



IUPUI

Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

2022-2023

Office of Academic Affairs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

.....	1
Values.....	5
The principles that shape this document are as follows:	5
Institutional Values.....	6
Civic Engagement	6
Collaboration	6
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.....	6
Economic Development of Indiana.....	6
Entrepreneurial Work and Innovation	7
Honors College	7
Interdisciplinary Work and Publication	7
International Work and Publication	7
Interprofessional Education.....	8
Open Access	8
Peer Review.....	9
Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success.....	9
Public Scholars/Public Scholarship	9
Research and Creative Activity in the Urban Environment	10
Rise to the IUPUI Challenge.....	10
Translational Research.....	10
University College.....	10
Definitions	10
Distinctions Between Promotion and Tenure	11
Tenure	11
Promotion	11
Time in Rank.....	12
Service	13
Unit Designations	13
Criteria by Faculty Type and Area of Excellence	14
Tenure-Track Faculty.....	14
Single Area of Excellence (research, teaching, or service):	14
Criteria for satisfactory for tenure-track faculty:	15
Research-excellent-tenure-track.....	15
Teaching-excellent-tenure-track	16

Service-excellent-tenure-track	17
Balanced Case:	18
Balanced-binned case	18
Balanced-Integrative Case-Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion-Tenure-Track	20
Balanced-Integrative Case-Thematic.....	21
Clinical Faculty.....	21
Service-excellent-clinical.....	22
Service-satisfactory-clinical.....	23
Teaching-excellent-clinical	23
Teaching-satisfactory-clinical	24
Balanced-binned case-clinical	25
Balanced-integrative-DEI case for clinical	25
Balanced-integrative-thematic case for clinical faculty	26
Librarians	27
Performance-excellent-librarian	27
Lecturer Faculty	27
Teaching-excellent-lecturer.....	28
Service-satisfactory-lecturer ranks	28
Lecturer-integrative DEI case:	29
Research Scientists/Scholars.....	29
Research-excellent-research scientist.....	29
Service-research-satisfactory	30
Documentation (Dossier-Candidate Sections)	30
Candidate's Sections	30
Candidate's Statement.....	30
Curriculum Vitae	32
Main Section: Research and Creative Activity	33
General notes.....	33
Dossier folder checklist	33
Documentation.....	34
Main Section: Librarians: Documentation of Professional Development.....	35
Dossier folder checklist: Librarians.....	35
Main Section: Teaching	36
General notes	36
Dossier folder checklist	36

Documentation.....	37
Librarians: Documenting Performance	40
Dossier Folder Checklist: Librarians.....	40
Main Section: Professional and University Service	40
General Notes.....	40
Definitions	41
Dossier Folder Checklist	42
Documentation.....	42
Librarians: Documentation of Service	44
Dossier Folder Checklist: Librarians.....	44
Main Section: Balanced-Integrative Excellence: Balanced-Integrative-DEI Case and Balanced-Integrative-Thematic Case	44
Appendices.....	46
Charts, Templates, and Guides have been moved to a separate document	46
Process and Responsibilities (Includes Dossier Administrative Sections)	46
Nine-Year Tenure Probationary Timeline for School of Medicine	46
Department Chair (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline	46
Dean Responsibilities.....	50
Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities.....	51
Institutional Procedures	53
Submission Deadlines	53
Addition of Materials/Comments	53
Reconsideration.....	54
Campus Level Reviews and Notification.....	55
Dossier Content-Administrative.....	55
Dossier Administrative Sections	56
External Assessment of Candidates.....	59
IUPUI Chief Academic Officer’s Comments Regarding Outside Letters.....	64
Advice.....	65
Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline	66
Ongoing Review (From: Peer Review section of original)	68
Appendix: Quality and Impact	69

The principles that shape this document are as follows:

