must be followed, particularly with regard to documenting publications. The following provides additional commentary on some of the requirements for the CV:

1. Since promotion*is based primarily on work accomplished in rank,* those accomplishments in teaching, service, and research and creative activity that are being cited as the basis for promotion should be clearly identified as having occurred while in the current rank. (See also Item C below.)
2. Only works that are published, accepted, or “in press” should be listed on the CV. Accomplishments that are pending (e.g., articles submitted but not yet accepted or nominations for teaching excellence awards) should not be listed on the CV. Works submitted, under contract or in progress may be discussed, as appropriate, in the candidate’s statement or elsewhere in the dossier. Note that books and comparable projects that are *under contract* with a publisher are typically considered as “work in progress” and NOT as “accepted” or “in press,” and so should not be listed in the CV, although they may be discussed in the candidate’s statement.
3. Prior work of candidates done before starting in non-visiting appointments in the School can be considered only if it is explicitly articulated either in their appointment letter or in a signed Memorandum of Understanding with the Dean and Chair. Work done while in visiting or other appointments may be used to show reputation, trajectory and promise, but is not usually considered as being done in rank. For tenure-track faculty, typically only work done within their tenure probationary period at IUPUI should be presented as in rank, unless they have been specifically awarded years of credit towards tenure based on a comparable appointment elsewhere. In all cases, policies and procedures given on the IU Policies website (<http://policies.iu.edu>) and in the [*IUPUI Faculty Guide*](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/)must be followed with regard to any exceptions sought to the standard probationary period.
4. All published or “in-press” works listed in a dossier must be cited using a complete citation form consistent with the candidate’s disciplinary style standards (e.g., APA, MLA); that is, citations listed in the CV must include the name of all authors, creators, or collaborators in the order in which they appear either in the publication or in the development and launch of their work, with the candidate’s name in bold where multiple authors are listed, as well as the title, publisher, place and date of publication, page numbers, and/or other information relevant to the scholarly product being cited. For articles published first on a publication’s website prior to the print edition, both publication dates should be indicated in the CV. Whenever possible, the DOI with hyperlinks should be used.
5. Collaborators on any scholarly product, including co-authors, should be asked to provide a statement clearly indicating the extent and nature of the candidate’s individual contributions to the team effort. Collaborators are expected to comment on the contributions of the candidate to the product, not on the quality and importance of the product. If there are multiple collaborators/co- authors, a statement from the primary collaborator is sufficient.

NOTE: Ideally, these statements are requested at the time the products are published and may be solicited by either the candidate or the department chair. These statements should be included with the materials sent to external reviewers.

The nature and extent of the candidate’s contributions to publications and other scholarly products that have collaborators/co-authors should be presented in the candidate’s statement or in the documentation of teaching, research/creative activity or service and not in the CV.

1. Each publication/product should be categorized as either refereed or non-refereed. Typically, only products that have undergone a blind peer-review process are considered to have been refereed; exceptions should be explained.
2. Publications that are in whole or in part derived from the candidate’s dissertation should be so noted. The candidate should also carefully document which part of the work, both the underlying research as well as the writing, was drawn directly from the dissertation and which part of the work moved beyond the dissertation.
3. Works in print should be listed under “publications” in the vita in the standard bibliographic format. Works listed as published must be retrievable. Works accepted for publication but that have not yet appeared in print should be included in the CV, but the notation “accepted” or “in press” should be added, as appropriate. In all cases, the complete manuscripts should be available for review. For the purposes of promotion and tenure, the following guidelines apply:
	* An “accepted” or “in press” publication, be it an article, chapter, book or other product, is one that has been accepted for publication and no longer requires revision. To justify inclusion of “in press” publications in the vita, candidates must provide a letter from the editor and/or publisher of the manuscript stating that final copy proofs are in production; “accepted” works may be listed in the CV if there is clear documentation from the editor/publisher that no additional work is required by the author(s) other than copy editing of the final proofs.
	* Otherwise, the work should be described as “submitted” in the statement and not listed on the CV. Note that an ‘advance contract’ offered by many publishers for work in development is NOT an indication that the work has been “accepted” for publication, nor is the work considered to have been peer reviewed at this stage. Works under ‘advance contract’ should not be listed in the CV but should be described in the candidate’s statement and in the dossier.
	* An article, chapter, book or other work that has been conditionally accepted for publication, but still requires revisions by the author should be described as “submitted” in the statement and dossier, but not listed on the CV; the candidate may supply a copy of a book contract or a letter from the editor stating that a manuscript has been accepted for publication pending revisions, but it should not be listed on the CV as “accepted” or “in press” if further revision is still required.
	* Letters from editors/publishers must be provided by the candidate to chairs in a timely fashion so that they may be shown to external reviewers.
	* For digital scholarship, candidates should list citations (including URLs) of any products on which they wish to be evaluated. Candidates should clearly identify the format (e.g., website, article, dataset, documentary) and their individual contributions. Candidates should also note the relationship(s) among products or versions resulting from the same research project or collaboration in order to clarify for reviewers what portion of the product constitutes re-use versus new work. If this clarification requires a longer explanation than what can be listed in the CV, candidates should include a fuller explanation in the eDossier.
4. Academic editing may be offered as an example of scholarly activity on the CV. While there is a range of academic editing, that which requires sustained research and original or critical activity constitutes basic research. Editing in the academy can include scholarly editing of primary texts, the editing of learned journals, anthologies, reference books and similar activities. It is the candidate’s responsibility to make the case in the candidate’s statement and dossier for which editing activities should be considered research activities (basic or applied) and which should be considered service or teaching activities.
5. Candidates can use different forms of scholarship—such as public, applied, and digital scholarship—to describe aspects of or all of their scholarly identity. Evaluators of such scholarship should accept that the evidence used to support such scholarship may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics are acceptable, and candidates should work with chairs to establish how non-text forms of peer-reviewed scholarship (e.g. museum installations, digital projects) can be documented for department and school promotion and tenure review. Likewise, candidates are responsible for working with chairs or program directors to establish how best to document scholarship that is the product of collaborations with non-academic partners. For further discussion on public and applied scholarship, see Appendix 2.
6. The CV must be formatted using the format given in the IUPUI P&T guidelines. Candidates will be required to resubmit their CV with the appropriate formatting if a different format is used.
	* Items on a CV can only be listed in one category – teaching, research/creative activity, or service– even if they may be considered as addressing multiple categories. The relevance of, for example, a research publication to a candidate’s scholarship of teaching can be described in the candidate’s statement, but the publication itself cannot “double count” as both a research and a teaching publication.
	* For balanced-integrative cases, items are listed by format (e.g., publication, presentation) not by area (teaching, research, or service). Each item may be listed only once. Candidates seeking promotion on the balanced-integrative DEI case should take special care to follow guidance in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines for identifying and categorizing DEI-focused work in the CV.

***B. Documentation of Scholarly and Professional Activities***

IUPUI P&T Guidelines for documenting scholarly and professional activity in teaching, research, and service as well as in diversity, equity and inclusion must be followed carefully. The following provides additional commentary on the documentation of scholarly and professional activities:

1. Candidates must provide one copy, offprint, or preprint of each work published or accepted for publication, while additional copies needed for external reviewers are provided by the department. Candidates must provide digital access to work appropriate to the standards under which the work will be evaluated and has been assessed by external reviewers.
2. The nature of public and applied scholarship – as well as scholarship in diversity, equity and inclusion – is diverse and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics are acceptable for P&T. Candidates are responsible for working with chairs to establish how non-print forms of peer-reviewed scholarship (e.g., museum installations, digital projects) can be documented for department and school, as well as external, review for P&T.
3. Candidates should provide copies of all known published reviews (and not just a selection) of a book or other work. If the work has generated significant comments in informal venues, this may be discussed in the dossier.
4. If a candidate for promotion and/or tenure presents published, in-press or accepted materials that cannot be given adequate evaluation because they are written in a language insufficiently known to members of the department or SLA committee, the chair of either committee may request that the candidate prepare an English translation of selected portions of the materials (or a precis of them) that would permit the committee to make an informed evaluation. In certain cases it may be deemed necessary to invite a consultant, fluent in the language in question, to participate (but not vote) in the committee's discussions.
5. Scholarly presentations are valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent they reflect the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications including documented breadth of exposure and dissemination; scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and prestige of the presentation venue.
6. A candidate's teaching record must be documented, not merely asserted. Candidates must provide an evaluation of teaching and advising materials, including summary statements of the results of course evaluations conducted since the candidate's last formal promotion evaluation, or for at least the three years preceding the year of the current review. It is the candidate’s responsibility to have peer reviews completed in a timely fashion such that they may be included with other materials. A self-reflection on how the candidate has used student and peer input for improvement is required.
7. Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and beyond the University, is the responsibility of the candidate. All pertinent documentation regarding such honors, awards, or service (e.g., letters of appointment to committees; letters of recognition from local, regional, national organizations) should be included in an appendix to the dossier and, whenever a professional honor or award is cited, the candidate should also provide some information or documentation about the award or honor.
8. Annual and three-year reviews are not expected to be part of the dossier.
9. It is the candidate’s responsibility to ensure that materials, including the vita, are placed in the proper format and location in the IU eDossier platform. Model dossiers are available on the IUPUI Academic Affairs website.
10. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

The chair is expected to provide a candid, independent recommendation regarding each candidate for promotion or tenure. The chair’s recommendation should be made after a review of the dossier and the recommendations of the primary committee, but it need not be in agreement with that of the primary committee.

In assessing a candidate, the chair should evaluate the candidate in each of the areas of teaching, research and creative activity (as appropriate), and service, and not provide a description of his or her activities and accomplishments. For candidates seeking promotion and tenure based on the balanced-integrative case, the chair should also evaluate the overall impact and contribution of the candidate’s work, which may include administration. The quality of the candidate’s work should be emphasized and not overlooked for the quantity. Superlatives that are not supported with substantive evidence are likely to detract from the candidate’s strengths. References to documents not included in the dossier may have the same effect.

While evaluations by home departments regarding tenure have priority over a candidate's association with other units, chairs must evaluate the activity in other units of candidates who have nominal or adjunct appointments in those units, and this activity must be considered when candidates are reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. When the candidate has an appointment in an external unit, it is the responsibility of the department chair to obtain an assessment of the candidate's contribution to the external unit from the unit's director (or other appropriate person/s). If the candidate has an appointment with more than one program, or is engaged in an active interdisciplinary program, it is the responsibility of all chairs and directors involved to ensure that the procedures in Section VIII are followed and that a written document detailing how the review is to occur is produced well in advance of the review. In addition, the department chair shall ensure that the primary committee consults with appropriate representatives of the external unit, as described below under “VIII. Joint and Adjunct Appointments and Involvement in Multiple Programs.”

Throughout the time in rank as candidates prepare for promotion, and especially for faculty in their probationary period, chairs (or designees) should advise candidates about both the adequacy of the documentation as well as the effective presentation of information in their dossiers, particularly as regards to the quantity of evidence offered.

Dossiers should not overwhelm reviewers with so much information that significant accomplishments are lost among endless details.

The chair’s responsibilities also include, but are not limited to, each of the following:

1. The chair must ensure that the departmental review process operates effectively and fairly – following established department, school, and campus guidelines – and that recommendations are submitted by the established deadlines.
	1. The chair is responsible for ensuring that an appropriate primary committee is in place.
		* If there are fewer than the required four faculty of appropriate rank to review a candidate, the chair will work with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to identify faculty from outside of the department to serve on the committee.
		* In some cases, a faculty member may have an MOU that outlines expectations for membership on the primary committee; the chair will work with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, as appropriate, to meet the terms of the MOU.
		* Whenever a candidate is going up for promotion and/or tenure in an area of scholarship that is unusual for the department, such as in interdisciplinary fields that transcend the intellectual authority of the faculty in the unit, the chair will work with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs to ensure that arrangements are made for a fair and informed review. These special or ad hoc arrangements should be stipulated in advance and be known to the candidate, the school P&T committee, and the dean.
	2. The chair is also responsible for ensuring proper format of the dossier, completeness of all sections of the dossier, and timely submission of the dossier, with primary committee and chair evaluations, to the Dean’s Office by the stated deadline.
	3. The chair is responsible for both identifying and soliciting external reviewers, although this responsibility may be delegated to another member of the department, such as the primary committee chair, when appropriate.

NOTE: The IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs assesses the qualifications of all external reviewers prior to the evaluation of the dossier.

