

SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS
INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY INDIANAPOLIS SCHOOL OF
LIBERAL ARTS PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Approved by SLA Faculty Assembly: XXXXX ##, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Purpose	##
II.	Review Process	##
III.	Responsibilities of the Candidate	##
IV.	Responsibilities of the Department Chair	##
V.	Responsibilities of the Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee: The Primary Committee	##
VI.	Responsibilities of the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee	##
VII.	External Letters of Recommendation	##
VIII.	Guidelines for Evaluating Applied Research	##
IX.	Joint and Adjunct Appointments and Involvement in Multiple Programs	##
X.	Guidelines for Evaluating Balanced Cases	##
XI.	Guidelines for Extending an Offer with Tenure to a Search Candidate	##
XII.	Guidelines and Procedures for Negative and Divergent Recommendations for Tenure and/or Promotion	##

Appendix 1: Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure Form

Appendix 2: The Nature of Community Engagement and the Evaluation of Public and Applied Scholarship

Appendix 3: SLA P&T Criteria

Appendix 4: SLA Promotion Criteria for Lecturers

Appendix 5: SLA Policy on Clinical Faculty Appointments

Appendix 6: Associate Faculty (Adjunct Lecturer) Promotion Policy

Appendix 7: SLA Third-Year Review Guidelines

Appendix 8: IUPUI Third-Year Review Guidelines

I. 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>) and the *IUPUI Supplement to the IU Handbook*. 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 applied scholarship and balanced 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>) and contained in the *IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook*, 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>) and in the *IUPUI Supplement to the IU Academic Handbook*. 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 both to work available in printed form (books, articles, etc.) and to work available in electronic media (Internet, computer programs, software, etc.). 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.

II. REVIEW PROCESS

A. 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 four 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. The Tenure Timetable, as appropriate, which clearly states the expected year in which a tenure eligible faculty member will be put forward for tenure. For lecturers and clinical faculty, a Promotion Timetable that clearly states the year in which they might be considered for promotion to senior

lecturer or the next appropriate clinical rank.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. 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.

E. 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 have added to the dossier. The dossier and appendices file 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.]

III. 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. The following list indicates several responsibilities of the candidate, which are not listed in any specific order of importance; neither is the list intended to limit the responsibilities of the candidates to those listed.

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 Policy. Consideration for promotion or tenure, however, requires demonstrated excellence in at least one of the three areas or evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university (see Section X below). Consideration of promotion of lecturers to the rank of senior lecturer 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. Peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required for all promotions, including lecturer and clinical lines, 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 Supplement to the IU Handbook*, in the *IUPUI Chief Academic Officer's*

Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossier, and in department criteria and school guidelines for promotion and tenure.

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.

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:

A. Since a **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.)

B. 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 be clearly designated as such and considered appropriately within the context of the rank for which the candidate is being recommended. 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. (See Item “G” below.)

C. Prior work of candidates can be considered in whole if the work is accomplished in rank (including visiting positions).

D. In some instances, professional work completed while the candidate was not in a tenure-track position, (e.g., as a research associate), may count toward tenure. This will be subject to approval by the chair/program director and dean. Such approval should be arranged as early as possible in the candidate’s career, and should be documented in writing. In all cases, policies and procedures given on the IU Policies website (<http://policies.iu.edu>) and in the *IUPUI Supplement to the IU Handbook* must be followed with regard to any exceptions sought to the standard probationary period.

E. 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 in the order in which they appear in the publication, 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.

F. Each publication should include a notation as to whether or not it was refereed and whether or not it was solicited. The significance of this information is always contextual and should be explained if it is not obvious. Typically, only products that have undergone a blind review process are considered to have been refereed; exceptions should be explained.

G. 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.

H. 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:

1. 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. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

I. 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 and which should be considered service or teaching activities.

J. Applied research may be offered as another example of scholarly activity and listed accordingly in the CV. While there is a range of applied research, that which requires sustained research and original or critical activity constitutes basic research; see the Guidelines for Applied Scholarship (Section VIII).

K. 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.

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

L. 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.

M. Candidates should provide copies of all known reviews (and not just a selection) of a book or other work.

N. 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,

O. 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 the prestige of the presentation venue.

P. 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 teaching 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.

Q. Proof of professional honors or recognition and proof of professional service, both within and without 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.