- Confidentiality of process. Therefore, potential conflicts of interest in voting, committee membership, and the committee voting record should be identified and resolved.
- Integrity and fidelity of process. Therefore, members cannot vote twice, and procedures need to be consistent over time at every level.
- Substance trumps technicalities in the review. Therefore, issues such as font size, format, and deadlines will not be rigidly enforced at the detriment to faculty success.
- Faculty own the dossier, and, therefore, have final say on contents.
- Faculty get the benefit of any doubt in processes such as reconsideration. Therefore, when in doubt, the advantage goes to faculty.
- Objectivity of the review. Therefore, avoid conflicts of interest in external letters and in committee membership to maintain objectivity and fairness.
- The Guidelines interpret university policy and criteria to assist in the preparation of promotion and/or tenure dossiers. The guidelines should provide useful in:
 - Helping faculty, chairs, and deans understand their role and responsibilities in the promotion and/or tenure process;
 - Ensuring that dossier evaluators on all review committees have the information they need to make judgments about individuals within a common shared context reflective of campus expectations and university requirements.
- These guidelines apply to the following appointees:
 - Faculty and librarians at IUPUI who are subject to promotion and/or tenure consideration, including all tenure-related appointees, clinical faculty, research faculty, and lecturers.
 - Faculty who hold appointments in Purdue schools at IUPUI, faculty based at medical centers, faculty based at IUPUC, faculty based at IU Fort Wayne, and some faculty in other units for whom the primary place of work may not be Indianapolis.
- The Guidelines are updated annually based on recommendations from the campus-level promotion and/or tenure committee, members of the Faculty Council Executive Committee, and votes of the IFC. Changes respond to the evolving nature of the institution as well as the experience of the campus-level reviewers, who often identify better ways of assisting faculty with preparing their dossiers for these important deliberations. In accordance with the *Indiana University Academic Policies*, tenure is based upon the guidelines in effect and agreed to at the time of the appointment. Promotion is based on contemporary guidelines in effect at the time of application for promotion. (See: [Time in Rank](#) in Definitions section.)
- Each school and library must have a document that states with reasonable specificity the standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
- In accordance with school policies, departments or divisions should also have such documents.
- School, library, and department documents must comply with the criteria of the university and IUPUI. A current copy must be on file with the [Office of Academic Affairs \(OAA\)](#). These documents need to be approved by the school's appropriate faculty governance process and by the assistant vice chancellor for faculty affairs for their compliance with campus and university standards. They also should be publicly available on the school's website so faculty can easily access them.

- Promotion and/or tenure considerations are based on the missions and the contexts of each candidate's department, school, or library in compliance with the IUPUI mission, as defined in each department, school, or library's statement of criteria and standards.
- Every faculty type has a set of areas of responsibilities. Every faculty member evaluated for promotion (and/or tenure) must be at least satisfactory in all areas of responsibility. These areas are:
 - Tenure-track faculty: Research/creative activity, teaching, service
 - Tenure-track librarians: Performance, professional development, service
 - Clinical faculty: Teaching, service
 - Lecturer faculty: Teaching, service
 - Research faculty: Research (service if specified by unit.)

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

Institutional Values

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

Civic Engagement

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

See also: [Interdisciplinary Work and Publication](#) and [Public Scholars/Public Scholarship](#)

Collaboration

- The work of the academy is often advanced through collaboration and joint work, especially in new or interdisciplinary areas where the expertise and experience of more than one colleague may be required.
- Results of this work—whether teaching, research and creative activity, or service—are frequently disseminated through publications with joint authorship.
- Collaborative work is valued, but candidates should make clear their individual role in such collective activity, preferably as specified by colleagues involved in the joint work.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

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

Economic Development of Indiana

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

Entrepreneurial Work and Innovation

- IUPUI is a comparatively new institution and has had an opportunity to develop policies, procedures and programs that build on the experiences of others, adapting best practices and creating innovative new approaches to teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- This opportunity has led many faculty to be entrepreneurial in their university duties, after leading their own disciplines into new areas of inquiry or seeking collaboration with other disciplines.
- While there is no criterion specifying entrepreneurial work or innovation, these qualities have long been appreciated and valued within the more traditional criteria ordinarily used to assess faculty achievement.
- Documentation of the impact of this work will help reviewers of the dossier understand its significance.