* 1. The chair is responsible for adding external letters and letters of reference to the dossier before it is reviewed by the primary committee. *The chair is responsible for ensuring that in references to letters from external reviewers by the primary committee, direct quotations should not be attributed to a reviewer by name.*
	2. The chair is responsible for ensuring that all MOUs that pertain to a faculty member’s appointment (e.g., joint appointments, membership of primary committees) are included by the candidate in the appropriate appendix.
	3. The chair must ensure that the candidate's dossier remains intact during the whole review process at the departmental level.
1. By February 1, the chair will ask faculty to confirm their candidacy for P&T by the first week of April, and chairs will inform the Dean’s Office by no later than May 1 which faculty intend to pursue promotion, using the form given in Appendix 1: “Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure.” Chairs have the authority to require non-probationary faculty who do not have mandatory promotion or tenure deadlines and who have not informed the chair of their intent to seek promotion by the first week of April to wait to go up for promotion in the ensuing promotion cycle.
2. The chair, or qualified designee, will document the stature and nature of journals, presses, or other media or scholarly outlets that are noted in a candidate’s dossier. In noting the nature and stature of journals, JCR Impact Factor (or similar indicators appropriate for the discipline), circulation (compared with other journals in the field), date of founding, and rejection rate should be included whenever possible. (See also Item V.E.2 below.)
3. For candidates who have co-authored publications, the chair will address in the chair’s letter the authorship convention for the discipline. If a chair letter will not be included in the dossier, authorship convention must be addressed in the primary committee letter.
4. Candidates for promotion or tenure should be given at least two months to provide materials for the dossier--but whenever possible, much more time, even several months. Moreover, the review process should be based on effective annual reviews. In accord with departmental procedures, the chair may delegate the task of assisting in the actual preparation of a dossier to a member of the department other than the candidate. The chair is still responsible, however, for ensuring that department members involved with promotion and tenure are acquainted with all information and guidelines issued by the IUPUI Chief Academic Officer and the School of Liberal Arts.
5. In instances where the chair is a candidate for promotion or tenure and approved departmental policies do not make appropriate provisions, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs is responsible for assisting the chair of the primary committee with, or identifying someone else to assume, the procedural duties of the chair, as well as ensuring that all promotion procedures are followed appropriately.
6. To avoid any possible conflict of interest, the chair must take necessary steps to ensure that the review of a candidate for promotion or tenure has been conducted without the participation of a spouse or a person with an intimate personal or a substantial financial relationship, past or present, with the candidate. Because these terms cannot be precisely defined, chairs must exercise their own judgment on how to comply with this requirement.
7. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE: THE PRIMARY COMMITTEE**

In commenting on the documentation, including the external letters, primary committees should address all aspects of the dossier, including written recommendations and evaluations of the candidate’s teaching, research or creative activity, professional service, and university citizenship; for candidates seeking promotion and tenure based on the balanced-integrative DEI case, the primary committee should also evaluate the overall importance, impact and contribution of the candidate’s work in diversity, equity and inclusion. Primary committees should also consider the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, real or apparent. Overlooked strengths and weaknesses can gain serious negative proportions in the review process. This is especially true of weaknesses, which gain importance by being ignored. When a dossier is reviewed at levels beyond the department without explanation of a perceived weakness, the latter may assume much greater importance than warranted, and candidates should be aware of this possibility.

Any member of a primary committee who is also a member of a subsequent committee (school or campus) typically votes at the primary level and “abstains” (“voted previously”) at other levels on those cases.

As stated in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, in the instance of candidates who work in interdisciplinary fields that transcend the intellectual authority of any single school/unit, special arrangements for primary and unit committee reviews may be necessary, including adding voting members from outside of the department, in consultation with the regular members of the primary committee. Outside voting members must be full-time IU faculty members with appropriate rank and expertise. Primary Committees are expected to follow relevant procedures outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines with regard to reviewing interdisciplinary work.

There must be at least four total votes (“yes” and/or “no”, not including abstain or absent) for each case. If the regular committee does not have enough members, the chair or dean will work with the regular committee to add appropriate members.

The responsibilities of the primary committee include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Appointments to the primary committee shall be made in such a way that no one who is otherwise qualified shall be barred from service on the basis of ethnicity, gender, physical disability, race, religion, or sexual orientation.
2. All committee members who participate in the discussion of a candidate must vote Yes or No on the candidate’s case; in the case of unforeseen emergencies and they are unable to vote, their vote should be marked “absent”.
3. The department chair shall explain to the committee at their first meeting that if, in the course of deliberations, any questions arise regarding race, gender or other sorts of bias, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee should consult with a representative of the University's Affirmative Action Office for advice and guidance in such matters.
4. Members of the primary committee are not permitted to discuss their evaluation with the candidate. Any questions the candidate may have regarding the committee's procedures must be directed to the chair of the department.
5. Along with promotion criteria approved by the department, the primary committee should use the suggested guidelines for evaluating teaching, research and service provided in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. As appropriate, the guidelines for evaluating balanced-binned and balanced-integrative cases as well as public and/or applied scholarship given below should be used.
6. The primary committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s research and creative activity, as relevant to the case, should include the following. When referencing and commenting on evaluations made by external reviewers in their letters, direct quotations must not be attributed to reviewers by name.
	1. Summarize the content of all available reviews of the candidate's publications.
	2. Evaluate anthologies, books, journals and other venues in which the candidate's works have appeared or will appear, and summarize their relative standing in the candidate's field. (The chair will provide in the dossier an evaluation of the stature of journals, presses, etc., as described above in section IV, “Responsibilities of the Department Chair.”)

It is important for committees to note that the number of highly-cited articles published in places other than elite journals continues to increase as non-traditional opportunities and avenues for dissemination become more prevalent. While the elite journals publish a substantial percentage of high-impact articles, many authors of well-regarded papers in a diverse array of fields are choosing other venues for disseminating their scholarship. Now that finding and reading relevant articles in other venues is becoming as easy as, and more affordable than, finding and reading articles in elite journals, scholars are increasingly building on and citing work published in a wide variety of venues. Consequently, the status of the venue in which a work is published should not be considered in isolation from the impact the work has on the field.

* 1. Summarize and evaluate invited and volunteered conference papers, talks, poetry readings, performances, etc., that the candidate has given, and, when possible, assess the relative importance of the meetings (conferences, colloquia, etc.) at which the contributions were made.
	2. Summarize the relative importance to the department and institution of the candidate's scholarly and creative production. If the candidate is said to have (emerging) national or international standing, this claim must be substantiated.
	3. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate's individual contributions, assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential value of the candidate's overall research and creative activity agenda and also assess the relevance to that general agenda of all individual scholarly products.
1. The primary committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s teaching should include the following:
	1. The committee will evaluate local, regional, national, and international awards or recognition the candidate may have won for teaching and determine their importance.
	2. The committee will evaluate and comment on the candidate's teaching effectiveness. This evaluation and commentary will be based on: (a) summary statements of the results of teaching evaluations – by both students and peers – conducted since the candidate's last formal promotion evaluation, or for at least the three years preceding the current review, (b) the candidate’s self-reflection on continuous teaching improvement, and (c) student learning outcomes data. This information is to be provided by the candidate.

NOTE: According to the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, “In the absence of a clear reason for the omission, dossiers without peer evaluations may be returned as incomplete” by the IUPUI P&T committee. These evaluations should be signed by the reviewers.

* 1. The committee will evaluate materials developed by the candidate that include, but are not limited to, the following:
		1. course development/revisions
		2. peer evaluations for others
		3. presentations on teaching (both locally and elsewhere)
		4. teaching-related publications
		5. program development/revisions
		6. web-based teaching materials
	2. According to the IUPUI P&T guidelines, “Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure track faculty.” Consequently, tenure-line faculty as well as clinical-line faculty seeking promotion based on excellence in teaching or overall excellence on a balanced-binned case are expected to have peer-refereed presentations and products in teaching, appropriate for faculty line and rank. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate's individual contributions, the committee will assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential value of the candidate's overall approach to teaching.
	3. The committee will note that departments, the school, and the campus have different expectations for showing excellence in teaching for tenure-line, lecturer-line, and clinical-line faculty, as described in the *IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* (see “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance”) and in the appendices to these school guidelines.
1. The primary committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s service should include the following:
	1. The committee will evaluate and summarize all evidence provided by the candidate concerning service, and will carefully weigh all claims made about the significance of such service. The committee’s responsibility includes, but is not limited to, an evaluation of service to the following:
		1. the candidate’s department or program
		2. school and campus programs that are not covered under the candidate's service to the department
		3. the IUPUI campus (and/or units on campus other than the school)
		4. the University
		5. the community (locally and elsewhere)
		6. the candidate’s profession
	2. The committee will evaluate any service and service leadership (e.g., involvement in a special task force, or leadership of the reorganization of a program) performed by the candidate, as well as service outcomes, at all levels of the University as well as with disciplinary/professional organizations and the community, while respecting confidentiality rules.
	3. According to the campus P&T guidelines, “Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure track faculty.” Consequently, tenure-line faculty as well as clinical-line faculty seeking promotion based on excellence in service or overall excellence on a balanced-binned case are expected to have peer-refereed presentations and products in service, appropriate for faculty line and rank. In addition to judging the quality of the candidate's individual contributions, the committee will assess the coherence, quality, development, and potential value of the candidate's overall approach to service.
2. When evaluating the work of candidates seeking promotion based on a balanced-integrative case, the primary committee should adhere to the “Guidelines for Balanced-Integrative Cases for Tenure-Track Faculty” outlined in Section XI.
3. **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE**

The members of the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee are elected by the faculty, as described in the bylaws of the School of Liberal Arts. In evaluating a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the committee will carefully consider all the information provided by the candidate, as well as the recommendation of the primary committee and the department’s chair. The committee shall also take into consideration the guidelines and criteria for promotion and/or tenure of the candidate’s department while following closely the guidelines outlined in this document and the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, as appropriate for the faculty line and rank being sought by the candidate.

In addition to the above, the responsibilities of the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The person charged by the SLA Agenda Council with calling the first meeting of the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee in the Fall of any given year shall take to that meeting copies of the University’s Equal Opportunity Policy. In addition, this person shall explain to the entire committee that, if in the course of deliberations any questions of bias as related to ethnicity, gender, or any other sorts of bias arise, then, at the request of one or more members, the committee should consult with a representative of IUPUI’s Office for Equal Opportunity for advice and guidance in such matters.
2. At their first meeting, the committee shall elect a chair. This person is responsible for organizing future meetings of the committee. The term of the chair is for the academic year, August through May; a chair may serve up to two consecutive years, if elected as chair by the committee both years.
3. In any given year, it is likely that the committee will include members from departments that are presenting candidates. In such cases committee members may not participate in discussions concerning candidates from their own department or who have other scholarly conflicts of interest, they must leave the room during such discussions, and they must abstain from voting on those cases. NOTE: Because Third-Year Reviews are considered to be formative reviews and a vote is not taken, committee members may participate in third-year reviews of candidates from their own department.
4. Committee members should resign from the School P&T Committee if:
	* they have a personal or financial relationship with any candidate seeking promotion, and/or
	* they are seeking promotion.
5. The ex-officio member of the SLA P&T Committee who is elected by and represents the school at the campus level may participate in the discussion but does not vote unless that person is also elected as a regular member of the SLA P&T Committee. In the latter case, that person typically should vote at the school level.
6. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (ADFA), who serves as the Dean’s Office liaison to the committee, does not participate in committee deliberations but may be invited to meet with the committee to provide insight or clarification on processes, guidelines, or other questions that arise.
7. There must be at least four votes (yes and/or no, not including abstain or absent) for each case. If the regular committee does not have enough members, the ADFA will work with the School Faculty Executive Committee to add appropriate members.
8. While allowed, the committee should strive to avoid differing recommendations for promotion and for tenure when an assistant tenure track faculty member is applying for both.
9. Per the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, those voting for promotion must at least hold the rank being sought by the candidate, and those voting for tenure must themselves hold tenure. If committee members do not meet these criteria for a candidate being reviewed, they may be present for the discussion and participate up to the point of vote but are not eligible to vote. The following table outlines which faculty ranks are eligible to vote on promotion/review for specific ranks.



