I. Procedures

A. Preamble

Promotion and tenure procedures are governed by procedures and guidelines at multiple levels of the institution. Preferred procedures and a digest of official policies endorsed by the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) regarding promotion and tenure can be found at: https://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/academicguide/index.php/E._Tenure/Reappointment/Promotion/Salary. In addition, IU-Bloomington’s promotion and tenure guidelines are described on the website of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs: http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/docs/promotion_tenure_reappointment/pt-revised-review-guidelines.pdf.

This document describes procedures and guidelines that departments in the College and the College Executive Dean’s office must follow for promotion and tenure.

B. Compendium of Procedures

1. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member will be reviewed annually by the Chair of the Department. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable tenure decision and offer departments an opportunity to bring potential problems to the candidate’s attention in a timely fashion. A written summary of the annual review must be provided to the candidate.

2. Midterm Reappointment Review

No later than the third year of the probationary period, the faculty member will receive a midterm reappointment review. The midterm review is a thorough review that involves a departmental review (personnel) committee report, a vote of eligible department faculty, and a review by the Chair of the Department. This is an opportunity for senior colleagues to learn more about each junior colleague’s work, provide mentorship, and evaluate the progress towards meeting the criteria towards tenure. In the case of a decision not to reappoint, candidates may appeal the decision following BFC policy (http://www.indiana.edu/~bfc/docs/policies/nonReappointmentReview.pdf). In the case where reappointment is made, it is important to emphasize that this decision does not guarantee tenure. Please refer to the College Policy on Midterm Pre-tenure Review:
3. **Review period**

A candidate is normally reviewed for tenure and promotion before the seventh year of the tenure probationary period. An early tenure review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when prior service at another institution warrants such consideration. Work conducted prior to a candidate’s first appointment to IUB (e.g., scholarly or scientific publications) may be taken into consideration as additional evidence of pace, future trajectories, and continuity or change in research interests. Work produced since the tenure candidate’s first appointment at IUB is assumed to be a better predictor of future productivity than earlier work. In the case of promotion to full professor, emphasis will be placed on work in rank as associate professor.

The University has Family Leave and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “extending the probationary period” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult with the Associate Executive Dean and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs. Faculty members should discuss the timing of the leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure process with the Chair of the Department who will also consult with the Executive Dean’s office and receive approval from the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs to ensure that there is appropriate and clearly written documentation of leave agreements (using the “Understanding on Tenure Status” form, found at: [http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/forms/index.shtml](http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/forms/index.shtml)).

4. **Primary Criterion for Promotion and Tenure**

A candidate must decide the basis for promotion, in consultation with the Department chair. The basis for promotion and/or tenure in most departments and in most cases is excellence in research or creative activity. Other bases for promotion are excellence in teaching, service or a balanced case. In all cases, the dossier must demonstrate at least satisfactory/effective performance in the areas not selected as a basis for promotion.

   a. **Excellence in Research/Creative Activity:** If research or other creative work is the basis for tenure and promotion (this is the default expectation for most units in the College), the candidate must have achieved, or clearly be developing, a position of national and/or international leadership in a substantial field. This must be demonstrated by the evidence in external letters and internal reports, and by pertinent documentation in the dossier.

   b. **Teaching Excellence:** Teaching excellence requires the candidate to provide evidence of a significant national and/or international educational impact on their field outside of Indiana University. If the
basis for promotion is teaching, the candidate’s teaching record should be comparable to those of the most effective teachers at this institution.

c. **Service/Engagement Excellence**: This basis for promotion is rarely used and requires demonstrated excellence with national/international visibility and stature resulting from service activities.

d. **Balanced Case**: This basis for promotion is rarely used and requires a candidate to be “Very Good” in all three performance areas in order for a Balanced Case to succeed. Specifically, the candidate's overall contribution to the university must be shown to be comparable in excellence overall to that of a candidate with a single primary area. In research or creative activity, this means evidence of significant contribution to a substantial field. In teaching, it means evidence of an important contribution to teaching inside this university and, where possible, outside of it. And in service, it means evidence of significant impact on the university or one’s discipline.

e. **Satisfactory Service and Good Citizenship**: Regardless of a candidate’s basis for promotion, it is also expected that all candidates will make a positive contribution to the professional environments of their departments and will make a positive service contribution to the University and profession. Service is an expected and essential responsibility of all faculty and satisfactory performance is expected both for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

f. **Continued Excellence**: 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 and promotion is based.