R. Copies of all annual review summaries of the candidate, as reflected in letters from the chair and the department primary committee, should be included in an appendix to the dossier. If an annual summary of the candidate is excluded from the dossier, the candidate must offer a compelling explanation for its exclusion. In addition, the candidate should discuss with the department chair submission of any other documents that may be deemed pertinent to promotion or tenure action. Annual review summaries will not be forwarded to the Office of Faculty Appointment and Advancement unless specifically requested by that office.

S. It is the candidate's responsibility to ensure that their materials, including the vita, are placed in the proper format. In order to facilitate this, three-ring binders, divided into labeled sections, are available from the dean's administrative assistant. In assembling the dossier, plastic sheet covers or other binders that make the dossier difficult to use should not be used. To facilitate evaluation, candidates are advised to include a sufficiently detailed table of contents for the dossier and for any appendices. Model dossiers are available from the dean's administrative assistant. [NOTE: This item will need to be updated to reflect the new 'e-dossier' that will be required.]

IV. 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. 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 IX 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 "IX. 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 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:

A. 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.
2. The chair is responsible for making certain that a complete and identical digital version of the dossier, excluding publications, appendices, and other supporting materials, is submitted with the original dossier. The chair is also responsible for ensuring proper format of both the original and the digital versions 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.
4. The chair is responsible for adding external letters and letters of reference to the dossier before it is reviewed by the primary committee. *Please note that in references to letters from external reviewers, direct quotations should not be attributed to a reviewer by name.*
5. The chair must ensure that the candidate's dossier remains intact during the whole review process at the departmental level.

B. By January 1 of each year department chairs will write to all members of their departments who are eligible for tenure and/or promotion, inviting candidates for mandatory or optional review to submit their candidacies by the first week of April to the chair, who then informs the Dean's Office, by no later than June 1, using the form given in Appendix 1: "Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure." Chairs have the option 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.

C. The chair will document the stature and nature of journals, presses, or other media 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.) NOTE: In the case where the chair is at the rank of associate professor and the candidate is seeking promotion to full

professor, the assessment of dissemination outlets should be done jointly with the chair of the primary committee.

D. 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

G. 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.

V. 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. 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.

The term of appointment to a department's primary committee should begin in January and end the following December. In this manner, the primary committee that initiates the process of promotion and tenure in the spring will be the same primary committee that evaluates the candidate in the fall.

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

A. 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.

B. 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.

C. 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.

D. 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 and, as appropriate, the guidelines for evaluating balanced cases and applied scholarship given below.

E. The Primary Committee is expected to evaluate the Candidate's Research and Creative Activity; this includes the following:

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 will summarize their relative standing in the candidate's field. (The chair will provide an evaluation of the stature of journals, presses, etc., as described below in section V, "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 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.

3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. When referencing and commenting on evaluations made by external reviewers in their letters, *direct quotations should not be attributed to a reviewer by name.*

F. Primary Committee Evaluation of the Candidate's Teaching.

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 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. This information is to be provided by the candidate.

3. The committee will evaluate materials developed by the candidate that include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - a. course development/revisions
 - b. peer evaluations for others
 - c. presentations on teaching (both locally and elsewhere)
 - d. program development/revisions
 - e. textbooks
 - f. web-based teaching materials
4. 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 teaching, and tenure-line faculty seeking promotion on a balanced case, are expected to have peer refereed presentations and products in teaching. 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 teaching agenda and also assess the relevance to that general agenda of all individual scholarly products.
5. 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 Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossier* (see “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance”).

G. Primary Committee Evaluation of the Candidate's Service.

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:
 - a. the candidate's department or program
 - b. school and campus programs that are not covered under the candidate's service to the department
 - c. the IUPUI campus (and/or units on campus other than the school)
 - d. the University
 - e. the community (locally and elsewhere)
 - f. 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 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, and tenure-line faculty seeking promotion on a balanced case, are expected to have peer refereed presentations and products in service. 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 service agenda and also assess the relevance to that general agenda of all individual scholarly products.

VI. 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.

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

- A. 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 the University's Affirmative Action Office for advice and guidance in such matters.
- B. At their first meeting, the committee shall elect a chair. This person is responsible for organizing future meetings of the committee.
- C. 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, 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.
- D. 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 votes either at the school level or at the campus level.
- E. 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.
- F. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are to have no direct or indirect contact with the committee or its members regarding their own cases.
- G. 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.
- H. 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 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 XI: Guidelines and Procedures for Negative and Divergent Recommendations for Tenure and/or Promotion.)