Honors College

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

Interdisciplinary Work and Publication

- In the instance of candidates who work in interdisciplinary fields that transcend the intellectual authority of any single school/unit, special arrangements for primary and unit committee reviews may be necessary.
- The school/unit that serves as administrative host for such a program should assume responsibility for preparing and transmitting files while making accommodations for participation of faculty from other schools/units in a primary committee and for an alternative unit committee.
- The special or ad hoc arrangements should be stipulated in advance, be known to the candidate, the program administrators (dean or director), and the dean of the host school/unit.
- In instances where there is not agreement on procedures among the concerned parties, the chief academic officer will determine the process and procedures for reviewing candidates.
- The same high standards of achievement and of documentation for traditional disciplinary work apply to interdisciplinary work.
 - Journals that publish interdisciplinary work may not be as well-recognized or widely known to the reviewers as other journals, but these may be most appropriate places to publish.
 - Care must be taken to consider the nature and quality of journals or other media where interdisciplinary work appears.
 - Holding formulaic expectations for work appearing in "top tier" journals is not likely to serve either institutional or individual interests well in every case.
 - Candidates should help their chairs to document and establish the quality of such journals—including those in electronic formats—but reviewers have a reciprocal obligation to evaluate the quality of the work on its merits and not solely on the reputation of the journal within a discipline.
 - In some instances, external assessments of outlets for publication may be useful and such information may be included within the dossier.

See also: [Public Scholars/Public Work](#) and [Civic Engagement](#)

International Work and Publication

- Scholarship and professional work are now often international in terms of their impact and application; collaborators are sometimes based in other countries; and appropriate journals, conferences, and other forums for dissemination may be international in scope and/or published outside the U.S. and in languages other than English.

- Such international work and outreach are encouraged.
- In most cases, they may be evaluated using standard procedures. Sometimes, however, they may require special forms of review and assessment, even—in some cases—the provision of translations.
- Review committees should demonstrate the same flexibility in assessing such international work as they do for interdisciplinary work.
 - International variations in rankings, modes of inquiry, and forms of dissemination must be acknowledged.
 - Candidates and chairs should take special care to explain the quality, audience, impact, and value of such international work and to solicit external evaluation by international peers, when appropriate.

Interprofessional Education

- As Indiana University’s urban health and life sciences campus, IUPUI is committed to advancing capabilities and contributions in interprofessional education and collaborative practice to produce graduates with the skills needed for future team-based and population focused models of health and wellness.
 - Interprofessional education occurs when learners from two or more health-related professions learn about, from, and with each other to enable effective collaboration.
 - Interprofessional, collaborative practice occurs when faculty and students from different professional backgrounds work together to produce the highest quality outcomes from a variety of settings or to produce scholarship that informs teaching, learning, and/or teamwork.
 - Interprofessional teams cross disciplines, programs, and schools to identify and facilitate opportunities for collaboration.
- Faculty scholarship in interprofessional education and practice is by nature, complex, time-intensive, highly collaborative, and involves faculty teams and community stakeholders across a wide array of disciplines, professions, and settings.
 - Scholarship in the area may include: presentations, articles in peer-reviewed interprofessional or discipline-based journals, original curricular and assessment products, program assessment and evaluation, innovation in service learning or other models or technologies that integrate interprofessional practice and educational pedagogy, and qualitative and/or quantitative descriptions or research related to project or program outcomes such as community and/or practice-based interprofessional projects.
 - Interprofessional work typically generates collective scholarship products. As such, the faculty involved share both individual and mutual responsibilities for the project team’s outcomes. Traditional publication conventions with first, or last and corresponding author designations may not be applicable to true collaborations, in which case alphabetical order to demonstrate equal authorship should be utilized and noted.
 - As teaching and research in interprofessional practice and education grows, not all scholarly products will fit into traditional profession-specific expectations or considerations. This work, which occurs at the borders of profession-specific boundaries or in-between professions, can transform a research program in new and unique ways, and flexibility in the application of traditional expectations and/or criteria for scholarship may be needed.