5. **Comparison Group**

The populations within which candidates for tenure and promotion are to be evaluated in regards to research, creative activity, and teaching are those who have recently received tenure/promotion or who will soon be considered for tenure/promotion at major research universities.

6. **Additional Considerations**

With the growth of interdisciplinary research and with the emergence of new fields, not all research/creative activity will fit comfortably into traditional “disciplinary” expectations or understandings. Also, the world of scholarly and scientific publishing is undergoing revolutionary change. New forms of digital scholarly communication (e-journals, moderated websites, blogs) continue to emerge and grow. In response to the developments, IUB Tenure and Promotion Guidelines include three additional areas for consideration:
a. **Interdisciplinarity**: Candidates for tenure and promotion are encouraged to pursue innovation wherever it seems promising, even at the edges of disciplinary boundaries or between them. Reviewers at all levels should be open to the possibility that work “on the edges” or straddling two fields may eventually transform research agendas in fundamental ways not always easily recognized by the home unit. A candidate’s interdisciplinarity may require that home units adapt their expectations/criteria and procedures. For example, practices for assembling review committees and soliciting external referees may need to be altered in order to insure that all aspects of research/creative activity are assessed by properly knowledgeable judges.

b. **New Scholarly Communications**: Reviewers at all levels should consider that the best new research/creative activity may not necessarily appear in the top traditional disciplinary journals or in books published by the historically most prestigious publishing houses. Peer reviewed publications are given greater weight than those that are not. Candidates assume responsibility for providing evidence of the value of their publication outlets.

c. **Impact on Diverse Communities**. In assessing the impact of research/creative activity, reviewers should consider the variety of communities – inside the academy and beyond – which may be transformed in significant ways by a candidate’s work. The emergence of “public scholarship” expands the range of audiences to whom a scholar/artist may direct their research/creative activity, and sometimes the best of this work does not appear in narrowly-defined professional outlets. Candidates should describe how their research/creative activity targeted for non-academic audiences intersects with work targeted to a scholarly community. Public scholarship will not supplant expectations for publications targeted to peer professional communities, but it may supplement that work. Evidence for “public scholarship” includes panel/commission and other technical reports, policy white papers, and strategic plans for community/civic groups.

7. **External Referees**

In the spring semester prior to the year when the tenure or promotion case is to be considered, the Chair of the Department will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the record of the candidate. Subsequently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the Chair of the Department. Each list must include 6 names and should be submitted together to the divisional Associate Dean for approval and selection. The candidate and department lists must be developed independently and chairs must include embedded links to prospective referee web pages on the lists they submit to the Associate Dean. If the department’s list of
recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate’s list of recommended external referees, these referees’ names will count as candidate-recommended referees. This process is followed to ensure the department’s list is independent of the candidate’s list. Once the external letters arrive, candidates may request to see them, and departments must oblige by allowing the candidate to read the letters. However, it is generally recommended that the candidate not insist on reading the letters at least until after the dossier has left the department.

External referees should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate’s record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, collaborators, former students, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest are not to be asked to serve as external referees. The expectation is that there will be six letters in the file: normally three from the candidate’s list and three from the department’s list. There may not be less than six letters. However, all requested letters that are received by the department must be included in the dossier. Thus, on occasion there may be more than six letters if additional letters are requested in an effort to ensure that the six-letter minimum is achieved and more than six ultimately are submitted by the referees. All solicited letters should be included in the candidate’s dossier prior to the departmental vote, so that all voting faculty members have access to this information. External referees are usually asked to submit their letters by mid-August.

8. **Internal Letters**

The chair of the department may also solicit on-campus letters only from those who have been asked to observe the candidate’s teaching, those who are in a position to comment knowledgeably on the candidate’s contributions to their collaborative projects, and those from outside the department who may comment on the candidate’s service contributions elsewhere (e.g., directors of programs, institutes, or centers). In all other instances, solicited or unsolicited letters from other faculty members (especially those in the home department) are discouraged.

9. **Candidate’s Statement**

The candidate is required to complete and submit a draft of his/her personal statement no later than May 15th prior to tenure and promotion consideration. The research statement should embed the listing of publications on the CV in a narrative trajectory, highlighting finished projects, current work, and future plans. A succinct statement is most effective. The candidate’s personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the College, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be
accessible to several audiences, including external referees, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate’s area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from recently tenured and/or senior colleagues. It is recommended that the candidate’s personal statement be included in the information sent to external referees.