\* “During the period of 2021-2024, associate-rank tenured professors may review and vote on candidates for teaching professor in their capacity as department chairs, committee members.” (Approved by IFC on 6 April 2021)

1. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are to have no direct or indirect contact with the committee or its members regarding their own cases.
2. The SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the recommendations of the primary committee and the department chair, taking into consideration whether the recommendations are based on adequate peer review, whether the rights of the candidate have been safeguarded in accordance with university-established procedures, and whether the academic mission, responsibilities, and expectations under which the candidate had originally been hired have been taken into account.
3. The SLA P&T Committee letter must account for any negative votes, even if the overall vote is positive. In the event that the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee makes a recommendation for tenure that differs with the primary committee, the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee will not forward that recommendation to the dean without having first consulted with that committee and, as appropriate, the chair of the candidate’s home department. This consultation will be facilitated by the dean’s office to avoid any improper communication among deliberative levels. (See also below Section XII: Guidelines and Procedures for Negative and Divergent Recommendations for Tenure and/or Promotion.)
4. After all responsibilities for reviewing candidates for promotion and/or tenure are completed each fall, the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for reviewing the SLA P&T Guidelines and forwarding recommended updates and edits to the Executive Committee for approval by the Faculty Assembly. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, or designee, will be invited to participate in the discussion of school guidelines.
5. **EXTERNAL LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION**
6. External Letters Required in All Tenure or Promotion Cases

For all faculty, a minimum of six letters is required for evaluation of each candidate. The *IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* provide specific criteria and guidelines for selecting and soliciting external reviewers for faculty at different ranks and types of appointments, including the type of input allowed by candidates in the selection of reviewers. These guidelines must be followed carefully by the department chair, especially with respect to ensuring the existence of an “arm’s length” relationship between the reviewer and the candidate. Chairs will need to provide justification for the selection of external reviewers who are not affiliated with a peer (or higher) institution.

* 1. All letters from external reviewers must be included in the dossier. Neither the candidate nor any reviewer (or reviewing body) may exclude or remove any letters.
	2. The names of all reviewers finally chosen, including those suggested by the candidate, will be kept confidential. At no point in the process will the candidate contact, either directly or indirectly, external reviewers or potential reviewers regarding the tenure and/or promotion review. If contacted by a reviewer, the candidate shall refrain from responding to questions about the promotion and tenure case and, instead, shall direct the reviewer to the department chair or the chair of the primary committee for any required information or directions. Review letters (by department, chair, school and dean) will not include any reviewer names.
	3. By June 1 of the year in which a candidate will go forward for tenure or promotion, the department chair will request an evaluation of the candidate. The *IUPUI Chief Academic Officer’s Comments Regarding Outside Letters* provide detailed guidelines on language that is required to be used in these letters along with examples; these should be followed carefully. The letters to all reviewers must be substantively identical among similar types of cases (e.g., tenure track, lecturer).
	4. In order to allow candidates time to gather materials for inclusion with the external letters, department chairs will notify candidates of the June 1 deadline in a timely fashion. At the latest, candidates should be made aware of this deadline by February 1.
	5. Letters solicited from external reviewers that arrive after the stated deadline and after the candidate’s dossier is forwarded to the school committee should not be included in the dossier without consultation with the chair, office of the dean, and the office of academic affairs.
1. Other Types of External Letters

In certain cases—including cases proceeding on the basis of public/applied scholarship and/or DEI work—it is strongly recommended that chairs solicit and submit additional letters. These may include the following:

* 1. External assessments of publication venues. When publications are interdisciplinary or outside conventionally conceived disciplinary work, it may be necessary to contact others to assist in judging the venues of an individual’s publications.
	2. Evaluation of contributions by collaborators. Letters from collaborators are required in order to document how much credit the candidate deserves for jointly authored work. Collaborators are well positioned to comment on the degree of participation of a colleague, but they should not be enlisted to review the quality or significance of the candidate’s work. Either chairs or candidates may solicit these letters from collaborators, and they should be included in an appendix to the dossier. It is recommended that collaborator letters be obtained at the time of publication rather than when the dossier is being assembled.
	3. Assessment of the candidate’s contributions to interdisciplinary work, including written evaluations from appropriate peers in research centers or other departments or programs.
	4. Evaluation of creative activity and applied research. Special consideration must be given to evaluating creative work as well as applied research when the products and/or activities are only available for a short period of time, such as with performances, presentations, readings, exhibits, etc. “The same degree of objectivity should be maintained in evaluating creative works [and applied research] as in evaluating research. In some cases, it may be necessary to invite external evaluators to campus to view works or performances even though promotion and tenure review may be several years away” (IUPUI P&T Guidelines, 2014-15, p. 62).
	5. Evaluation of local impact by non-scholarly experts.
1. **JOINT AND ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS AND INVOLVEMENT IN MULTIPLE PROGRAMS**
2. Joint Appointments

When a candidate has a joint appointment with another department, program, center, or other University unit, a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the dean(s), the chair(s)/director(s) of all involved units, and the candidate is required that explicitly states the expectations of all units in the review process. The MOU should be developed at the time of appointment or when responsibilities change. For tenure-track and clinical-track faculty such an agreement should be in place by the time of the faculty member’s third-year review. A copy should be provided to the candidate at the same time that it is provided to the dean. It is important that to every extent possible annual reviews for the faculty member be conducted in a manner consistent with the review for promotion and tenure decisions. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should include a copy of the joint appointment MOU in an appendix to the promotion dossier.

1. Adjunct Appointments

In instances of an adjunct appointment, the chair of the primary appointment department should ensure that the primary committee consults with appropriate representatives of the external unit in a form that provides for adequate consideration of all relevant information.

1. Faculty without Adjunct or Joint Appointments Who Are Active in Another Program

Active participation in the activities of interdisciplinary programs may comprise an ongoing and integral part of a faculty member's professional activities. To the extent that this is so, these efforts should be recognized, alongside other relevant activities, in the evaluation procedures for promotion and tenure.

* 1. Candidates will be asked to include, as part of their promotion and tenure dossier, a detailed statement of all teaching, research, and service activities that they have undertaken as participants in the relevant interdisciplinary program.
	2. The chair of the candidate's home department shall request from the director or chair of the relevant department, center, or program a written evaluation of the degree and quality of the candidate's contributions for inclusion in the dossier. This evaluation will be written by the director of the program.
	3. Once documentation of a candidate's interdisciplinary or other program activities has been incorporated into the dossier, it will be considered at all stages of review and by all reviewers as integral to the evaluation of the candidate.
1. **GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING PUBLIC SCHOLARSHIP AND APPLIED SCHOLARSHIP**

Expectations for any kind of research remain fundamentally the same whether a candidate provides evidence through one kind or multiple kinds of scholarship. The variety of scholarship might include: public, applied, digital, and traditional. Whatever kind of scholarship candidates document, each candidate must demonstrate how their work satisfies the same basic criteria: What was the problem or issue engaged? What was produced within one’s discipline? Was the production collaborative in nature? How was the product vetted and peer reviewed? What is the audience for the scholarship? Where are the outlets of the scholarship and what impact did it have? Given the diversity of scholarship that exists, answers to these questions will be diverse. The following general guidelines focus on public and applied scholarship, but can also guide the evaluation of digital humanities scholarship.

1. General Guidelines
	1. The research, creative activities and other scholarship of public and applied scholars will take a variety of forms. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain and to document the quality and quantity of their work and the contribution to knowledge of their submissions.
	2. Public scholarship and applied scholarship may display considerable overlap between research and service. The result of such overlap creates scholarly activities in which service aspects enhance the impact of the research. Because of such overlap, candidates who apply for promotion and tenure should consider submitting their dossier as a balanced case.
	3. If public scholars and applied scholars choose research as their area of excellence, then publications in modes of dissemination are expected as evidence of scholarly work. Furthermore, candidates whose principal specialization is public or applied research are expected to present papers and to participate in scholarly meetings and colloquia, demonstrating a commitment to current scholarship in the field.
	4. In addition to traditional publications, public and applied scholarship may also include such work as the securing of grants and research contracts for themselves, their students, and their collaborators; serving as consultants, working with a range of non-university groups and organizations, and participating in national organizations; scholarly editing; recorded oral documents; reports and collaborative projects; visual productions; exhibits; and other activities that demonstrate the application of scholarship to the needs of both the public and the profession.
	5. When public or applied scholarship is included in the dossier, it must be reviewed by peers in the candidate’s field if it is to contribute to the case for promotion and tenure. External reviewers should be asked to evaluate all aspects of candidates’ work including such items as letters from non-academics and professionals from other disciplines who are in a position to validate the candidate’s work, and show that it has made a contribution to knowledge within the discipline and/or to the range of audiences listed above.
	6. The value of multiple authors or collaborators should be considered as a basic part of public scholarship and applied scholarship. Such scholarship often involves substantial effort and time because it is often collaborative in nature and involves non-academic (e.g. community, business, government) groups that do not operate on academic calendars or promotion and tenure schedules.
	7. Public scholarship and applied scholarship may include some (appropriately approved) dissemination restrictions due to requirements of the client, partner, or community organization.
	8. Documented impact on the local community may be accorded the same weight as international, national, and regional impact. As such, when evaluating these forms of scholarship, national reputation can be established based on work that has a distinctly local focus and impact.
2. **GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING BALANCED-BINNED CASES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

The School of Liberal Arts fully supports the option for pursuing promotion as well as tenure based on a balanced-binned case of scholarly work in teaching, research and service. Candidates for this type of balanced case must present evidence of balanced strengths in teaching, research and service that together reflect excellent overall performance comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single primary area. The case should present evidence of *highly satisfactory* peer-reviewed scholarly work *as required by IUPUI guidelines*, which may or may not demonstrate integration of all three areas of endeavor. According to IUPUI promotion guidelines on balanced cases, as with promotion in excellence in one area and satisfactory performance in the other two, candidates for promotion need to show a “record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship” as well as an “emerging national reputation” for promotion to associate professor and “a sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank” for promotion to full professor.

Peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarly work is required to document highly satisfactory *in all three areas of a balanced case.*

To summarize, overall excellence in a balanced-binned case has the following characteristics:

* + A developed body of focused work that extends or advances knowledge and brings recognition.
	+ Dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship through publication, presentation, and/or other media.
	+ An emergent or sustained overall national reputation (as appropriate for rank).
	+ Significant products and/or outcomes.
	+ A reflective, systematic, and purposeful approach to scholarship.
	+ Evidence of quality work and significant achievement.
	+ In many cases, funding and/or awards (as appropriate for discipline and rank) that support and/or recognize scholarship and innovation.

Expectations for promotion on a balanced-binned case for clinical-line faculty are outlined in Appendix 5.

1. **GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING BALANCED-INTEGRATIVE CASES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

In the balanced-integrative case, the candidate’s activities and accomplishments are interrelated around a theme or philosophy. For the holistic argument, activities and achievements are not divided into the areas of teaching, research and service. In their statements, candidates present their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated quality and impact on a specific community. Balanced-integrative cases must show a cumulative record that supports an argument for overall excellence. Balanced-integrative cases share some of the characteristics of Public Scholarship or Applied Scholarship cases as well as balanced-binned cases, and so these guidelines draw on those outlined above as well as on the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. Candidates should also describe plans for the future.