Open Access

- IUPUI is committed to disseminating the fruits of its research and scholarly activities as widely as possible and as such supports faculty participating in digital open access distribution of their scholarship. The [IUPUI Open Access Policy](#) provides a no-cost, opt out approach to increase access to scholarly articles authored by campus faculty members.

- Open access supports many of IUPUI's Institutional Values including: Civic Engagement; Collaboration; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Economic Development; Interdisciplinary Work and Publication; International Work and Publication; Public Scholarship, and Translational Research.

Peer Review

- The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, and service is the bedrock on which promotion and/or tenure decisions are based. This review may be applied to instances or items (e.g. a scholarly work, a course taught, a creative expression), or to the candidate as a whole.
- This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. Professional peer review as well as academic may be appropriate for individual items produced by clinical, lecturer, and tenure-track faculty and librarians.
- At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed. Review of candidates by peers from the academy is required for promotion for faculty members, and for tenure for tenure-track faculty and librarians. One or two external reviewers may be non-academic as long as they are qualified for the subject matter and can assess the faculty member's total record in light of their academic rank and responsibilities.
- These two types of peer review, ongoing review of activities and accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, or service, and assessment of the candidate's overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations. Both candidate and chair provide information about peer evaluation of activities. Selection and contribution of external peer reviewers of the promotion or tenure case is covered in XXXX section below.

Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success

Formerly the Principles of Undergraduate Learning.

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

Public Scholars/Public Scholarship

- IUPUI's Mission of Civic Engagement aligns with the values of public scholarship and embraces the unique relationships and contributions between faculty and community.
- Faculty appointments as a public scholar are typically determined at the time of hiring. Appointments can be revised and documented as one's area of excellence is defined and refined.
- IUPUI defines public scholarship as an intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is responsive to public audiences and non-academic peer review. It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing production of knowledge with community stakeholders.
- The university and campus recognize the appointment of public scholars and embrace their unique relationships and contributions to the community. Public scholarship is conducted in partnership with identified "publics" to address their needs and concerns. As such, public scholarship tends to be highly collaborative, is outcomes-focused and results in final products that benefit and are valued by the community. Scholarly outcomes may include exhibits, curricular products, community projects, and websites.

- The nature of public scholarship is diverse, and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of scholarship. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics should be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documentation.
- Peer review of public scholarship must take into account the faculty members' investment in such activities as building community relationships, engaging in reciprocal learning and project definition, experimenting with collaborative methods, and writing grants to support collaboration with faculty, students, and public stakeholders. Peer review must also evaluate the types and the appropriateness of the outcomes produced based on the faculty member's goals, methods, and public(s). Given the importance of collaboration in this work, external evaluators must have knowledge of the processes involved in public scholarship activities and should have knowledge of the project content, rather than only experience based on the faculty member's discipline. IUPUI support for public and engaged scholarship in promotion and tenure may be found on this [page](#).
- See also: [Civic Engagement](#) and [Interdisciplinary Work and Publication](#)

Research and Creative Activity in the Urban Environment

- Applied research or creative activity that integrates various applications into improved practices is often as essential or as valuable as theoretical research.
- IUPUI has made interdisciplinary research a particular focus for its mission and its strategic objectives as a result of combining in one place the traditionally differentiated missions of Indiana University and Purdue University.
- As the state's only public metropolitan university, IUPUI has specific opportunities and responsibilities to engage in research that draws on and supports its urban environment.

Rise to the IUPUI Challenge

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

Translational Research

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

University College

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

Definitions

In this part, we provide explanations and policies around key aspects of promotion and tenure.

Distinctions Between Promotion and Tenure

These guidelines include advice and procedures used in preparing and evaluating dossiers for both promotion and tenure. The criteria are closely related, but not identical. While both are based on performance commensurate with rank, tenure requires documented evidence of the promise of continued achievement with distinction. Promotion or tenure recommendations may be made separately; however, most tenure-probationary faculty/librarians are considered for both at the same time (unless they already hold a rank of associate or full professor/librarian), and, generally, a decision to award tenure is not made without simultaneous promotion in rank.