10. **Joint Appointments**

Faculty with joint appointments will have a Memorandum of Understanding that identifies the tenure home and describes the procedures for tenure and promotion consideration.

11. **Dossier**

The Chair of the Department is responsible for ensuring that the dossier is compiled correctly; no tenure or promotion candidate should be expected to prepare their own dossier without the assistance of departmental staff or the oversight of the chair. Starting in Fall 2014, promotion and tenure dossiers will be electronic. Access to the dossier will be password-controlled and only eligible faculty and administrators will have access to the dossier. The chair of the department will be responsible for identifying those in the department who should have access to the dossier once it is uploaded and ready for review.

The dossier must include:

**General**

- “Signatures Sheet” (Tenure and Promotion Routing and Action Summary Form) [Recommendations from faculty review committees and administrators go here.]
- Department and School Criteria/Expectations for Tenure/Promotion
- Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae (indicate peer reviewed publications; list separately publications to be considered research, teaching or service; for promotion to full, indicate work done since appointment as associate professor)
- Candidate’s Statements on Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, Service/Engagement
- External Letters
- List of Referees Selected (indicating those who did/did not respond and reason for non-response)
- Department (School) List of Prospective Referees (including brief summary of credentials and relationships with candidate)
- Candidate’s List of Prospective Referees (including credentials and relationships with candidate)
- Dossier Checklist Signed by Candidate and Chair (Dean)
Research/Creative Activity

- Copies of Publications and/or Evidence of Creative Work (including scholarly presentations)
- Reviews of Candidate’s Books, Creative Performances and Exhibitions
- List of Grants Applied for/Received (include cover sheet/abstract; funding source; amount; PI)
- Copies of Manuscripts or Creative Works in Progress
- Evidence for the Impact/Influence of Publications or Creative Works (e.g., citations)
- Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues
- Awards and Honors for Research/Creative Activity
- Candidate’s Contributions to Collaborative Projects (with letters from collaborators)

Teaching

- List of Courses Taught (chronologically by semester, number of students enrolled, grade distribution)
- Sample of Course Materials (syllabi, exercises, assignments, exams, student work)
- Graduate Training (PhD and Masters—committee member or chair; dissertation titles)
- Student Awards, Honors, Collaborative Publications, Achievements
- Undergraduate Research Experiences and Mentoring
- Student Course Evaluations (including summary of quantitative data; all qualitative responses)
- Solicited/Unsolicited Letters from Former Students
- Evidence of Student Learning Outcomes (assessment strategies; data; pedagogical adjustments)
- Letters from Peer Observers/Teaching Mentors (solicited by chair/dean)
- Curricular Development (including new courses; evidence of impact)
- Professional Pedagogical Development (workshops; learning communities, master classes)
- Teaching Publications (including scholarship of teaching and learning; textbooks)
- Teaching Awards, Honors, Grants, Fellowships

Service/Engagement

- Evidence of Service to the University, School and Department
- Evidence of Service to the Profession (including book reviews)
- Evidence of Engagement with Non-Academic Communities and Agencies

All vote-eligible faculty have the right and responsibility to review the dossier prior to the departmental vote.
12. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

The College recommends the following procedure: During the spring semester, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure and promotion case must be submitted, the Chair works with the candidate and an elected faculty committee as defined by departmental faculty governance procedures to select a review committee that has the appropriate rank and expertise to evaluate the dossier. The departmental review committee should include no fewer than three faculty members. If there are an insufficient number of appropriately ranked faculty members in the department to constitute a review committee, the Chair of the Department should work with the candidate and the elected faculty committee to select appropriate committee members from faculty in other related departments with guidance from the Associate Executive Dean. Departments may propose alternative procedures that must be approved by the Executive Dean’s Office.

The review committee is charged with submitting a written report to the department faculty evaluating the candidate’s case for promotion. In particular, the committee report will include:

- an evaluation of the candidate’s work;
- a summary and evaluation of both the external referees’ assessment and the internal letters (one that avoids long quotations from the letters themselves);
- an evaluation of teaching consisting of a discussion of teaching metrics that include the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, as well as a narrative that provides an assessment of such factors as breadth, content, and innovation; and,
- an evaluation of department, university, professional, and community service (local, national, and international).