All of the following should be evident, using multiple sources of information:

1. **Integrated Activity**:
	* By definition, work in balanced-integrative cases display considerable overlap between and integration of research/creative activity, teaching and service, including administration. Activities and accomplishments in one area of faculty work impact other areas. Because of such integration, the balanced-integrative case does not require the strict binning of activities into particular areas of faculty work (research/creative activity, teaching or service).
	* The case for overall excellence is based on the integrated record of scholarly work; that work does not need to be equally distributed across research/creative activity, teaching and service, but performance in any one area must on its own be at least satisfactory.
	* The scholarly activities of faculty may take a variety of forms. It is the responsibility of the candidate to explain and to document the integration as well as the quality, quantity, impact, and significance of their work in rank. Activities and products should show a reflective, systematic, and purposeful approach to scholarship.
2. **Independence, Innovation, and Initiative**: Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements and are often the norm with balanced-integrative cases. As independence, innovation, and initiative are key for documenting overall excellence, candidates need to describe and document their own roles and responsibilities as essential and generative actors in collaborative accomplishments.
3. **Impact on a Specific Community**: Distinct outcomes that impact a specific and definable community (which may include the school, campus or university) must be demonstrated. While referred to as “local community” in IUPUI P&T Guidelines, local refers to the focus of the work (i.e., on a specific community); the community where the work occurs does not need to itself be geographically “local,” although that is usually the case. Tying the outcomes to unit (program, department, school, campus or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact. As such, when evaluating these forms of scholarship, reputation for excellence can be established based on work that has a distinctly specific/local focus and impact.
4. **Scholarly Impact**: While the type of scholarly work and the evidence to support accomplishments in balanced-integrative cases may differ from traditional forms of scholarship, academic peer review is required as a component of assessing scholarly impact.
	* Candidates for balanced-integrative cases may present evidence of dissemination reflecting scholarly impact through venues other than traditional publications. Scholarly outcomes and dissemination may include community projects, program development, documentation of activism, community resources, student-focused initiatives, exhibits, websites, interdisciplinary work and/or other non-traditional products or communication. Non-traditional activities, products, dissemination outlets, and alternative metrics may be acceptable forms of documentation.
	* For balanced-integrative cases, scholarly impact is typically not exclusively documented by peer-reviewed publication. Professional peer review as well as other indicators, including community letters, may be appropriate for assessing some components of faculty work. As relevant, qualitative and quantitative input from local constituencies can be an essential element of peer review and demonstrating the impact of integrative work.
	* Evidence of achievement of distinctive outcomes through administrative, committee or voluntary service may also support the claim of excellence in balanced-integrative cases. Such evidence typically is characterized the following:
		+ Command and application of advanced/scholarly knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
		+ Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
		+ Achievement of intentional outcomes that support the institutional values of IUPUI; and
		+ Evidence of quality and impact. For example, disseminating work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong indication of quality and impact.
	* External reviewers should be asked to evaluate all aspects of candidates’ integrative work, including such items as solicited letters from non-academics and professionals from other disciplines who are in a position to validate the candidate’s work and show that it has made a notable contribution to knowledge within the discipline and/or to the range of audiences targeted by the scholarly work.

**Criteria for Promotion for the Balanced-Integrative Case**

A balanced-integrative case presents a holistic argument for excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities. Activities in each area of teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service should be at least satisfactory (according to unit and campus criteria) before making a claim for the overall record to be evaluated as excellent.

* Promotion to associate professor: Candidate will have led or been an essential part of endeavors with distinct and demonstrable outcomes impacting a specific community, which may include contributions to the unit and university, Indianapolis and/or Indiana, as well as any distinct and definable community in the U.S. or internationally. National or international dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of the work.
* Promotion to full professor: Through sustained and significant impact, the candidate will be seen as a leader in the specific community in which they work and will also have achieved a national or international reputation through their work.

***Balanced-Integrative: Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)***

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is one of IUPUI’s institutional values:

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

The balanced-integrative DEI case is an approved option for demonstrating overall excellence across an array of integrated, scholarly activities aligned with supporting and advancing diversity, equity, and/or inclusion at the level of school, campus, local community, and/or field. As outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, diversity, equity and inclusion are defined broadly as follows:

*Diversity*: Perceived human differences in appearance, thinking, and actions, shaped by historical and social systems of advantage and disadvantage. Diversity includes but is not limited to intersectional identities formed around ideas and experiences related to race, ethnicity, class, color, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, size, disability, veteran status, national origin, religion, and/or marital status.

*Equity*: The promotion of access, opportunity, justice, and fairness through policies and practices that are appropriate for specific individuals and groups. While the term “equality” recognizes a common humanity, “equity” recognizes the distinct needs of individuals and groups, which cannot be addressed with generalized solutions that fail to acknowledge structural inequities.

*Inclusion*: An approach designed to ensure that the thoughts, opinions, perspectives, and experiences of all individuals are valued, heard, encouraged, respected, and considered. While “diversity” ensures adequate representation of human difference, “inclusion” solicits and centers diverse contributions.

IUPUI P&T Guidelines outline expectations for documenting integrative-excellence in DEI. Relevant evidence includes a statement of DEI philosophy; description of integrated DEI activities and accomplishments; discussion of personal role in group-based DEI activities; demonstration of scholarly impact; demonstration of local impact on a specific community; and plans for the future.

In addition, review of balanced-integrative DEI accomplishments should take into account the faculty member’s investment in activities that support and advance DEI; these may include but are not limited to building community relationships; engaging in action that promotes equity; engaging in reciprocal learning and project definition; experimenting with inclusive and collaborative methods; writing grants to support collaboration with faculty, students and stakeholders; serving as consultants; working with a range of non-university groups and organizations; participating in local and national organizations; reports and collaborative projects; and other activities that demonstrate the application of scholarly effort to the local community and to the profession.

1. **GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING BALANCED CASES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

For both clinical and lecturer lines, the School of Liberal Arts supports the available options for pursuing promotion on balanced cases. Clinical and lecturer lines may both seek promotion based on a balanced-integrative DEI case. Clinical lines also have the option to seek promotion based on a balanced-integrative thematic case as well as the balanced-binned case, as outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

**Balanced Integrative Cases**

Non-tenure track faculty seeking promotion on a balanced-integrative case should present work with these characteristics, as described above for tenure-line faculty: (a) integrated activity; (b) independence, innovation, and initiative; and (c) impact on a specific community. All clinical-line faculty as well as lecturer-line faculty seeking promotion to Teaching Professor also have expectations for peer-reviewed dissemination of their work showing scholarly impact appropriate for the rank they are seeking as well as sustained excellence over time. (Note: lecturer-line faculty seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer are not expected to have peer-reviewed dissemination of their work.)

***Balanced-Integrative-Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Case***

All non-tenure track faculty may seek promotion on a balanced-integrative-DEI case, as described above for tenure-line faculty, presenting evidence as appropriate for faculty line and rank sought, as outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

***Balanced-Integrative-Thematic Case***

The balanced-integrative-thematic case is an option for clinical line faculty. Criteria and expectations for balanced-integrative-thematic cases are outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

**Balanced Binned Case**

The balanced-binned case is an option for clinical line faculty. Criteria and expectations for balanced-binned cases are outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines as well as in Appendix 5 of these guidelines.

1. **GUIDELINES FOR EXTENDING AN OFFER FOR TENURE TO A SEARCH CANDIDATE**

*Any candidate in a search being considered for a position with tenure must be scheduled to meet with the IUPUI Chief Academic Officer (or designee) during the campus interview process (prior to the offer request).* For candidates who are at the rank of associate or full professorwho come from a comparable or better research institution AND who have been through a tenure review process successfully, the review process, beyond what is otherwise required, must also include:

* Three additional letters of reference (for a total of six letters) solicited by the chair or search committee chair that are independent of suggestions by the candidate. NOTE: the three letters solicited must meet the arm’s-length and peer-institution criteria required for tenure review; the three letters provided by the candidate as part of the application process do not have to meet that standard. The chair must provide brief biographical statements on all external reviewers using the same format as required for the P&T dossier.
* Personal statement by the candidate addressing research, teaching and service as appropriate, if not included in the letter of application.
* Peer and summary student evaluations of teaching, if available.
* Endorsement by the dean.

For candidates who are not coming from a comparable or better research institution and/or have not previously been through a successful tenure review, then along with the above items an expedited tenure review process must also be conducted as part of the offer approval process. Candidates may want to provide longer personal statements that more thoroughly address their area of excellence (teaching, research, service, or balanced case) if this is not fully articulated in their application letters. The expedited review process includes the following additional steps:

* Endorsement by the department primary committee or by all faculty with tenure and appropriate rank.
* Endorsement by the chair.
* Endorsement by the school P&T committee.

For an expedited tenure review, letters of endorsement from each of the levels of review need only indicate support for the appointment with tenure; a detailed rationale is not needed if the evaluation is positive. Votes of committees should be included in the committee letters. If the school P&T committee disagrees with the department recommendation, then the Guidelines for Divergent Recommendations (Section XII) should be followed as appropriate.

Procedures for candidates for executive leadership positions may vary, but the spirit of these review guidelines should be followed as closely as possible.

1. **GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR NEGATIVE AND DIVERGENT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION**

Several areas of the IUPUI P&T Guidelines and the School P&T Guidelines give guidance for when there are negative and/or divergent recommendations for tenure, including the opportunity to add materials/comments to a dossier in response. Candidates, chairs, committees and the dean are expected to be familiar with and follow these guidelines and policies.

1. Reconsideration of a Negative Recommendation for Tenure
2. *IUPUI P&T Guidelines* – See the following sections:
* “Department Chair Responsibilities”
* “Dean Responsibilities”
* “Addition of Materials/Comments”
* “Reconsideration”
1. Documenting Reconsideration Request and Response:
* The candidate’s reconsideration request should be uploaded by the candidate into the “Supplemental – Post Submission” folder of the eDossier within the designated timeframe for making the request.
* If the first negative review occurs at the school level and a consultation between the School Committee and the department (primary committee and/or chair) occurs, as allowed by IUPUI P&T Guidelines, the consultation is noted in the School Committee’s response to the reconsideration request, including notice of whether the vote of the School Committee was changed.
	+ - No definition of consultation is given, so the form of the consultation can and may vary from case to case. The consultation typically takes the form of a joint meeting of selected committee representatives.
		- The associate dean for faculty affairs or other representative of the dean’s office will facilitate the consultation and will serve as a moderator during the consultation.
		- During the consultation, discussion should note the relative importance of criteria, principles, or evidence used in the evaluation that led to the contrary recommendation.
		- Every effort should be made for the consultation to occur before the request for reconsideration deadline passes for the candidate.
* Requests for reconsideration require a written response from the level at which the request was made. Responses to the reconsideration request are uploaded to the “Internal Review Letters” folder.
1. “Divergent” Recommendations on Promotion

Candidates do not have the right to request reconsideration of a negative recommendation for promotion, unless it occurs in the context of a reconsideration request of a negative evaluation for tenure, or otherwise allowed by the Chief Academic Officer.

* If the School P&T Committee offers an evaluation that is divergent from the department with regard to promotion, the department may request additional feedback on the decision, but the School P&T Committee cannot be asked to reconsider its evaluation.
* Candidates may respond to a negative recommendation for promotion at the department or school level by providing a response and/or additional material in the Supplemental folder of eDossier for other levels of review to consider.
	+ When substantive materials are added, the leader of that particular level (committee chair, chair, or dean) should document that the committee or they have received the new materials and have decided whether to re-vote.
1. Addition of Materials/Comments to the eDossier:

The addition of new material or comments to the eDossier by the candidate are addressed in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines in the section “Addition of Materials/Comments.”

If the department Primary Committee, school P&T Committee, the chair or the dean want clarification or other explanation of information in the candidate section of the dossier, the committee chair or the administrator (chair or dean) must make the request for additional information in writing to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, who will forward this request to the candidate. Corrections, changes or other responses made by the candidate should be uploaded to the Supplemental – Post Submission folder of eDossier, along with the original request. If the candidate does not provide changes, corrections, or explanations, reviewers should address this in their reviews. All evidence for decisions made about promotion or tenure must be included in the dossier itself (See IU policy ACA-37).

APPENDIX 1

Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure

# Chairs are required to fill out and return this form to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs by no later than the fourth Monday in April for each candidate that the department will be considering for promotion and/or tenure in August.

Department:

Chair:

Candidate:

P&T Type: ☐ Tenure;

☐ To Associate Professor (☐ Clinical); ☐ To Professor (☐ Teaching; ☐ Clinical) ☐ To Senior Lecturer

Basis for Promotion: ☐ Research/Creative Activity; ☐ Teaching; ☐ Service

☐ Balanced-Binned; ☐ Balanced-Integrative: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

List department Primary Committee members, including rank. Indicate the chair. NOTE:

# According to campus policy, primary committees must have enough members to result in at least four approve/disapprove votes being recorded. (Abstentions are not considered a vote.)

* Those voting for a promotion must at least hold the rank being sought by the candidate.
* Those voting for tenure must hold tenure.

NAME RANK

Check all that apply:

# The candidate does Public/Applied Scholarship.

* The candidate has a joint appointment with another unit:
* The candidate’s appointment is described in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MOU is attached to this form.
* The candidate has an adjunct appointment in another unit:
* The candidate is the department chair.
* The candidate has an extended tenure clock or is going up for P&T early.
* Other:

REQUIRED:

* **Candidate has been informed that final dossiers are due to the department by August 1**.

APPENDIX 2

## The Nature of Community Engagement and the Evaluation of Public and Applied Scholarship

The School of Liberal Arts recognizes the campus definition of public scholarship as part of the criteria available for promotion and tenure. According to the campus guidelines, “IUPUI defines public scholarship as an intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is responsive to public audiences and non-academic peer review. It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing production of knowledge with community stakeholders.”