Tenure

The *Indiana University Academic Policies [statement on tenure](#)* (ACA-37) emphasizes an implicit reciprocal commitment between tenured faculty members and the university. The university provides freedom and economic security; faculty members maintain high standards of excellence in their work. The university works to ensure safeguards to academic freedom through employment security, while the faculty member or librarian works to fulfill the commitment demonstrated during the probationary period with respect to continued growth and productivity.

- Tenure is based on a documented record of achievement that meets defined standards for the department, school, and campus, together with evidence and a plan that demonstrates the level of achievement that is likely to continue and grow. Tenure acknowledges achievement in light of its promise for the future.
- The criteria by which a candidate is judged for tenure are those in effect at the time of accepting an offer. Units and candidates must preserve those criteria. Candidates are free to choose updated criteria if they wish.
- Tenure is local (i.e., campus specific) and faculty/librarians who have tenure are expected to contribute in concrete, demonstrable ways to the continued development of IUPUI as an academic community.
- Tenure is awarded at the campus level, not at the department or school level, even though tenure is specific to a unit.
 - The safeguards of tenure are preserved at the campus level and tenured faculty/librarians thus accept a responsibility to the campus as well as towards the university.
 - Due to institutional change and development, an individual's tenure "home," defined as the unit which oversees faculty assessment, may change over time. IU policy and IUPUI guidelines on mergers, reorganizations, and eliminations of academic units govern employment security for tenured IUPUI faculty.
- Some faculty members—most notably those in the School of Medicine and the School of Social Work—may be assigned to other campuses, yet their tenure is at IUPUI. Due to the unique mission of such programs, faculty members maintain their academic community through their association with the IUPUI campus and are subject to the policies and procedures of the IUPUI campus even if the principal site of their work is elsewhere.
- Tenure is the occasion to renew a personal commitment to achieve the promise of the probationary period and to accept the responsibility of membership in the academic community of IUPUI.

Promotion

As candidates compile records of sustained achievement in their respective fields of work, their accomplishments and level of expertise deserve recognition through promotion at key intervals.

- Promotion is recognition of achievement.
- For probationary tenure-track candidates, promotion to the associate level is normally sought toward the end of the probationary period in conjunction with the tenure decision.

- As a general rule, promotion standards are those in effect at the time of application for promotion while tenure standards are those in effect at the time of hire. Units must keep copies of the standards in effect upon hire (the acceptance of an offer letter) for each pre-tenure faculty or librarian. Individual faculty or librarians may choose standards developed later if they wish. Decisions about tenure and promotion to associate rank should in most cases be parallel and consistent. Any negative decision on promotion that is based on changed criteria should be assessed in terms of the candidate's reasonable ability to have met the new standard.
- All promotions to full, and all promotions in the non-tenure-track ranks, are based on standards in effect at the time of application.
- Both tenure-track and non-tenure-track candidates may seek promotion in rank when their achievements warrant this recognition. This campus document defines the campus-level standards for each rank, and each department and school interpret those standards in relation to the disciplinary culture.

Time in Rank

- In most instances, the work being assessed as the basis for promotion or tenure will have been completed since either the initial appointment or last promotion. In many cases, it is understood that national reputation depends, in part, on foundational work that may have occurred earlier in the candidate's career. For faculty, publications and presentations in rank at another institution prior to appointment at IUPUI will be considered part of the candidate's record. The overall pattern of productivity over time will be scrutinized, with emphasis placed on recent work and scholarly trajectory.
 - When there is a question about whether work prior to IUPUI appointment should be considered in-rank, this question should be discussed with the unit P&T committee and determined no later than the third-year review. Such questions may arise from considerations of:
 - Work accomplished during post-doc or other research-only positions
 - Work performed at non-academic institutions
 - Position titles or classifications that are not the same as those in general use at Indiana University.

Units with numerical expectations for work should be especially clear. At the campus level, overall trajectory and recent work are determinative, regardless of specific titles held previously.