The review committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding tenure and promotion on the basis chosen by the candidate (i.e., research/creative activity, teaching, service) or as a balanced case. The committee report must provide a recommendation in all three areas—research/creative activity, teaching, and service—as well as an overall recommendation. The committee report will be made available to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. This is a confidential document that cannot be shared outside the eligible voting members prior to the department vote and it is formally included in the dossier.

The review committee report should not be edited in response to the departmental deliberation and vote. The chair’s letter must describe the discussion and deliberation in the department meeting and vote, capturing the range of assessments presented at the meeting of the voting-eligible faculty, giving later reviewers a better understanding of the grounds for both positive and negative votes (if any).
Both tenured Associate and Full Professors are eligible to vote in tenure and promotion cases, but only Full Professors are eligible to vote for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. Departmental governance documents must establish which faculty members with FTE less than 1.0 are eligible to vote. An overall vote on tenure and/or promotion must be taken, as well as separate votes in each of the three performance areas, using campus-wide evaluative categories.

If a candidate has appointments in multiple units (i.e., a split appointment), one unit is designated as the “tenure home.” For split appointments, the tenure home is now identified in a Memorandum of Understanding. Non-tenure-home units send their review reports and recommendations to the chair/dean of the home unit, who includes them in the dossier for consideration by the home unit.

13. Department Meeting and Vote

The Department will hold a meeting early in the Fall semester to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate, at which the chair presides. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Faculty members unable to attend the meeting are still eligible to vote if they have been “materially engaged” in the review process. Faculty members who are away from campus are encouraged to participate in the meeting electronically. No proxy votes are allowed. The departmental recommendation must be based on the ballots from three or more vote-eligible faculty members, not including the chair.

Following discussion, members vote by secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and/or promotion on the stated basis (i.e., research/creative activity, teaching, service) or as a balanced case. Prior to the vote, the chair will review campus criteria and requirements for a vote in support of the candidate. For the categories of research and service, the four options on the ballot are excellent, very good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. For the category of teaching, the four options on the ballot are excellent, very good, effective, and ineffective. The chair must make clear at the meeting that in order to register a positive vote for tenure and promotion, the ballot must indicate excellence in the primary area of consideration and at least satisfactory/effective in the other two areas (except in a balanced case, in which all areas must be ranked very good). All other votes will register as a negative vote. Faculty members have the right to abstain. Absences and abstentions do not register as a vote on the ballot. The chair’s letter should provide an account of any absences or abstentions.

When all ballots have been submitted, the votes will be tallied by an appropriate senior staff member specified in the faculty governance documents, and the chair will inform the vote-eligible faculty members of the results. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the Chair of the Department in case
they are requested by the Executive Dean or the Provost. The Chair of the Department does not vote on the departmental ballot, but rather records his or her vote as part of the chair’s review and on the routing sheet.

14. **The Department Chair’s Review**

After the department vote, the Chair of the Department writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the department’s deliberations, including any unique characteristics of the discipline that may bear on the case (e.g., books versus articles, extent of co-authorship, significance of order of names on publications, etc.) and an accounting of the discussions in the meeting that might explain the vote, particularly in the case of negative votes, abstentions, absentees and faculty who fail to vote. The Chair is responsible for presiding at the meeting and to ensure that there is ample time to discuss the case; he or she should remind faculty it is their obligation to express their views whether positive or negative, but it is particularly important if they do not plan to support the case for tenure and/or promotion. The Chair also offers an independent recommendation regarding tenure and/or promotion; this recommendation is not bound by the department vote. The Chair’s statement, the departmental review committee report, and the recorded vote are added to the dossier. It is strongly recommended that the chair meet with the candidate in a timely fashion to discuss the vote. The completed file is then forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences through the e-Dossier process. The deadline for submission of the file to the College is generally in the middle of September for tenure cases, late September for promotion to Full Professor and Clinical Associate and Clinical Full Professor cases, and late October for promotion to Senior Lecturer cases.

15. **Degree of Candidate Access to File**

According to Indiana University policy, all dossier materials including external reference letters must be shared with the candidate upon request at any time in the review process. Candidates may add new material to the dossier at any time during the review process and should do so if new information becomes available (e.g., an acceptance of a manuscript or article) that would improve the case for tenure.