I. After all responsibilities for reviewing candidates for promotion and/or tenure are completed each fall, and before the third-year reviews are conducted each spring, the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for reviewing the SLA P&T Guidelines and forwarding recommended updates and edits to the Agenda Council for consideration by the Faculty Assembly. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, or designee, will be invited to participate in this discussion.

VII. EXTERNAL LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

A. 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 Chief Academic Officer's Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossier* 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 "arms 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.
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 Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossier* 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.
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 January 31.

B. Other Types of External Letters

In certain cases, 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).

VIII. GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING APPLIED RESEARCH

Applied research differs from traditional modes of research in two important ways. First, applied research expands the audiences to which research results are directed. These audiences include a range of groups outside the academy (like community organizations, government agencies, businesses and corporations, primary and secondary school teachers, legal firms, archives, and other agencies). Second, applied researchers legitimately use an array of vehicles to communicate their research and analysis to these audiences. These may include government reports, project papers, slide/tape and videotape presentations, and other forms of research reports and presentations. Applied research activities, therefore, should reflect both original, scholarly effort on the part of participating faculty and a significant contribution to IUPUI's mission to serve communities beyond the academy. The following guidelines are intended to aid candidates, chairs, and tenure and/or promotion committees in offering evidence of the quality of a candidate's applied research activities. Reviewers should also reference Appendix 2, "**The Nature of Community Engagement and the Evaluation of Public and Applied Scholarship**", whenever reviewing faculty whose dossiers include public and applied scholarship.

A. General Guidelines

1. Differences between traditional and applied research must be recognized. The research and creative activities of applied researchers will take both traditional and applied forms, and it is the responsibility of the candidate initially to explain and to document the quality and quantity of their work and the contribution to knowledge behind their submissions.
2. Applied research 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.
3. If applied researchers choose research as their area of excellence, then publications in media (including digital) of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly work. Furthermore, candidates whose principal specialization is 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, applied research 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 applied research 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.

IX. JOINT AND ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS AND INVOLVEMENT IN MULTIPLE PROGRAMS

A. Joint Appointments

When a candidate has a joint appointment with another department, program, center, or other University unit, the chair of the department with the larger fractional appointment should assume responsibility for coordinating the preparation of the dossier and for ensuring proper consultation of the respective faculties (or comparable bodies) with each other. When fractional appointments are equal, then the administrators in charge of the units should jointly determine the procedure to be followed in consultation with the candidate. If the involved parties cannot reach consensus, then they should consult the dean(s).

When the larger fraction of a joint appointment is in a non-departmental unit, responsibility ordinarily resides with the chair of the department in which promotion or tenure would be granted, even when the candidate's departmental appointment is nominal.

For all faculty members with joint appointments, a memorandum of agreement that outlines review procedures should be developed at the time of appointment or when responsibilities change. For tenure-track faculty such an agreement should be in place by the time of the faculty member's third-year review. At the very latest, the procedures to be followed should be submitted to the dean(s) in writing on or before March 1 of the year in which the candidate will go forward for promotion and/or tenure. 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 MOA in an appendix to the promotion dossier.

B. 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.

C. 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.

X. GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING BALANCED CASES

The School of Liberal Arts fully supports the option for pursuing promotion as well as tenure based on a balanced case of scholarly work in teaching, research and service. Candidates for a 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 *in each of the three areas*. 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 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 national reputation (as appropriate for rank).
- Impactful products and/or outcomes that are innovative.
- Evidence of integration of all areas of endeavor.
- A reflective, systematic, and purposeful approach to scholarship.
- Evidence of quality work and significant achievement.
- Funding and/or awards (as appropriate for discipline and rank) that support and/or recognize scholarship and innovation.

XI. GUIDELINES FOR EXTENDING AN OFFER FOR TENURE TO A SEARCH CANDIDATE

Any candidate 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 professor, come from a comparable or better research institution AND who have been through a tenure review process successfully, the offer package, 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 arms-length and peer-institution (or better) 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 and teaching, 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.

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

Several areas of the Campus P&T Guidelines and the School P&T Guidelines speak to instances when there are negative and/or divergent recommendations for tenure, and the opportunity to add materials/comments to a dossier in response.