- While the probationary period for untenured faculty ordinarily is seven years (with the tenure review occurring in the sixth year), special conditions may warrant earlier than normal consideration. (See section on [timeline](#).)
- Tenure-track faculty hired in the School of Medicine have a nine-year tenure probationary timeline.
- For librarians, tenure is based on the entire professional career, including relevant professional positions held prior to coming to Indiana University.
- There is no defined period between associate and full rank, although most candidates seek full rank five to ten years after promotion to the associate rank. Occasionally, the period under consideration may vary due to: Prior appointments at other institutions; the cumulative nature of some work that may build on earlier accomplishments; leaves that may have extended the probationary period; administrative roles; or earlier than normal consideration.
- When a case has special circumstances, candidates and department chairs should provide an explanation for any unusual conditions that may affect the review of the candidates' dossiers.
- Candidates who seek earlier than normal consideration must present evidence of achievements comparable to those who have served the full probationary period. Earlier-than-normal cases sometimes require special care to ensure equity of treatment.

- Some faculty may have a longer-than-normal probationary period. Because extensions are formally approved for important reasons, such as illness, childbirth or unavoidable delays in research infrastructure, candidates should not be held to higher expectations because of a longer-than-normal probationary period.
- Part-time IUPUI appointments are rare. Agreements regarding the length of a probationary period for a part-time faculty member should be committed to writing in a MOU or letter of appointment.
- In considering candidates for tenure and/or promotion, where there are questions about time in rank, reviewers are reminded that tenure assumes an extended period of productivity and improvement. The purpose of the probationary period is to give candidates for tenure an opportunity to demonstrate their capacity for sustained excellence and an ability to adapt to changing conditions of their disciplines and the institution. In some cases, consideration of work completed elsewhere or prior to appointment to a tenure-track position may be appropriate. Regardless, the dossiers must present clear evidence of the candidate's ability to contribute at the expected levels throughout his or her professional career.

Service

- All tenure-track faculty, tenure-track librarians, clinical faculty, and lecturer faculty have responsibilities for university service. University service supports and develops IUPUI and its schools and units. Most tenure-track faculty and librarians, as well as some clinical faculty, also participate in disciplinary service which supports and develops the research and professional goals of their discipline.
- Satisfactory service means being a contributing member of the campus and disciplinary communities and is a factor in promotion and tenure considerations. All faculty must be satisfactory in all areas of responsibility, therefore unsatisfactory service to the university will preclude successful application for promotion and/or tenure.
- Not all university service is equal.
 - Some committees, such as an Institutional Review Board, the Committee on Ethics in Research, campus Promotion and Tenure, or a Faculty Board of Review, may require extensive time commitments and may address principles or issues fundamental to the continued effectiveness of the campus. These special features need to be recognized.
- The primary committee, chair, unit committee, and dean are best able to assess the degree of performance of university service.
 - If it is deemed inadequate or unsatisfactory, this fact should be noted, and an evaluation based on the documented record of performance should be included in the dossier when it is forwarded to the campus level for review. The candidate must be informed and be provided an opportunity to respond prior to a final recommendation at the primary and unit levels.
- Service when it contributes to overall excellence (the balanced cases) or as an area of excellence (service-excellence cases) is discussed *elsewhere*.

Unit Designations

Within these guidelines, the following designations and definitions are used:

- School = Unit or "unit level." The academic school in which the faculty member has his or her appointment. Examples include Liberal Arts, Science, and Informatics and Computing.
- Department = Primary or "primary level." A sub-unit of a school; the first unit through which a faculty member is evaluated. A department is headed by a department chair. This is not the same as a program, and a program director (except for School of Medicine regional directors) does not have a role in promotion and tenure cases. In Columbus, the division serves the same role as a department.