This appendix is intended to point to documents, located in the Faculty/Staff Portal on the School website, that expand on the explanation of public scholarship in the main body of the Promotion and Tenure guidelines, and to demonstrate how a candidate might demonstrate public scholarship as part of their dossier.

The first document, labeled “Public Scholarship Concept Paper,” is the product of a Faculty Learning Community designated to discuss and generate a deeper, more complete understanding of public scholarship in terms of annual faculty reviews and promotion and tenure dossiers. To this end, the concept paper offers discussions of key terms related to the definition of public scholarship and ways to evaluate public scholarship from the perspective of chairs, primary committees, and promotion and tenure committees.

The second document, labeled “Scholarly Activity Mapping—Part I,” is a resource developed by Dr. Mary Price of the Center for Service and Learning to assist candidates in identifying whether or not their work meets the scope and definition of public scholarship. The exercise detailed in this document encourages faculty to consider the terms that distinguish scholarship that is co-created with communities or the public from scholarship that does not require the co- creation of knowledge with non-academic communities. The benefit of this exercise is to provide candidates who produce community-engaged scholarship with a system of thinking about how they will document their work.

The third document, labeled “Strategies for Developing and Documenting Products of Public Scholarship in Research and Creative Activity, [Teaching, and Service],” helps faculty early in their careers consider different methods for documenting public scholarship. The document’s main purpose is to emphasize the need to plan out how faculty will make a case for promotion and tenure based on scholarship that has community engagement and the co-creation of knowledge at its core. The document also contains suggested guidance for chairs and primary committees that need to evaluate a candidate’s dossier based on public scholarship. Such guidance includes consideration of time to completion and types of scholarship as well as how departments can identify peers who are qualified to evaluate public scholarship.

# APPENDIX 3

TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI

Candidates will be evaluated with regard to their performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service as stipulated in the Academic Handbook. It is expected that the candidate should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be satisfactory in the others. In some cases, the candidate may present evidence of a balance of strengths (the balanced-binned case) or may present a balanced-integrative case with an approved focus (e.g., diversity, equity and inclusion). In all cases, the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Specifically, the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean of Liberal Arts will use the following criteria in evaluating the relevant categories:

***Areas of Excellence:***

* 1. If research or other creative activity or public and applied scholarship, including collaborative work, is the primary criterion for tenure and promotion, the candidate must have achieved a major body of work in a substantial field, and must provide evidence of scholarly work for the future. The quality of this work must be demonstrated by evidence of letters, both internal and external, and by other pertinent documentation.
	2. If the primary criterion for tenure and promotion is teaching, the candidate must have demonstrated a superior ability and interest in stimulating in students a genuine desire for study and creative work. Candidates should also provide evidence of a significant educational impact on their particular discipline or across disciplines, both inside and outside the School of Liberal Arts. Evidence of outstanding teaching might include indications of the success of students, student and peer evaluations, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, active participation in organizations and initiatives devoted to teaching, and other pertinent documentation.
	3. If the primary criterion for tenure and promotion is service, the service should be exceptional and the documentation should demonstrate the impact of this service on the candidate’s profession as well as contributions to the institution and the community.
	4. For a balanced-binned case, the candidate’s overall contribution to the School of Liberal Arts, the University or one of its constituent units must be shown to be comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single primary area, with work in each of the three areas clearly more than satisfactory (i.e., “highly satisfactory”). In research, this requires evidence of significant contribution to a substantial field. In teaching, it requires evidence of a significant contribution to teaching inside the School of Liberal Arts, and, where possible, outside it. And in service, it requires evidence of significant impact on the School of Liberal Arts and/or discipline. Within the current balanced-binned case framework, peer-reviewed dissemination is required in both research and teaching.
	5. For a balanced-integrative case the candidate should demonstrate excellence across a coherent array of integrated scholarly activities based on a relevant theme that demonstrates excellence comparable to that of a candidate with a single primary area. The candidate will have been an essential part of – and for promotion to professor, will have led – endeavors with distinct and demonstrable local outcomes; local refers to either or both of campus/university and local community. National dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of work; for promotion to full professor, the candidate should have national and/or international reputation. The quality of the work should be demonstrated by evidence of letters from peers and appropriate stakeholders, both internal and external, and by other pertinent documentation. Note that balance-integrative cases focused on DEI have specific expectations articulated in both the IUPUI and School P&T Guidelines.

There should be strong indications in the dossier that the candidate will maintain and enhance the level of performance on which the awarding of tenure is to be based.

The tenure and promotion process should take into account the population within which candidates are to be evaluated. Evaluation of the quality of the teaching, research and creative activity, and service of candidates for tenure and promotion is to be comparable to that of individuals who have recently received tenure or who have recently been promoted at other major universities.

***Satisfactory Performance***

In all cases except for balanced-binned and balanced-integrative cases, candidates must demonstrate at least “satisfactory” performance in whichever areas they are not seeking to demonstrate “excellence” for promotion and show that they have performed all the basic functions and duties of a faculty member. For the balanced-integrative case, at least satisfactory performance is required in each of the three areas of faculty work (research, teaching, and service) with overall excellence shown by the case as a whole. For the balanced-binned case, candidates must show at least “highly satisfactory” performance in each of the three areas of faculty work with the overall contribution shown to be comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single primary area.

Satisfactory performance in each of the three areas of faculty work are outlined in the IU School of Liberal Arts Faculty Work Document.

APPENDIX 4

**Promotion Criteria for the Lecturer Ranks**

**IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI**

**Approved March 6, 2020**

This document outlines the IU School of Liberal Arts’ criteria for promotion within the lecturer ranks. A candidate for promotion either from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer or from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor will be evaluated by the school criteria set forth below, as well as the more general criteria provided in the *IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers* and the more specific criteria approved by the candidate’s department.

Promotion is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. The candidate seeking promotion in the lecturer ranks is required to show a record that is excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service. In accordance with university and campus policy, evaluation of a candidate’s record will take into account the mission of the candidate’s unit and the particular contributions to that mission that are expected of the candidate.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer is normally considered during the sixth year in rank as Lecturer, but promotion may be sought sooner or later than this time frame. Promotion to Teaching Professor may be sought at any time by a Senior Lecturer; as promotion is based on work done in rank, five years is the common (but not required) minimum length of time before advancement.1

One or more teaching related activities or achievements, properly documented,2 are expected when making the case for excellence in teaching, in conjunction with the specific criteria outlined below for each promotion rank. For promotion to both Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor these activities/achievements may include, but are not limited to: important contributions to the curriculum of the department, school, or campus; notable contributions in advising and mentoring; effective pedagogical innovations, including the effective use of technology; leadership in teaching; demonstrated impact on former students; significant participation in teaching workshops, panels, and conferences; the securing of, or participation in, grants for teaching-related projects; contribution to the success and retention of first-year students; outreach and impact on K-12 education; outreach to adult learners; contributions to the documentation and assessment of student learning; and/or pedagogical or disciplinary research or creative activity and its publication, presentation, or application in support of teaching.

# **Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

**Excellent Performance in Teaching.** In demonstrating teaching excellence, candidates must show convincing evidence that their performance in the classroom has been of high quality, as judged by departmental standards and evaluated in peer reviews, and that they have made important and documented contributions to student learning at the school and/or campus levels. Candidates must also show evidence of having shared teaching-related ideas and/or activities *locally or internally* through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation or other means. Candidates are also required to provide: a teaching philosophy that is informed by best practices and is reflective in nature, clearly showing continuous efforts to grow and improve professionally as a teacher; documentation of one or more influential and effective teaching-related activities/achievements (see above).

**Satisfactory Performance in Service:**  In demonstrating satisfactory service, the candidate must show convincing evidence that the candidate’s service to the program, department, and/or school has been satisfactory in quality as well as in quantity. Service may include, but is not limited to, professional and university service, committee membership, and community work directly related to the candidate’s disciplinary expertise.

# **Criteria for Promotion to Teaching Professor**

**Excellent Performance in Teaching.** Including the criteria outlined for promotion to Senior Lecturer, those seeking promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor also must successfully document:

* an ongoing commitment to highly effective, high-impact teaching practices and important contributions to student learning, whether in the classroom, online, or other instructional contexts.
* a record of positive contributions over several years to the teaching mission of the unit, campus, or university that is broad in scope, such as the advising and/or mentoring of students.
* a sustained commitment to professional development and pedagogical excellence, which is often documented by teaching or other appropriate awards, memberships in teaching colloquia, and/or fellowships (e.g., FACET or Mosaic).
* a record of disseminated scholarly work through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation or other means not only at the school and/or campus level but typically (although not necessarily) also beyond the campus – in local/regional/national professional organizations, the community and/or Indiana University. Some form of peer review needs to be part of the documentation of scholarly work in teaching for promotion to Teaching Professor.

**Satisfactory Performance in Service.** The candidate must document a record of departmental, school, and/or campus committee involvement; some participation in professional organizations and/or service to outside groups is also expected.

-----------------------------------------------------------------

***NOTES:*** 1For a transition period through 2023-2024, each promotion case will be examined for a sustained record of excellence, regardless of the exact rank held at the time. This is because criteria and titles changed in 2020.

2Proper documentation of effective teaching practices and contributions to student learning is required in order to show excellence in teaching. See Appendix for recommendations on the types of evidence that are most informative.

**Appendix**

Direct evidence of effective teaching practice is generally preferred, but indirect evidence is also informative and appropriate. While not exhaustive, examples of evidence might include one or more of the following:

*Direct Evidence*

• Student ratings and comments, performance in subsequent courses or standardized tests, and/or publications or presentations resulting from coursework or mentoring.

• Sample documents related to course preparation and planning of individual classes within a full course, for example: (a) a comprehensive and relevant review of the literature related to the subject-matter (annotated bibliography); (b) outlines of the course contents; (c) annotated syllabi; (d) description of and rationale for print or electronic textbooks and other resources; (e) annotated copies of handouts and slides; (f) annotated sample class prep notes; (g) evidence of effective instructional technology use; (h) design of specific learning strategies and activities, innovative techniques; (i) copies of test questionnaires, sample copies of students exams, essays, field work reports, creative works; (j) rationales for grade evaluation measures and tabulation of grades throughout a course

• Peer reviews of those documents alongside a report about direct classroom observations

• Reflective self-evaluations, correlated to student ratings and peer reviews

• Solicited reports by students and colleagues about the quality of the candidate’s mentorship

*Indirect Evidence*

• Teaching and other appropriate awards recognizing effectiveness

• Retrospective evaluations from former students; letters received from students (solicited or unsolicited).

• Students’ success on the job market, on getting accepted in a graduate program, and suchlike

• Ratings in respect to teaching in annual reviews

• Learning outcome measures, inferred from student performance and “productivity,” and aggregated

• Participation in CTL and/or CSL workshops, seminars, professional meetings

• Participation in curriculum/course development or supervision of honors, MA or PhD thesis.

APPENDIX 5

# Promotion Criteria for Clinical Faculty

# School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI

This document outlines the IU School of Liberal Arts’ criteria for promotion within the clinical ranks, including the awarding of long-term (multi-year) contracts. Candidates for clinical positions should be practitioners who have at least three years of appropriate experience in the clinical, professional, or community context as well as academic achievements [for example, a terminal degree or published work in their field] in keeping with their appointment.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Clinical Professor is normally considered during the sixth year at the Assistant Clinical Professor rank. In exceptional cases, promotion to Associate Clinical Professor may be pursued after the third-year review during the fourth or fifth year in rank. The Promotion to Clinical Professor may be sought at any time by an Associate Clinical Professor; however, this promotion is typically recommended after a period of five or more years at the Associate Clinical Professor rank.

In order to be awarded promotion, the candidate may demonstrate (1) excellence in teaching and at least satisfactory service, (2) excellence in service and at least satisfactory teaching, or (3) a balanced case that is highly satisfactory in both service and teaching.

Research is not a category for evaluation of clinical faculty performance. However, research and creative activity may be used to support the categories of teaching and service where appropriate.

# Criteria for Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

To be judged as excellent in either teaching or service, assistant clinical professors seeking promotion to the rank of associate clinical professor are expected to have developed at least a local or regional reputation, with scholarly contributions disseminated in peer-reviewed forums relevant to their work locally, regionally, or nationally.