A. IUPUI and SCHOOL GUIDELINES

1.0. Reconsideration of a Negative Recommendation for Tenure:

When candidates for tenure receive a negative recommendation (at any level), IU policy allows for the candidate to request reconsideration of that recommendation.

1.1. *Campus P&T Guidelines (2014-15):*

1.1.1. Under the section labeled “Department Chair Responsibilities,” the following guideline is given: “In a tenure case, at the first level where there have been negative votes, (if applicable) discuss the candidate’s right for reconsideration. This must be done in a timely manner and prior to the next level of review” (p. 11).

1.1.2. Under the section labeled “Dean Responsibilities,” the following guideline is given: “A candidate for tenure **must** be notified at the first level of negative tenure review. This must happen in a timely manner and before the next scheduled level of review. They must be apprised of their right for reconsideration at that time” (p. 12)

1.1.3. Under the section labeled “**Reconsideration**” (p. 32), the following guidelines are given:

- a. In instances where a candidate wishes to add comments or materials that are relevant to the recommendations of a review, this addition of materials constitutes a request for reconsideration. Candidates should consult the "Policies Governing Reappointment and Non-Reappointment during Probationary Period" statement in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook*. This policy states, in part that the faculty member or librarian who believes that a recommendation or a decision that he or she not be granted tenure has resulted from inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information may offer factual corrections and request reconsideration at the level at which the decision not to recommend

- tenure was **first** made.
- b. The request for reconsideration must be made within two weeks after the faculty member or librarian receives notification of the negative recommendation and before the review at the next level is completed.
 - c. Reconsideration is not an appeals process but an opportunity to correct the record while review is still underway.
 - d. Under unusual circumstances, reconsideration of promotion decisions may be permitted with the approval of the Chief Academic Officer. The procedures noted above will be followed in such a situation.
 - e. Nothing in the act of requesting reconsideration or being reconsidered precludes a candidate's later seeking a Faculty Board of Review.
 - f. Reconsideration documents should be included in the dossier section for the level of review at which the request was made. Documents should be in chronological order. When adding pages to an existing PDF file, please make sure the new pages are searchable.

1.1.4. With regard to how reconsideration documents should be incorporated into a candidate's dossier, the following guidelines are given for both the Primary and School Level reviews:

“Reconsideration documents in chronological order, if applicable. For example,:

- Original letter with first overall negative tenure outcome
- Candidate's Reconsideration Request
- Response to Reconsideration Request” (p. 16)

2.0. Consultation:

When there are “divergent” recommendations for tenure between the primary and school committees, the option for the primary committee and school committee to “consult” is allowed.

2.1: *Campus P&T Guidelines (2014-15):*

2.1.1. Under the section labeled “**Dean Responsibilities**” in the context of providing oversight of the School P&T Committee, the following guideline is given:

“When divergent evaluations of a dossier result in different recommendations **on tenure** [emphasis added], the unit committee may wish to consult with the primary committee and/or department chair. The dean should ensure that such consultation, when necessary, has occurred before the dean considers a case. The consultation should note the relative importance of criteria, principles, or evidence used in the evaluation that led to the contrary recommendation. The consultation must be noted in the unit committee's report, including notice of whether or not the vote of a committee was changed as a result. When there are divergent evaluations **with respect to promotion** [emphasis added], the unit committee should provide feedback to the primary committee. The report from each committee should make an effort to account for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The reports should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate's qualifications. It is strongly recommended that the letter address the criteria as listed in the **Reviewer's Summary Evaluation**.” (p. 12)

2.2: *School P&T Guidelines:*

2.2.1. Under the section “VI. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE,” the following guideline is given:

“F. In the event that the SLA Promotion and Tenure Committee makes a recommendation that differs with the primary committee with regard to the designation of the candidate's area of excellence or their vote, 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." (p. 12)

3.0. Addition of Materials/Comments [Quoted from pp. 31-32 of IUPUI P&T Guidelines, 2014-15.]:

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

If additional materials are submitted during the review process for inclusion and consideration in the dossier:

- a. The party providing these materials should present them to the department chair, unit/school dean, or Faculty Appointments and Advancement depending on the level at which the dossier is being considered. 2014-15 Chief Academic Officer's Promotion and/or Tenure Guidelines.
- b. In turn, the administrative officer will ensure that all prior reviewers have an opportunity to consider the added materials.
- c. All prior reviewers have the right to comment on additional material, but these comments need to be forwarded through the same review process, beginning with the primary committee. Prior reviewers need not take any action as a consequence of reviewing added material; however, they must have an opportunity to reconsider their original recommendations. In the case of factual information (e.g., acceptance of a journal article listed as under review), these additions are routine and ordinarily require no comment.
- d. Committees at prior levels may elect to re-vote on the case if circumstances warrant this action.
- e. In instances where a committee or administrative officer seeks additional information or material, this material must be provided to both the candidate and persons who have already reviewed the dossier, all of whom must have an opportunity to comment.
 - It is the responsibility of the persons seeking additional materials to provide such material to all concerned parties.
 - These comments then become a part of the dossier. Such additions must be made only when clearly necessary.
 - Ordinarily there will be very little time allowed for comment, and concerned parties must act within specified deadlines.
- f. All additions must be submitted electronically as searchable PDFs.
 - If including copies of e-mails, the best practice is to print the original e-mail to PDF and send as an attachment, preserving the authenticity of the communication.
 - The new PDF file is added to the candidate's existing PDF portfolio as a new section so subsequent reviewers will know the addition was made during the review process. This does not apply to reconsideration documents.

4.0. Deadlines:

The Academic Affairs Office (AAO) establishes "time frames" and "deadlines" each year for the various stages of the promotion and tenure review process. According to the document that is provided outlining these time frames and deadlines for when school need to submit dossiers to the campus level, "If extenuating circumstances exist, a request for a time extension should be sent by the date established [by AAO] to the Assistant Dean of the Faculties for Approval." Specific information about the dossier needs to be provided. The deadline can be extended into but no later than mid-November (specific date provided by AAO).

B. PROCEDURES

1.0. The "Request for Reconsideration" may be made by the candidate for tenure at any point in the review

process (primary committee, chair, school committee, dean, campus committee) when a negative recommendation for tenure is FIRST made.

- a. The Dean and the Chair must make sure that candidates are appraised of their right to request reconsideration and provided with all appropriate documents as indicated in the campus guidelines.
- b. The candidate has two weeks from the date that s/he receives notification of the negative recommendation to make a request for reconsideration.
- c. The request for reconsideration will include comments and, as appropriate, additional materials. The request must not take the form of an emotional appeal. It should only seek to address what may be perceived as “inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information” by offering “factual corrections” (Campus P&T Guidelines, p. 32).
- d. Requests for reconsideration should be made by the candidate to the associate dean for faculty affairs and copied to the chair.
- e. If a request for reconsideration is made before the dossier is forwarded to the Academic Affairs Office, the Dean’s Office will typically request a time extension in order to allow time for the reconsideration process and, if appropriate, the consultation process to take place.
- f. The associate dean for faculty affairs will direct the request for reconsideration to the correct level for review.
- g. Whenever there is a request for reconsideration, all documents related to the request must be added to the dossier at the level at which the request occurred and in chronological order, as appropriate, including:
 - Original letter with first overall negative tenure outcome
 - Candidate’s Reconsideration Request and supporting documents, if provided
 - Response to Reconsideration Request. Any request for reconsideration requires a written response. The response to the reconsideration request should include either a confirmation of the original vote or a statement of a changed vote, if relevant.

2.0 If there are “divergent recommendations” between the primary and school committees, campus guidelines allow and school guidelines require the school committee to consult with the primary committee and, as appropriate, the department chair and/or program director.

- a. Consultation between the school committee and the department/program will only occur after the school committee has provided the candidate with its evaluation.
- b. The definition of “consult” is not defined, so the form of the consultation can and may vary from case to case.
- c. The associate dean for faculty affairs or other representative of the dean’s office will facilitate the consultation and may serve as a moderator during the consultation if requested.
- d. During the consultation, discussion should note the relative importance of criteria, principles, or evidence used in the evaluation that led to the contrary recommendation.
- e. Every effort should be made for the consultation to occur before the request for reconsideration deadline passes for the candidate (if relevant). *Note that candidates for promotion only do not have the right to request reconsideration.*
- f. The candidate may choose to use material that results from the consultation to support the request for reconsideration (see section II.A above).
- g. *In keeping with the Guidelines given in Section I.C. above*, the candidate can add information or additional materials to the dossier at any level; before the dossier goes to the campus level, the candidate can make modifications to the CV and/or personal statement.
- h. The consultation must be noted in the unit committee’s ‘final’ report, including notice of whether or not the vote of a committee was changed as a result. Both reports (initial and post-consultation) must be included in the candidate’s dossier. If the consultation occurs at the same time as a candidate has made a request for reconsideration (see Section II.A), the notation of the consultation and the response to the reconsideration request can be incorporated together in the final committee evaluation report (see Section II.A.g).