16. **College and Campus Procedures**

a. **College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committees:** Once the file leaves the department, it goes to the College Tenure Committee in the case of promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure and the College Promotion Committee in the case of promotion to Full Professor or Senior Lecturer. The Tenure Committee generally has 10 members and the Promotion Committee generally has 6 members, but the size can vary depending on the number of cases in any given year. The composition of the committees reflects a balance among the divisions of the College.
The Executive Dean presides over the Tenure Committee and the Associate Executive Dean presides over the Promotion Committee. When a faculty member from the School of Global and International Studies or the Media School is being considered, the Dean of the School jointly presides with the Executive Dean or the Associate Executive Dean. In all such cases, the participation of the Deans is limited to an organizational and procedural role to ensure that the vote of the Committee represents an independent evaluation of the dossier, free from the direct influence of the Dean(s).

The committee reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. If a member of the candidate’s department(s) is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The committee members vote by secret ballot following the same procedures as a department (see Section I.B.13). It is important to note that at no stage in the process (i.e., the Department, Tenure and Promotion committees, Dean, etc.) may the basis for a positive recommendation differ from the original basis on which the case was presented by the department and the candidate. The committee vote is advisory to the Executive Dean, and is included in the report that goes into the candidate’s dossier.

b. **Executive Dean’s Office**: After the file leaves the Tenure or Promotion committee, the presiding Dean(s) and the Executive Dean write a letter evaluating the research/creative activity, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the dossier. The letter is signed by the presiding Dean(s) and the Executive Dean and indicates whether the College supports or does not support tenure and/or promotion. In the rare instance where there is disagreement between the presiding Deans, and when a common decision cannot be reached, the Executive Dean’s decision is authoritative. That is, the presiding Deans’ role is advisory to the Executive Dean. The official position of the Executive Dean’s Office will be forwarded to the campus by the Executive Dean. This letter is sent to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs Office in early to mid-December.

c. **Campus Committees**: After the file leaves the College, it goes either to the Campus Tenure Advisory Committee or the Campus Promotion Advisory Committee, which includes members from the College and from other schools on campus. The Campus Committee members also read the file and write a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. The committee members vote on whether the candidate should be promoted and, if appropriate, receive tenure. The Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (VPF AA) prepares the final substantive evaluation and recommendation for the “executive level” (Provost and President), who in turn make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. A decision on tenure and/or promotion is communicated in campus mail once approved by the Board of Trustees prior to July 1.
d. **Reconsideration**: A faculty member may request a reconsideration upon receiving a negative tenure or promotion decision from the executive level if he or she believes that there were unjustifiable judgments of professional competence or judgments based on erroneous information. That request entails the preparation of a written rebuttal and the addition of new material germane to the deliberations. If the candidate chooses to request additional external letters, they must be obtained following the same procedures used to obtain the initial set of letters. When the rebuttal materials are completely prepared, they are included in the dossier, which is sent in its entirety back to the first level of review that made a negative recommendation (and then it is reviewed again by all subsequent levels). The reconsideration process will not add time to the candidate’s tenure probationary period, even if those deliberations extend into the seventh probationary year. Rebuttal materials must be submitted by the candidate for review within two months following notification of the negative decision. (See the following document for a complete description of this process: http://www.iub.edu/~vpfaa/docs/promotion_tenure_reappointment/pt-revised-review-guidelines.pdf).

e. **Appeal Process**: If the above reconsideration results in a negative decision or if the candidate foregoes the reconsideration opportunity, the candidate has the right to file a grievance (after the executive level decision) with the BFC Faculty Board of Review (FBOR) on procedural grounds only. The Board will decide whether evidence supports the conclusion that procedural irregularities had consequences for the legitimacy of the outcome, and if so, suggests remediation to the Provost (who decides whether the review needs to be redone, all or in part). A grievance will not in itself extend the tenure probationary period (unless so requested by the Provost). The candidate must submit materials to the FBOR within two months following notification of the negative decision by the executive level, or within one month following completion of the reconsideration process.
II. Guidelines for Department Tenure and Promotion Documents

The College requires each department to have a document that describes its promotion and tenure procedures, consistent with the following guidelines. The guidelines must be aligned with and detail the faculty governance procedures associated with sections 11-14 in the College Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines document above.