The criteria for promotion include:

# TEACHING

**Excellent Performance in Teaching.** The candidate must successfully document a commitment to pedagogy through highly effective teaching and important contributions to student learning, as judged by departmental standards, whether in the classroom, online, or other instructional contexts. In demonstrating teaching excellence, candidates must have a record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching at the local or regional level (at least), such as through local/regional or national presentations or workshops, curricular products, or publications, consultations, grants, teaching awards, memberships in teaching colloquia or fellowships (e.g., FACET or Mosaic). In addition to student and peer evaluations, there are many activities and achievements that candidates should also engage in addition to substantiate further their excellence in teaching, including professional development and advising or mentoring of students.

**Highly Satisfactory Performance in Teaching** (for balanced cases)**.** The candidate must successfully document a commitment to pedagogy through effective and innovative teaching, as judged by departmental standards. The candidate must successfully document an emerging record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching at the local or regional level, such as, local/regional or national presentations or workshops, consultations, grants, teaching awards, memberships in teaching colloquia or fellowships (e.g., FACET or Mosaic), curricular products, or publications. A candidate should also provide additional evidence of effective teaching through professional development and impactful advising or mentoring of students.

**Satisfactory Performance in Teaching.** The candidate must document a record of teaching that is in keeping with departmental and university objectives (e.g., Profiles of Learning), as well as performance in advising, and mentoring; the pursuit of professional development in teaching should also be documented (e.g., workshops, involvement with the Center for Teaching & Learning).

# SERVICE

**Excellent Performance in Service.** The candidate must document significantly more than a routine amount of involvement in, as well as some leadership of, service activities of outstanding quality and effectiveness, including involvement (where appropriate) in the outreach efforts of the School of Liberal Arts to its various constituencies. Additionally, evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service at the campus level and beyond must be evident. For professional service, the candidate must document that these activities have contributed to the betterment of the School or disciplinary field. In addition, the candidate must show a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in service at the local or regional level or beyond, such as presentations or workshops, consultations, grants, service awards, or publications.

**Highly Satisfactory Performance in Service** (for balanced cases)**.** The candidate must document more than a routine amount of involvement in service activities of quality and effectiveness, including involvement (where appropriate) in the outreach efforts of the School of Liberal Arts to its various constituencies. There should be evidence of involvement in one or more initiatives over a period of time that contributed to the unit goals or school mission; independent documentation should be provided to show significance, impact, role and effective communication with others. For professional service, the candidate must document that these activities have contributed to the betterment of the School or disciplinary field. In addition, the candidate must show an emerging record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in service at the local or regional level or beyond, such as presentations and workshops, consultations, grants, service awards, or publications.

**Satisfactory Performance in Service.** The candidate must document a record of departmental, school, or university committee involvement and some participation in professional organizations or service to outside groups.

# Additional Criteria

In addition to consideration of teaching and service activities, long-term appointment recommendations should be based on an expectation of the candidate’s future achievements, as determined by dependability, growth, originality, potential, and versatility of the candidate’s work in relation to the mission of the School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI and of the particular unit within the School to which the faculty member is assigned. That is, careful consideration should be given to the individual faculty member’s potential contribution to the unit and School missions.

# Criteria for Promotion to Clinical Professor

Promotion in rank to clinical professor requires at least some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship. However, the expectations for the quantity and impact of such scholarship must be moderated by the teaching and service loads of the candidate.

The criteria for promotion to clinical professor include:

# TEACHING

**Excellent Performance in Teaching.** The candidate must document consistently outstanding performance in teaching, through modes of instruction, advising, and mentoring, that demonstrates student academic and professional achievement. Candidates should provide evidence of a significant educational impact on their particular discipline or across disciplines, including inside or outside the School of Liberal Arts. Evidence of outstanding teaching might include teaching awards (school, campus, university, or disciplinary), indications of the success of students, student and peer evaluations, publication of textbooks or other curricular materials, active participation and leadership in organizations and initiatives devoted to teaching, or curriculum/program development and assessment. Additionally, the candidate must document a record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching at the local or regional level as well as show attainment of national visibility for scholarly contributions to teaching, such as presentations or workshops, consultations, grants, teaching awards, memberships in teaching colloquia or fellowships (e.g., FACET or Mosaic), curricular products or publications.

**Highly Satisfactory Performance in Teaching** (for balanced cases)**.** The candidate must successfully document an ongoing commitment to pedagogy through effective and innovative teaching, as judged by departmental standards. The candidate must successfully document a record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching at the local or regional level (or beyond), such as, local/regional or national presentations or workshops, consultations, grants, teaching awards, memberships in teaching colloquia or fellowships (e.g., FACET or Mosaic), curricular products, or publications. A candidate should provide additional evidence of effective teaching through professional development and impactful advising or mentoring of students.

**Satisfactory Performance in Teaching.** The candidate must document a record of teaching that is in keeping with departmental and university objectives (e.g., Profiles of Learning), as well as performance in advising or mentoring; the pursuit of involvement in professional development in teaching should also be documented (e.g., workshops, involvement with the Center for Teaching & Learning).

# SERVICE

**Excellent Performance in Service.** The candidate must document the nature and impact of service, including leadership roles, well beyond the routine expectations of professional educators, including involvement (where appropriate) in the outreach efforts of the School of Liberal Arts to its various constituencies. Additionally, evidence of an established reputation for excellence in professional service (service that is directly tied to the candidate’s field of knowledge) beyond the local level must be provided, including involvement in and contributions to organizations and professional service at the national level. For professional service, the candidate must document that these activities have contributed to the betterment of the School or disciplinary field. In addition, the candidate must document a record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in service at the local or regional level as well as show attainment of national visibility for scholarly contributions to service, such as presentations or workshops, consultations, grants, service awards, or publications.

**Highly Satisfactory Performance in Service** (for balanced cases)**.** The candidate must document a major role in one or more service activities of quality and effectiveness over a period of time, including involvement (where appropriate) in the outreach efforts of the School of Liberal Arts to its various constituencies. Additionally, evidence of active and ongoing professional service (service that is directly tied to the candidate’s field of knowledge) beyond the local level must be evident, including some involvement in and contributions to organizations and professional service at the national level. Independent documentation should be provided to show significance, impact, role and effective communication with others. In addition, the candidate must document a record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in service at the local or regional level, such as presentations, workshops, consultations, grants, or publications; while most work may be local or regional in nature, at least some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required.

**Satisfactory Performance in Service.** The candidate must document performance of a range of departmental, school, or university committee assignments, as well as participation in professional organizations or service to outside groups at the local or regional level or beyond.

*Approved by School of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly November 10, 2017*

APPENDIX 6

POLICY ON CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI

This document establishes the guidelines for clinical ranks for the IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI. This document is supplemental to the administrative policies of Indiana University as and the IUPUI Supplement to the IU Faculty Handbook. The policy stated in the Indiana University Academic Handbook regarding clinical ranks is provided in Appendix A. In addition to IU policy, the School of Liberal Arts establishes these additional guidelines for academic instructional appointments of full-time clinical rank faculty.

## Context

In 1987, Indiana University approved the concept of non-tenure track faculty appointments for individuals engaged in teaching in or for clinical services in the area of health care. In 1996, other schools were extended the opportunity to create clinical positions where faculty are engaged in other client services. In the School of Liberal Arts, clinical appointments are appropriate for individuals who teach and provide service based on the knowledge and skills for clinical, professional and community work that is directed toward patients, clients, or community members.

## Distinctions between Lecturer-Line and Clinical-line Appointments

*Lecturer Lines*

According to the IU Academic Handbook, “Lecturers are academic appointees whose primary responsibility is teaching. Lecturers’ assigned responsibilities may include research and service only in support of teaching.” Faculty who primarily teach and provide service to students in undergraduate and graduate programs not focused on clinical, professional, or community settings should be appointed as lecturers.

Titles: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Teaching Professor.

*Clinical Lines*

According to the IU Academic Handbook and IUPUI campus policy, “The prefix ‘Clinical’ is used for appointees whose primary duties are teaching students and residents/fellows and providing professional service in the clinical setting.” Consequently, clinical appointments in the School of Liberal Arts are appropriate for those whose work primarily involves teaching and providing service in clinical, professional, and/or community contexts.

Clinical appointees contribute to the teaching mission of the School by contributing their professional experience and expertise to the professional preparation and development of the School’s students. Clinical appointees contribute to the service mission of the school through service in their areas of professional expertise, including establishing and maintaining linkages between the School, its students, and the professional and public communities associated with their respective fields. This service may include applied research or applied professional expertise in a manner consistent with the guidelines for applied research for the School of Liberal Arts. Clinical faculty should have expertise and experience not normally found in the tenure-track professoriate. The expectation is that this experience will be introduced into the classroom setting, will benefit students through advising, and will benefit the School through the individual’s professional service activities.

According to the IU Academic Handbook, individuals holding clinical appointments may be involved in research that derives from their clinical/professional experiences, but “continued appointment and advancement in rank must be based on performance in teaching and service.” Titles: Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, or Assistant Clinical Professor.

## Appointment

Candidates for clinical positions should be practitioners who have at least three years of appropriate experience in the clinical, professional, or community context as well as academic achievements in keeping with their appointment. [For example, someone hired as a clinical assistant professor of museum collections management should have a minimum of a terminal degree such as the PhD and three years of professional museum experience.]

*Term of Appointment*

Initial appointments for assistant clinical professors shall be one to three years during a probationary period of not more than seven years. Appointments for associate clinical professors and clinical professors will typically be five to seven years, and renewable after review. The process for appointment with probationary status or appointment with a long-term contract at the rank of associate clinical professor or clinical professor shall go through the ordinary procedures for faculty appointments.

The primary duties of faculty members holding clinical rank in the School of Liberal Arts are teaching and providing professional services such as service to students, the department, the school, the university, the community, and the profession.

Teaching load and service requirements will be based on the policy that a full-time teaching load in Liberal Arts is a 4-4 course load for ten-months, with adjustments depending on other expectations of the appointment. In the case of clinical appointments, reallocation of teaching load in support of administrative responsibilities and/or professional service, plus scholarship of teaching and service, will be negotiated with the chair or program director, in consultation with the Dean.

*Termination Notice*

The termination notice shall be announced to the appointee in a time frame consistent with campus policies.

## Procedures and criteria

*Ongoing Reviews*

Annual Review: Clinical faculty are reviewed annually in accordance with established department or program procedures for full-time faculty of comparable rank. The faculty member shall submit the faculty annual report and other materials required by the department/program for this purpose. Annual merit increases in salary should follow the same guidelines established for other faculty in the department.

Third-Year Review: During the third year after the initial appointment of assistant clinical professor, the department/program primary committee, the chair/director and the school's Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review the appointee, following established procedures for third-year review of tenure-line faculty.

Reappointment Review: As continuing appointment must be based on satisfactory performance in teaching and service, clinical professors and associate clinical professors who have earned long-term appointments shall be reviewed by both the unit primary committee and chair/director prior to another long-term reappointment. The faculty member should provide a personal statement that describes contributions to the teaching and service missions of the school and a CV. External review is not required, but may be solicited, for reappointment after promotion; if solicited, reviews must be included with the request for reappointment that is submitted to the dean.

Longer term appointments offered to non-tenure-track faculty do not carry the same guarantees as tenure. A faculty member in clinical ranks will be reappointed only if his or her performance is judged by the department/program and dean to be effective. Reappointment is also contingent upon the continued existence of the expedient need which created the demand for the position and upon the continued consonance of the position with the academic mission of the department or unit.

*Promotion*

As indicated in the IU Academic Handbook, clinical appointees are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as assistant clinical professors shall be reviewed and given long-term contracts after a probationary period of not more than seven years. Clinical faculty shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in teaching or professional service, with satisfactory performance in the other, based on the expectations of their appointment.

No later than the start of the sixth year of appointment, assistant clinical professors will submit a dossier for promotion in keeping with the expectations outlined in the IUPUI Dean of Faculties Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for associate clinical professor. This includes independent review by peers external to IUPUI or the department/program. Promotion to Clinical Professor requires independent review by peers external to IUPUI. Reviews for consideration of promotion to associate clinical professor and clinical professor will go through the normal faculty procedures for the school, including review by the primary unit, the school P&T committee, dean, and the campus P&T committee.

*Criteria for Promotion*

The faculty of each unit using Assistant and Associate Clinical Professor appointments shall adopt criteria for promotion that are appropriate to the duties that may be assigned to clinical appointees. Those criteria must follow campus and university standards, be written, available to unit faculty, and filed with the campus academic officer.