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 June 1** for each candidate that the department will be considering for promotion and/or tenure in August.

Department: _____

Chair: _____

Candidate: _____

P&T Type: Tenure; Promotion to Associate Professor; Promotion to Full Professor;
 Promotion to Senior Lecturer; Other _____

Basis for Promotion: Research/Creative Activity; Teaching; Balanced Case; Service

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 Scholarship or other forms of 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

Community engagement, through public and applied scholarship, entails an active partnership between scholars and a community for the creation and application of knowledge through scholarship in research, teaching and/or service in order to address challenges or needs faced by the community. Giving due weight to applied scholarship conducted through community engagement in tenure and promotion decisions, however, requires review by peers familiar with community engagement as well as with the professional standards of the discipline of the scholar. Appropriate recognition of the scholarship involved in community engagement in the promotion and tenure process, including the importance of peer review informed by the community being served, is a critical issue facing public and applied scholars in a variety of departments. IUPUI and the School of Liberal Arts have stated a commitment to community engagement through public and applied scholarship; consequently, it is essential that commitment be reflected in how faculty members are evaluated for tenure and promotion. Quality applied and public scholarship should be appropriately recognized when evidence is presented that shows it has resulted in significant outcomes appropriate to the context in which the work is done.

Differences Between Applied & Public Research/Scholarship and Traditional Research

Public and applied research differs from traditional modes of research in two important ways. First, public and applied research expands the audiences to which research results are directed. These audiences include a range of groups outside the academy (like community organizations, government agencies, businesses and corporations, primary and secondary school teachers, legal firms, archives, and other agencies). Second, public and applied researchers legitimately use an array of vehicles to communicate their research and analysis to these audiences. These may include government reports, project papers, electronic presentations (e.g., blogs, websites), and other forms of research reports and presentations. Public and applied research activities, therefore, should reflect both original, scholarly effort on the part of participating faculty and a significant contribution to IUPUI's mission to serve communities beyond the academy.

Scholarly work of public and applied scholars in any discipline is typically not simply a product but often also a process that involves the advancement, integration, application, and transformation of knowledge. Public and applied scholarship differs from "traditional" research in many disciplines not so much in method or in rigor but more in the collaborative nature of its creation, in the venues in which it is presented, the range of professionals it employs or impacts, and the nature of the peer review. Public and applied scholarship, like all good scholarship, is peer reviewed, but that review includes a broader and more diverse group of peers, many from outside traditional academic departments, working in community contexts such as museums and other sites of mediation between scholars and the public.

Public and applied scholarship must not be assessed, as is often the case for traditional research, simply by the number and type of peer-reviewed publications placed in journals or with scholarly presses. Instead of applying a traditional approach for evaluating scholarship, the tenure and promotion requirements need to include an evaluation process that recognizes and rewards alternative forms of publication, dissemination, and impact of applied work. Publicly relevant research and scholarly activities should be given equal weight as other forms of research and teaching scholarship in the tenure and promotion evaluation. While dissemination of scholarship through traditional outlets (journals, books, etc.) are typically also an important component of a promotion case based on applied and/or public scholarship, it is impossible to establish a set equivalency between "traditional" and "alternative" forms of dissemination (e.g., "one community exhibit equals one journal article"). Ultimately, the importance and impact of alternative forms and dissemination of scholarship must be justified and evaluated on a case-by-case basis. In all cases, the scholarly products/activities must be significant, appropriately peer-reviewed, and show appropriate recognition of the quality of the scholarship.

Community Engagement in Applied & Public Research/Scholarship

Community Engagement may be a distinctive feature of public and applied scholarship, and it must be evaluated appropriately for the quality and impact it has. IUPUI has a stated commitment to relationships with local, state,

and global communities, and a stated commitment to recognizing and rewarding in our review processes faculty work that contributes to the campus' role as a civically engaged institution. When evaluating community engagement, it is important to keep these characteristics in mind:

1. Engagement can be *scholarly*. A scholarship-based model of engagement involves both the *act of engaging* (bringing universities and communities together) and the *product of engagement* (the spread of discipline-generated, evidence-based practices in communities).
2. Engagement can reflect a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. Scholarly community engagement involves generating, transmitting, applying and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.