A. Preamble

All department guidelines must include the following preamble: “These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of XXXX. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. If the department’s criteria for tenure change during the period of candidacy, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for tenure under the criteria in force at the time of hiring; promotion reviews are grounded in current expectations.”

Promotion and tenure procedures are governed by procedures and guidelines at multiple levels of the institution. The formal procedures endorsed by the Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) regarding promotion and tenure can be found on IU’s policy page at: https://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/academicguide/index.php/E._Tenure/Reappointment/Promotion/Salary. In addition, IU-Bloomington’s promotion and tenure guidelines are described on the website of the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs: http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/docs/promotion_tenure_reappointment/pt-revised-review-guidelines.pdf.

This document describes procedures and guidelines that departments must follow for promotion and tenure.

B. Research/Creative Activity

Department guidelines must explicitly state that excellence in research/creative activity is required for a standard tenure and/or promotion case in which research/creative activity is the basis. The department guidelines must also specify that research/creative activity must always rise to the level of Satisfactory for tenure and/or promotion when research/creative activity is not the basis. It is essential that the department guidelines specify the standards for excellence or minimum effectiveness in research/creative activity in the context of the discipline; the standards must be consistent with the broad definitions provided on the VPFAA website (http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/forms/index.shtml).

Department guidelines should address the relative weight and importance of the following in evaluating research/creative activity:

1. Books, articles, book chapters, and other creative work;
2. The role of quantity versus quality in publications or creative activity;
3. The role of professional standing and “impact” on the field, where what constitutes evidence of professional impact is important;
4. The role of external grant funding and, in particular, whether it figures into research excellence directly or indirectly through the publication of articles;
5. The role of conference attendance and other professional activities that are signs of professional regard (e.g., editorial activities)

The department guidelines must state that, in order for book manuscripts to be considered published research, they must be accepted by a publisher, and irreversibly “in production.” Book manuscripts are considered “in production” when all creative and scholarly work has been completed by the author. Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in press” or “forthcoming” in order to be considered published research. “Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further creative or scholarly revisions. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume for each “forthcoming” publication is recommended. Department guidelines must state that books that are “in production” and articles/chapters that are “in press” or “forthcoming” at the time the dossier is considered by the external referees will be given greater weight in the decision than material under review or merely under contract.

Candidates are expected to establish independent lines of research/creative activity. For that reason, it is vital to establish the autonomous role played by the candidate in collaborative publications and grant proposals. The candidate must describe his/her role in the research statement. The chair/dean is encouraged to solicit input from collaborators and co-authors, attesting to the autonomous contributions of the candidate.

C. Teaching

Department guidelines must explicitly state that excellence in teaching is required for a promotion case where teaching is the basis. The department guidelines must also specify that teaching must always rise to the level of minimum effectiveness for tenure and/or promotion when teaching is not the basis. Please review the College “Policy on the Evaluation of Pedagogical Practices” revised and adopted in 2006: http://college.indiana.edu/faculty/policy/collegepolicies/pedagogicalpractices.shtml

It is essential that the department guidelines specify what excellence or minimum effectiveness means in teaching in the context of the particular department; the standards must be consistent with the broad definitions provided on the VPFAA website (http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/forms/index.shtml).

The guidelines should address the relative contribution and importance of the following:
1. Numerical student course evaluations;
2. Student written evaluations;
3. Peer evaluations. VPFAA Promotion and tenure guidelines state that peer reviews of teaching should be ongoing (annually for tenure-track faculty and periodically for tenured faculty). In the case of promotion, the general expectation in the College is that a peer evaluation will be conducted every other year.
4. Graduate student supervision and committee work;
5. Undergraduate supervision;
6. Post-doc supervision;
7. Teaching awards;
8. Teaching publications;
9. Curricular/pedagogical development;
10. Awards received by students.

D. Service

Promotion based on excellence in service is extremely rare. Department guidelines must explicitly state that excellence in service is required for a tenure or promotion case where service is the basis and that service plays an important role in the promotion process when research/creative activity or teaching is the basis. It is essential that the guidelines clearly specify what an effective service record looks like and how service expectations increase from consideration for promotion to Associate versus Full Professor. Department guidelines should address expectations of service specified on the VPFAA website (http://www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/forms/index.shtml).

Specific issues to address:

1. The role of department service.
2. The role of College and university service.
3. The role of professional service.
4. The role of community service.
5. The role of national and international service.