The campus standards for excellence for promotion in the clinical professor ranks, as well as the expectations for external peer review, are indicated in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines in the “Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories.”

The school criteria for promotion to clinical associate professors and clinical professor are outlined in the document, “Promotion Criteria for Clinical Faculty.”

At the end of the probationary period, an unsatisfactory promotion review shall lead to termination of the appointment in keeping with campus policy. In the event of negative reappointment decisions, advance notice must be given per campus policy.

Salary increases based on promotion shall follow the school guidelines for tenure-lines for promotion to clinical associate professor and clinical professor.

*Sabbatical-like Leaves*

Clinical faculty are not eligible for University sabbatical leaves, but clinical faculty who have earned promotion (clinical associate professors and clinical professors) may apply for sabbatical-like leaves following the guidelines established by the school for the lecturer ranks.

*School-Supported Grants & Awards*

Because clinical faculty are evaluated and promoted based only on their work in teaching and service, it is expected that clinical faculty will primarily pursue teaching- or service- focused grants and awards. Consequently, clinical faculty may not be the PI or Co-PI for grants requiring school support that are research in nature, unless the research is clearly in support of teaching or service.

Clinical-line faculty are eligible for Trustee Teaching Awards following the same criteria used to evaluate lecturer-line faculty.

*School and Department Service*

Faculty appointed to these ranks are expected to participate in departmental activities that are pertinent to the tasks assigned them. In return, departments are expected to provide the necessary resources for teaching and service responsibilities.

Although the input of non-tenure-track faculty may be solicited on any aspect of departmental business, they should not cast a vote in decisions regarding the hiring, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of tenure-track faculty. However, tenured and tenure-track faculty may establish departmental procedures that allow non-tenure-track faculty to vote on hiring and promotion decisions concerning non-tenure-track faculty of their rank. It is important that the research and teaching missions of the department or unit remain within the purview of faculty on tenured or tenure-track lines. Non-tenure- track faculty may play an important role in determining how best to implement the teaching and service missions of the department, but major decisions concerning curriculum and the overall direction of the department should be the responsibility of tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Furthermore, clinical rank faculty shall be eligible for membership on School, department, and program committees and have full voting rights on all matters except those involving the hiring, review, tenure, and promotion of tenured and tenure- probationary faculty. However, in keeping with IU policy as outlined in the IU Academic Handbook, clinical faculty “voting participation must be structured in a way that reserves at least 60% of voting weight to tenure track faculty.”

Also in keeping with the policy stated in the IU Academic Handbook, clinical faculty are not eligible for academic administrative appointments at and above the department chair level.

*Other Rights, Privileges, and Policies*

The IU Academic Handbook outlines other rights, privileges, and policies that govern clinical line appointments and other non-tenure line appointments.

Approved by the School of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly: April 18, 2014
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ASSOCIATE FACULTY PROMOTION POLICY

# IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI

Promotion to the rank of senior associate faculty is recognition of excellence in teaching in the School of Liberal Arts and a sign of confidence in future high-quality instruction. A candidate for promotion from associate faculty to senior associate faculty is required to show evidence of teaching excellence, including influence on student outcomes and accessibility to students. Convincing evidence will document instruction that has been of high quality and has made important contributions to student learning, using criteria established by the home department or program.

* 1. *Eligibility*

Associate faculty who have taught at least 18 credit hours *and* for at least four semesters in the School of Liberal Arts are eligible to submit a portfolio for review for promotion.

* 1. *Benefits*

Senior associate faculty will receive the following benefits:

* + 1. A 10% increase in the rate per credit hour for associate faculty at the time of the next academic year contract.
		2. When appropriate, as determined by the chair or program director, the opportunity to be considered for courses before those holding the rank of associate faculty.
		3. When appropriate, as determined by the chair or program director, the opportunity to be considered for courses for both semesters of the academic year.

*NOTE*: Per campus policy, the ability of associate faculty to be considered for promotion does not constitute tenure or the right to continuous contracts. Promoted associate faculty members will continue to be considered for future employment based on alignment of their skills with school needs.

* 1. *Promotion Materials*

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Associate Faculty will provide their department with evidence of teaching excellence. Departments have flexibility as to what materials will be provided, but it’s recommended that the materials include such things as student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-reflection on continuous teaching improvement and professional development, evidence of curriculum development, evidence of demonstrably inclusive teaching methods and evidence of impact on learning.

* 1. *Review Process*

Once associate faculty are eligible for promotion, they may submit their promotion portfolios to the department chair or program director before the end of January. The chair or director will appoint a promotion review committee of at least three members, one member of which may hold the rank of senior associate faculty. The promotion review committee will evaluate the portfolio and make its recommendation for promotion to the chair or director. The chair or director will write his or her recommendation and send it, along with the promotion committee’s recommendation, to the dean for his or her review and decision. If promotion is approved, promotion takes effect the ensuing fall semester.

APPENDIX 8

THIRD-YEAR REVIEW PROCEDURES

# IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI

*Updated April 2020*

All non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members in SLA (with the exceptions noted below) are required to undergo a school-level review in their third year. This obligation also applies to non-tenure-track clinical faculty members. The term “third year” normally refers to the faculty member's third year of employment. However, people who enter with one year of credit toward tenure are in their “third year” in their second year of employment, and people who enter with two years of credit toward tenure are in their “third year” in their first year of employment. Those who enter either with tenure or with more than two years of credit toward tenure are exempt from the third-year review.

Procedures:

In the spring of each year (usually in early March), the notice of reappointment for non-tenured faculty is due in the Dean’s Office. On that due date chairs will also submit, separately from the reappointment materials, the following items to the dean:1

1. The candidate’s statement (the “candidate” being the faculty member undergoing the third-year review). This document must not exceed five pages. It should be similar in organization to the statement the candidate will prepare when coming up for promotion and tenure, or just promotion in a clinical case. (See the IUPUI Promotion & Tenure Guidelines, specifically the section on the “candidate’s statement.”) One thing it must state is the candidate’s anticipated area of excellence for promotion or the candidate's intention to come up on the balanced case.
2. The department primary committee's statement about the candidate’s progress, or that of the committee defined in a candidate’s letter of appointment in special cases. This statement should not be an evaluation of the candidate’s “case.” It should be an evaluation of the candidate’s progress--specifically the candidate’s progress toward promotion and tenure, or toward promotion in a clinical case. (The aim of the evaluation should be to assess progress, not to pronounce the candidate “excellent,” “satisfactory,” etc.)
3. The chair’s statement about the candidate’s progress whenever applicable. This statement should conform with the expectations laid out for chairs in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines (“Department Chair Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline”) and relevant expectations laid out for Chairs in the School P&T Guidelines (“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”).
4. The candidate’s vita, prepared in accordance with the official IUPUI *Curriculum Vitae* Format (provided in the IUPUI Promotion & Tenure Guidelines).

Candidates should be provided with a signed copy of both the primary committee and chair’s letters, or of the specially appointed committee’s letter. Chairs or immediate supervisors should have candidates sign a form showing their receipt of these letters; this signed receipt should be kept in their department or unit personnel file along with signed copies of the reviews. A third signed copy of both letters will be submitted to the Dean’s Office.

The School P&T Committee will provide an assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure, taking into account the candidate’s intended area of excellence or the candidate’s intention to come up on the balanced case. It will not provide a promotion or tenure decision, a pre-tenure decision, or anything of that kind. If the committee detects any problems, its assessment should aim at helping the candidate and the candidate’s department in their efforts to rectify the problems.

The P&T committee will send its signed letter to the candidate and send a copy to the dean and to the candidate’s chair or immediate supervisor.

The assessment is to be finished and in the hands of the candidate, the candidate’s chair or immediate supervisor, and the dean no later than two weeks before the due date of the Faculty Review Checklist. (That checklist is usually due in the Dean's Office at the end of April.) That way, any candidate who wants to react to the assessment will have time to do so before the term ends and the P&T Committee dissolves.

Any response from the candidate should go to the candidate’s chair or immediate supervisor, or to the dean, not directly to the P&T Committee. If necessary, the dean, though not the candidate or the candidate’s chair or immediate supervisor, will consult with the P&T Committee about the candidate's response.

NOTE: An annual review assesses activities and achievements within one calendar year. Being “excellent” or the opposite is not a guarantee of future tenure success or of failure. A third-year review uses evidence of accomplishments but focuses on trajectory, plans, and cumulative endeavor. Being “on track” or making “excellent progress” does not necessarily relate to accomplishments during any given calendar year.

1 The third-year review is separate from any other review of the candidate, including the reappointment review. It’s due on the same date as the reappointment review, but it’s not part of that review. This does not mean that the key documents in the third-year review (e.g., the primary committee's statement) cannot be substantially the same in content as the corresponding documents in the reappointment review. It’s just that the two reviews are separate. One of them, the third-year review, ends up in the hands of the P&T committee; the other does not. So it’s best to submit the documents for the two reviews in two separate packets.

APPENDIX 9

IUPUI POLICY ON THREE-YEAR FORMATIVE REVIEW

OF TENURE-PROBATIONARY FACULTY AND LIBRARIANS

IUPUI faculty and librarians (hereinafter referred to collectively as “the faculty” or “the faculty member(s)”) represent our campus’s most valuable resource. The University makes a substantial long-term investment in its faculty. Our tenure-probationary faculty’s success must be among the highest priorities for all campus administrative officers.

While IUPUI has in place an annual review policy mandating that all faculty members be provided with a yearly written evaluation of their work in the areas of teaching, research, and service (or, in the case of librarians, the equivalent areas of performance, professional development, and service), these annual reviews are frequently conducted by the department chair or the school dean alone, without the participation of a peer review committee.

### The Policy

To ensure that all tenure-probationary faculty members benefit from helpful and meaningful assessments of their progress toward promotion and tenure near the mid-point of their probationary period, a THREE-YEAR FORMATIVE REVIEW [hereinafter referred to as the “REVIEW”] shall be conducted on all such faculty members during the spring semester of the third year of their appointments in accordance with the following guidelines.

### Applicability

This policy applies to all tenure-probationary faculty members at IUPUI, with the exceptions noted immediately below. The term “third year” refers to the *third full academic year* of the tenure- probationary faculty member’s appointment. However, faculty members who enter with one year of credit toward tenure are in their “third year” during their second full academic year of appointment, and those who enter with two years of credit are in their “third year” during their first full academic year of appointment. Those who enter either with tenure or with more than two years of credit toward tenure are exempt from the REVIEW.

### Procedures

In schools or units where faculty-approved policies or guidelines for conducting the REVIEW already exist, those policies or guidelines should be followed to the extent that they do not seriously conflict with the general procedures set forth below. If there is conflict, especially regarding due dates and required documentation, such schools or units ought to resolve it by either revising their policies or guidelines accordingly, or negotiating special arrangements with the Office of Academic Affairs.

In schools or units where such policies or guidelines have not yet been formulated or approved by the faculty, the REVIEW shall in the interim be conducted in adherence with the following general considerations.

* 1. The chief purpose of the REVIEW is to provide tenure-probationary faculty members with feedback from the school or unit level review committees regarding their cumulative progress toward promotion and tenure. Hence, other than the department chair or school dean, involvement by the department’s Primary Committee (where applicable) and/or the school’s Unit Committee (where applicable) in the REVIEW is essential.
	2. The order of review and deliberation involving the department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees should generally follow the sequence and procedure used by each school in handling ordinary tenure and promotion cases.
	3. The faculty member being reviewed should submit only a candidate’s statement together with an up-to-date vita (preferably in accordance with the “Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers”). The statement (not to exceed 5 pages) should be similar in organization to the statement the faculty member would expect to write at the time of making a case for promotion and tenure. In particular, it should clearly state the anticipated area(s) of excellence or the intention to request consideration on the basis of a balanced case.
	4. The department chair or school dean and the Primary and Unit Committees (where applicable) must each provide the faculty member with a written assessment that includes evaluation of progress toward promotion and tenure, using normal and appropriate metrics that will eventually be employed in a tenure decision. If the chair, the dean, or the Committees identify any problems, their assessment must include specific suggestions for remedy aimed at helping the faculty member and the faculty member’s department or unit in their efforts to rectify the problems.

### Documentation and Reporting

A copy of each review report, whether by the Committees, the chair, or the dean, shall be communicated to the faculty member under review within three days of the time it is completed.