- Single-level school: In the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy and the School of Social Work (with the exception of Labor Studies) there is no department and the school as a whole acts as the school/unit.
 - In some schools and for some cases, a lack of available faculty at the department level will mean a single level of evaluation at the school level.
- Core Schools/system schools: In two cases (O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs and Kelley School of Business) promotion and tenure cases involve the overall school that exists at both Bloomington and Indianapolis. In these cases, the *executive associate dean* at the Indianapolis site manages the duties assigned to chairs and the overall dean manages the duties assigned to deans. The primary committee is at Indianapolis; the school committee involves both campuses. For the School of Informatics and Computing, both school and primary committees exist at Indianapolis; the senior executive associate dean in Indianapolis, and the overall dean (resident in Bloomington) take the roles of the dean. For Nursing, faculty at IU-Fort Wayne and IU Bloomington use IUPUI department and school committees and their cases are reviewed at IUPUI; Columbus nursing faculty are part of IUPUC. For Social Work, all system-wide faculty present cases to the School of Social Work single-level committee; after that, all IU Northwest cases go to IU Northwest and all other cases go to the IUPUI campus committee.
- Chair: In most cases this refers to the department chair; in others, the chair of the promotion and tenure committee. A department chair must have tenure and have at least the rank applied for to write the chair's letter for a candidate [with an exception until 2024 for the teaching professor case.]. If the chair is not qualified, his or her duties are fulfilled by the dean or dean designate.
- Full rank: Someone is at full rank when they are a professor, librarian, clinical professor, research scientist, or teaching professor.

Criteria by Faculty Type and Area of Excellence

Note: For all types of faculty, candidates must ensure that their dossiers document that they fulfill expectations for every area of responsibility. These expectations apply to balanced-binned or balanced-integrative cases, as well as teaching, research, and service cases for tenure-track faculty, and as appropriate, clinical and lecturer faculty.

- All candidates with teaching responsibilities (all tenure-track, all lecturer, and all clinical) must include information on teaching assignments (in the CV) as well as reflection on effectiveness indicators (student evaluations, peer evaluations, and outcomes information).
- All candidates with research responsibilities (all tenure-track, all research scientists) must engage in peer-reviewed dissemination.
- All candidates with service responsibilities (all tenure-track, all clinical, all lecturer; research scientists if specified by unit) must engage in department, school and/or external service.

Tenure-Track Faculty

Single Area of Excellence (research, teaching, or service):

Top-level expectations:

- To associate: "record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. Emerging national reputation."
- To full: "record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank."

Must achieve 'satisfactory' in two areas and 'excellent' in one.

Criteria for satisfactory for tenure-track faculty:

- Standard for **satisfactory** for tenure-track candidates: **two of these** items must be achieved.
 - Research-satisfactory-tenure-track
 - Candidate has performed research that is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice
 - Candidate has disseminated the results of research in scholarly journals or other appropriate venues
 - Research program is clearly articulated
 - Grants and external support: Achieved according to the department or school-explicit standards
 - Departments provide clear information about the stature of journals and the significance of the research publications
 - Department affirm the candidates' plans for continued research
 - Teaching-satisfactory-tenure-track
 - Required of all:
 - Quantitative¹ and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes
 - Information on teaching load
 - Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers
 - Evidence of the quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students
 - Some of the following:
 - Evidence of new course development or significant course revision presented with evidence on effectiveness
 - Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized; student satisfaction is indicated by evidence; satisfactory impact on student achievement clear
 - Awards and recognition: Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning; some recognition of teaching efforts
 - Professional development: Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance, personal experimentation, or reading; record of mentoring other teachers; reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching; peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth or mentoring of others.
 - Service-satisfactory-tenure-track
 - University citizenship: Routine department expectations; chair's determination that service is more than mere participation
 - Discipline and community: routine, required, or expected

Research-excellent-tenure-track

- Standard for **excellent** for tenure-track candidates: one of these must be achieved.

¹ A task force of the University Faculty Council, and, the University Faculty Council Faculty Affairs Committee, recommend caution in using quantitative scores from student evaluations, and recommend against using student evaluation scores as the primary assessment of teaching (spring 2022).