Alternative Dissemination Outlets for Community-Focused Applied & Public Scholarship

Faculty with appointments as Public Scholars and others engaged in applied scholarship typically are actively engaged in community-level projects or agency work as part of the terms of their appointments. The outcomes of this applied scholarship, sometimes in the form of reports submitted to the host/funding agency, are typically rigorously peer-reviewed at various levels both within and outside the host/agency. From the perspective of traditional tenure and promotion requirements, such outcomes of applied scholarship are recognized only when the faculty are able to transform their work into peer-reviewed journal articles. Although applied scholars often seek to turn their work into publications, it is important to recognize that such demands can be problematic especially when contracting requirements prohibit transformation of agency reports into peer-reviewed journal articles or monographs.

Under these circumstances, applied scholars should rigorously document their contractual work and its peer evaluation at various levels. Such documentation should clearly highlight the contribution of the faculty, the use of discipline-specific principles, methods, and analytical perspectives, and the dissemination and impact of the work in relevant areas. This latter point is of special importance given that technical reports and similar documents often have a wide readership that may equal and even surpass that of articles published in specialized journals. Likewise, under traditional tenure and promotion guidelines, single-author articles are afforded more weight than multiple author ones. However, the realities of applied work in which public and applied scholars work closely with multi-disciplinary teams and with community-based practitioners, often require – logistically and ethically - the inclusion of multiple parties in the dissemination of results. The narrative should clearly state the “deliverables” of applied work.

As indicated in the campus P&T Guidelines, “The nature of public scholarship is diverse and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics should be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documents” (p. 36). Indeed, the “local” community as the context for dissemination may be as important, and possibly in some cases more important, than national and international distribution.

General Guidelines for Evaluating Applied and Public Research/Scholarship

The following guidelines are intended to aid candidates, chairs, and tenure and/or promotion committees in offering evidence of the quality of and evaluating a candidate's applied and public research/scholarship activities.

1. Differences between traditional and applied scholarship must be recognized. The research and creative activities of applied researchers will take both traditional and applied forms, and it is the responsibility of the candidate to explain and to document the quality and quantity of their work and the contribution to knowledge behind their submissions.

The production of community-based activities such as exhibitions, festivals, archives, audio recordings, videotapes/films, and digital media works should be seen as evidence of scholarly research, interpretation, and dissemination similar to the production of books, monographs, and articles. Applied scholars should be able to show that their scholarship follows accepted disciplinary research methodologies, such as ethnographic research that involves field-based interviews and observations. When scholarly creations such as exhibitions, films, and festivals are juried by panels and other reviewers that can be shown to be “at arms length”, this scholarship should be recognized as comparable to peer-reviewed publications.

2. Applied scholarship often displays considerable overlap between research, teaching and service. The result of such overlap creates scholarly activities in which service aspects enhance the impact of the research. Service components of applied scholarship should be viewed as an asset, not a dilution of the scholarship.

3. If applied scholars choose research as their area of excellence, then publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly work. Furthermore, candidates whose principal specialization is 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, 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. The quality of these non-traditional forms of scholarship need to be shown through peer-review and other measures that are accepted in the discipline as representing appropriate means for showing impact.

5. When applied research 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. Scholarship that is ephemeral in nature (e.g., an exhibit) should be video recorded, especially when external reviews are not possible at the time of the event, to facilitate external review.

External reviewers of public and applied scholarship may not necessarily hold academic appointments, but they should be selected on the basis of having an established expertise to evaluate the evidence presented to them and be able to speak to the quality and impact of the applied scholarship.

Checklist for Assessing Public and Applied Scholarship

The primary committee, chair/director and the School of Liberal Arts P&T Committee are expected to use the following checklist when assessing public and applied scholarship. The purpose of this checklist is to be certain that when a candidate for promotion and/or tenure claims that all or some of their research is applied or public scholarship, their work is evaluated following SLA and IUPUI P&T guidelines.

If the candidate for promotion and/or tenure has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that describes their appointment, the candidate must include in their dossier a copy of the MOU.