To ensure that the REVIEW is properly conducted for all applicable tenure-probationary faculty members, the dean of each school shall be responsible for submitting copies of the chair’s or the dean’s and the Committees’ reports on all tenure-probationary faculty members who have been reviewed to the Chief Academic Officer through the Office of Academic Affairs by May 1 each year.

### Limitation on the Use of the REVIEW

The thrust of the REVIEW shall be to help the tenure-probationary faculty member to succeed. The REVIEW and its findings shall NOT be used by the department chair or the school dean, or the Chief Academic Officer, as the basis for a tenure decision, a pre-tenure decision, a reappointment or non-reappointment decision, or any personnel action of like kind. The tenure- probationary faculty member is not limited in the use of the REVIEW.

[1] Some schools require far more than this (e.g., list of potential reviewers, summary of pre-IU professional activities, previous annual reviews, letters from students, or even a dossier “that is identical in substance and format to that which they will submit for the actual review two years later”). The present policy does not encourage premature requisites or burdensome requirements.
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# Major Performance Review and Reappointment of Professors of Practice

# *Approved September 15, 2017*

# **Description of Responsibilities for Professors of Practice**

Professors of Practice are appointees who have achieved distinction in their fields of practice. They bring unique practical experiences and talents that will benefit students and strengthen the reputation of the School. The main responsibility of Professors of Practice is teaching, although they may be assigned research, creative and service responsibilities associated with their contributions to student development and placement. *See* [*IU Policy ACA-19: Regulation of Professor of Practice Appointments*](http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/academic-appointment-review/Regulation-of-professors-practice.shtml)*.*

Professors of Practice are initially appointed for three years. Assuming a successful substantive mid-term departmental review, their contracts are then renewed annually through their seventh year in rank at IU. A major performance review will take place during the sixth year of the seven-year probationary period, and if performance is judged excellent, appointees shall be given long-term renewable contracts of either three year or five-year terms. Professors of Practice should be reviewed within the scope of their appointment letter.

**General Guidance for Reappointment Review**

Professors of Practice do not go through a promotion process, but they are required to go through a “major performance review” before the end of their seven-year probationary period, which includes reviews at both the department, school and dean levels.

It is important to note that there are significant differences between the expectations for review & reappointment of professors of practice and the review and promotion (or promotion and tenure) of tenure-line and lecturer-line faculty. The Professor of Practice review results either in a new appointment of at least three but no more than five years or the termination of the appointment after the last year of the current appointment.

* The Major Performance Review does not require the same level of accomplishment as is required for a tenure-line promotion or tenure case or even lecturer-line promotion. The criteria for “excellence in teaching” for professors of practice seeking reappointment is NOT the same as the criteria for excellence in teaching for tenure-line or lecturer line faculty seeking promotion, although there is much in common.
	+ Recommendations for reappointment must be based on the criteria that have been established by the School for what is expected to document excellence in teaching and satisfactory in service. (See Appendix 10: “Major Performance Review and Reappointment of Professors of Practice.”)
	+ Evaluation by external reviewers is not required or expected as part of the Major Review.
* Faculty hired into Professor of Practice lines are hired based on their professional accomplishments in their fields of practice. Their contributions to teaching come from the “unique practical experiences and talents that will benefit students and strengthen the reputation of the School.” Faculty hired into Professor of Practice lines may not have advanced academic degrees (e.g., MA or PhD).
	+ Because Professors of Practice may not have advanced academic degrees, there is not an expectation for Professors of Practice to be engaged in the scholarship of teaching (such as presentations and publications) or other peer-reviewed activity, although if they do so that is note-worthy.
	+ The impact of their teaching need only be shown at the department and/or school level. There is not an expectation that they show impact of their work beyond the school, although if they do so that is note-worthy.
* Because of their unique professional experiences, Professors of Practice may have split appointments (such as between a department and an administrative unit) or may have an administrative appointment, such as director of a program. Consequently, Professors of Practice should be reviewed within the scope of their appointments.
	+ Appointment letters are typically considered confidential in nature because they may contain privileged information, but the expectations of the appointment – such as teaching load or administrative expectations – should be made clear to reviewers at the time of review.
	+ Professors of Practice who have administrative appointments as program directors should be evaluated within the context of their appointment as administrators. That is, program directors typically have lighter teaching loads, which should not be held against them, but they should be able to show non-classroom-based evidence for teaching excellence, including mentoring and advising.
	+ Professors of Practice who have an appointment with the Deans Office should only be evaluated by review committees for the teaching and service work that they do for the academic unit. The Dean will conduct his/her own evaluation of the administrative work done by Professors of Practice for the Deans Office.
* Review committees may request to see past annual reviews for Professors of Practice who are undergoing their Major Review. However, the primary basis for recommending reappointment should be on whether the criteria for Professors of Practice for Excellence in Teaching, as outlined in the School Guidelines, are deemed to have been met.
* The review at each level should include a specific recommendation for reappointment or not, documenting the basis for the recommendation in a signed letter of 1-2 pages.
* The Dean makes the final decision on reappointment, taking into consideration the evaluation and recommendation of the prior levels of review.

# ***Criteria for Major Performance Review and Reappointment***

* 1. **Teaching**

All Professors of Practice seeking reappointment are evaluated on teaching.

* + - A four-option continuum is used to rate candidate performance in teaching: Excellent, Very Good, Effective and Ineffective.
		- Excellence in teaching must be demonstrated at the local—unit and School—level.

**Excellence in teaching may include–*but is not limited to*–the following:**

* 1. A record of high quality teaching demonstrated by sustained excellence in classroom performance, including the presentation and discussion of student evaluations for all courses. (required)
	2. Evidence of peer observation and evaluation of teaching. (required)
	3. A trajectory of improved teaching skills as shown by various measures of teaching, including student evaluations. (required)
	4. Keeping course content and mentoring up to date, in terms of new developments in their field of expertise. (required)
	5. Evidence of successful teaching across the undergraduate curriculum within an area of expertise and, when applicable, in different teaching environments (large and small class sizes). (required)
	6. Student involvement in the Professor of Practice’s ongoing creative practice and management activity, as apprentices, assistants, interns, or advisees.
	7. Unsolicited letters from students in addition to those solicited by the unit or school.
	8. Undergraduate and graduate student advising/mentoring activities.
	9. Teaching awards and other similar recognition of pedagogical excellence.
	10. Participation in course and curriculum development and innovation.
	11. Evidence of leadership/participation in the School of Liberal Art’s instructional goals and objectives
	12. Development of new teaching materials such as textbooks, cases, instructor manuals, student guides, websites, and videos.
	13. Participation in teaching and learning activities within the School, IUPUI, IU or peer professional groups. [For examples, see IU’s Mosaic Active Learning Initiative,<http://ctl.iupui.edu/Programs/Mosaic-Faculty-Fellows-Program>and the Faculty Academy on Excellence in Teaching, https://facet.iu.edu/index.html.]
	14. Published peer-reviewed, non-peer-reviewed, and invited articles related to teaching.
	15. Presentations at local, statewide or national/international conferences about teaching.
	16. Supervision of independent study students.

# **Service**

All Professors of Practice are expected to make service contributions, although the extent and nature of these contributions may vary based on initial expectations set forward in each contract of employment.

* + - A four-option continuum is used to rate candidate performance in service: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory.
		- Professors of Practice up for reappointment are expected to be at least Satisfactory in service.

**Satisfactory service contributions may include—*but is not limited to*—the following:**

2.1 Participation in service activities that support teaching/learning. 2.2Membership on graduate student MA committees.

* 1. Supervision and mentorship of TAs with significant instructional responsibilities.
	2. Involvement in student groups/clubs that support student learning and professional development.
	3. Development of service-learning components to the School’s curriculum.
	4. Internal or external service awards and grants.
	5. Participation or leadership in unit, School, and campus committees.
	6. Participation in School and IUPUI activities in support of the teaching mission (e.g., attending commencement, supporting activities related to student scholarship and professional development).
	7. Development of educational programs, workshops, and other training ventures for School constituencies.
	8. Public service to the community that calls upon professional expertise as a teacher, pedagogical scholar, or practitioner.
	9. Leadership in service activities of professional organizations.
	10. Serving as liaison with industry to develop or maintain industry internships, guest lectures and other activities and events that either bring industry to campus or give our students opportunities in the industry at large.

# **Creative practice and management activity**

Professors of Practice may be expected to continue their work as creative artists and practitioners in their chosen fields of practice or to contribute to the management of industry processes. The extent and nature of these contributions will vary based on initial expectations set forward in each contract of employment.

* + - A four-option continuum is used to evaluate those evaluated on this dimension of activity: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory.
		- Professors of Practice who are expected to contribute in creative, professional or management activities are expected to be at least Satisfactory in this endeavor when they go up for a major performance review and reappointment.

# Creative and professional activities and management contributions may include – *but are not limited to* – the following:

* 1. Participate in the creative process (e.g., produce, write, direct, perform, stage, shoot, score, edit) with local, regional, national or international groups or outlets.
	2. Participate in the distribution of creative work with local, regional, national or international groups or outlets.
	3. Serve as a management consultant in the creative development process or distribution of creative work.
	4. Collaborate with practitioners or industry leaders in innovative projects.
	5. Create, organize or head an entity that shepherds the creative process or distributes creative work.
	6. Publish invited or peer-reviewed papers or participate in presentations about creative works, new techniques or other advances in their fields.

# **Timing**

No later than the sixth year as a Professor of Practice, a faculty member will undergo a major performance review in order to receive a long-term contract. Shortened probationary periods may be the result of demonstrated teaching excellence that predates appointment in the School or an exceptional record of teaching, service or creative accomplishments in the School.

Evaluation of a candidate for a long-term Professor of Practice position within the School results in an up or out decision: Faculty either receive a longer-term contract, or they will not be permitted to teach full- time in the School beyond the term of their contract.

Reappointment decisions are made at least one full year in advance (i.e., the decision to renew a contract for a Professor Practice’s fourth year is made during the Professor of Practice’s second year of work).

Professor of Practice therefore are guaranteed a full year of employment following a negative performance evaluation (i.e., faculty have voted against reappointment).

The following structure and activities are designed to support a newly hired Professor of Practice:

1. First year
	1. Orientation to expectations through first semester meetings with unit chair.
	2. The unit chair serves as official mentor for the first year.
	3. Annual review completed no later than the end of the second semester of employment.
	4. In-person meeting with the unit chair to discuss the annual review.
2. Second year
	1. Annual review completed no later than the end of the spring semester, typically the fourth semester of employment.
	2. Reappointment decision for the fourth year is made during the spring semester.
3. Third year
	1. Substantive mid-term departmental review. Review completed no later than the end of the spring semester. Professors of Practice are expected to prepare a dossier for this review. In addition to a summary of student and faculty evaluations of teaching, a personal statement on teaching and service contributions at IU must be provided. An effective narrative is likely to include discussion of one’s approach to teaching, specific activities and contributions, an assessment of growth and accomplishments, and goals for the future.
	2. A positive third year review results in a contract for the fifth year, and allows the candidate to be considered for one-year renewable contracts through their seventh year, subject to annual performance reviews.
4. Fourth and fifth years
	1. Annual review completed no later than the end of the spring semester.
	2. In-person meeting with the unit chair to discuss the annual review.
	3. Reappointment for sixth year is made during spring semester of the fourth year. Reappointment for the seventh year is made during spring semester of the fifth year.
5. Sixth year
	1. During the fall semester of the sixth year of the appointment, Professors of Practice prepare their major performance review dossiers. In addition to a summary of student and faculty evaluations of teaching, a personal statement on teaching and service contributions at IU must be provided. An effective narrative is likely to include discussion of one’s approach to teaching, specific

activities and contributions, an assessment of growth and accomplishments, and goals for the future. [Note: These will not be submitted through the IU edossier.]

* 1. The third week of January is the deadline for submitting their major performance review dossiers to the unit chair.
	2. Units have until the end of March to review dossiers, vote, and prepare written assessments of candidates to the School dean. Deadlines established for the school third-year review process should be followed. The criteria outlined above should be used for making the evaluations and recommendations for reappointment or not.
	3. The School Promotion & Tenure Committee reviews, votes, and prepares an evaluative report on candidates, following deadlines established for the school third-year review process, and using the criteria outlined above for making their evaluation. This evaluation and recommendation for reappointment or not is forwarded to the dean by no later than the third Monday of April.
	4. The dean will make the final decision with regard to reappointment to a long-term contract.