Committee Checklist:

- ___ 1. Specific reference to the terms of the public scholar's work given in the MOU are included in the committee review. (Leave blank if no MOU.)
- ___ 2. Has the candidate clearly identified what they consider their traditional scholarship vs. their public or applied scholarship? (See SLA and IUPUI guidelines for definitions.)
- ___ 3. The committee report includes a statement of how the candidate provided evidence of the quality of their applied/public scholar projects *and* how the committee used that information in their evaluation.
- ___ 4. Applied/public scholar projects often overlap with service and sometimes teaching. A statement assessing whether or how that might be the situation for this candidate is included in the evaluation.
- ___ 5. A brief statement concerning whether the committee believes external reviewers understood the nature of applied/public scholar activities of the candidate vs. traditional scholarship is included in the evaluation.

APPENDIX 3
TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA
IUPUI SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS

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. 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:

- (1) If research or other creative activity or public and applied scholarship, including collaborative work, is the primary criterion for tenure, 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 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 or 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) In a balanced 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. 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. Typically, a balanced case shows a clear and synergistic integration of scholarly work in all three areas of teaching, research and service.
- (5) 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.

APPENDIX 4
PROMOTION CRITERIA FOR LECTURERS
IU SCHOOL OF LIBERAL ARTS AT IUPUI

A candidate for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer will be evaluated by reference to the school criteria set forth below, as well as the more general criteria given in the Indiana University *Academic Handbook* and the IUPUI Faculty Council document titled "Lecturer Appointments at IUPUI," as well as the more specific criteria approved by the candidate's department. Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. The candidate is required to show a record that is excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service. In accordance with university and campus policy, evaluations of a candidate's record will take into account the mission of the candidate's unit and the particular contributions to that mission that is expected of the candidate.

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 that they have made important contributions to student learning. There are many activities and achievements that are not required by the school for a successful promotion case, but which, if properly documented can enhance a case for excellence in teaching. These may include, but are not limited to: important contributions to the curriculum of the department, school, or campus; notable contributions in advising and mentoring; pedagogical or disciplinary research or creative activity and its publication, presentation, or application; effective pedagogical innovations, including the effective use of technology; leadership in teaching; the success of former students; 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; and contributions to the documentation of student learning. In demonstrating satisfactory service, the candidate must show convincing evidence that the candidate's service has been satisfactory in quality as well as in quantity. Service may include, but is not limited to, professional and university service, including advising, committee membership, and community work directly related to the candidate's disciplinary expertise.

Approved by Faculty Assembly March 25th, 2005

APPENDIX 5
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 or Senior Lecturer.

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 contracts 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." As it states, "Clinical faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching or service and satisfactory in the other area. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence."

The school standard for promotion for clinical assistant and associate professors is analogous to that for a tenure-line faculty seeking promotion based on teaching or service. Although a national reputation in the area of excellence is not expected, 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."

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 senior lecturers.

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

APPENDIX 6
ASSOCIATE FACULTY PROMOTION (CURRENT POLICY)

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.

1.1. 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.

1.2. 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.

1.3. 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, evidence of curriculum development, and evidence of impact on learning.

1.4. 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 7
School of Liberal Arts Third Year Review Procedures

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. 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 and ideally should not exceed two pages. It should be similar in organization to the statement the candidate will prepare when coming up for tenure and promotion. (See the Dean of the Faculties Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, specifically the section on the "personal 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 chair's statement about the candidate's progress. This statement should conform with Section V ("Responsibilities of the Department Chair"), item C, in the SLA Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
3. The department primary committee's statement about the candidate's progress. 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 tenure and promotion. (This is a point about the thrust of the evaluation. The aim of the evaluation should be to assess progress, not to pronounce the candidate "excellent," "satisfactory," etc.)
4. The candidate's vita, prepared in accordance with the Dean of the Faculties Guidelines (i.e., the P&T format).

Four copies and the original will be submitted to the Dean. (A copy should be given to the candidate as well.) The original will remain with the Dean; the four copies will be passed on (by the Dean's Office) to the SLA Promotion & Tenure Committee.

The P&T Committee will provide an assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion, 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 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 it to the candidate and send a copy of it to the Dean and to the candidate's chair.

The assessment is to be finished and in the hands of the candidate, the candidate's chair, 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 to the Dean, not directly to the P&T Committee. If necessary the Dean, though not the candidate or the candidate's chair, will consult with the P&T Committee about the candidate's response.

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 that 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 8
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 the Dean of the Faculties.

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 "Dean of the Faculties' 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 Office of the Dean of the Faculties by May 31 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 Office of the Dean of the Faculties, 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.