- Disciplinary or professional research: Significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that clearly demonstrate attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of research
- Grants and external support [as required by school or department]: Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support, including the degree to which the process was competitive
- Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations, grants, and publications; evidence of national recognition of the quality of work
- Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others.
- For associate rank: Emerging national reputation
- For full rank: A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank

Teaching-excellent-tenure-track

- For all:
 - Instruction: Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes; the case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy
 - Peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning
- Some of the following:
 - Course or curricular development: In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation, or other means. Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence.
 - Mentoring and advising: Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach; high accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor; scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented; demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students; external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work
 - Scholarly activities, including awards: Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels; positive departmental evaluation of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals); peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods; national or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects
 - Professional development efforts in teaching: Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning; membership in communities of practice on the campus, national, or international level; participation in dissemination of good practice; peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area
- Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence [in teaching] for clinical and tenure-track faculty
- For associate rank: Emerging national reputation
- For full rank: A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank

Service-excellent-tenure-track

- Service when presented as evidence for excellence can involve any of the following:
 - Work with or for individuals as clients or patients.
 - Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners.
 - Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit's teaching, research, or service missions².
- Service must be significant work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of advanced knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of quality and impact.
 - Disseminating their work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong support for a case for excellence; see also Appendix: Quality and Impact.
- If service involves patients or clients, the candidate must document that their work is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. Overall, this patient/client work would demonstrate impact beyond individual recipients of the service through appropriate professional or academic peer-review dissemination activities.
- Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care. Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
- Faculty presenting administrative, committee, or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate distinctive outcomes and evidence of quality for their work; see Appendix: Quality and Impact.
- Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:
 - External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service, including refereed and non-refereed publications or other means of dissemination.
 - Appropriate evaluation of ongoing activities may be accomplished by professional or academic peers.
 - For external evaluators for the promotion or tenure case, a majority of evaluators should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. These evaluators can assess the entirety of the candidate's case within academic responsibilities and expectations.
 - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
 - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
 - Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.

² This language encompasses administrative work. Someone who develops a new program, for example, organizes advanced subject matter expertise, pedagogical knowledge, understanding of recruitment and market needs, and knowledge of university processes. Sometimes this work can be part of a Teaching-excellence case but may also be considered university service.

- Also: acceptable university service
- For associate rank: Emerging national reputation
- For full rank: A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank.

Balanced Case:

Candidates may present either a single-area-of-excellence or a balanced case for promotion or tenure. In all balanced cases, the candidate must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in the areas of responsibility that pertain to their faculty types. The sum total of all of their accomplishments across all areas (“balanced strengths”) adds up to an excellence that is “of comparable benefit to the university” as a single-area case (ACA-38.)

An individual faculty member’s career and accomplishments may be more or less integrated across teaching, research and service. Those who primarily see themselves as experts or focused on one of these should choose the single-area case type.

The balanced case category includes each of these types:

- **Balanced-binned:** accomplishments distributed among areas, but not necessarily integrated among themselves. Each area must achieve a level of highly satisfactory.
- **Balanced-integrative Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion:** an integration among accomplishments and an overall philosophy and achievement towards DEI.
- **Balanced-integrative-Thematic:** an integration among accomplishments according to a specified philosophy or focus.³

Top-level expectations for all balanced cases:

- The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of activities: “A candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.” (ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions; “comparable” to a single-area of excellence case.)
 - To associate: Candidate will have led or been an essential part of endeavors with distinct and local outcomes. National or international dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of work.
 - To full: The candidate will have sustained accomplishments and have achieved a national or international reputation through their work.

Balanced-binned case

In this case type, the candidate’s activities and accomplishments are *not* concentrated in one area, but are distributed among all three, although not necessarily to the same degree in each. The candidate must demonstrate that their work constitutes “highly satisfactory” which is clearly more than satisfactory accomplishment in all three areas, with convincing evidence of significant peer-evaluated impact and quality. In the research and teaching areas, highly satisfactory includes peer-reviewed dissemination. Not all candidates would have all example items in each area as listed. Cases would be expected to show a greater number and quality in at least two of the areas. Candidates must clearly identify their signature accomplishments and areas of emphasis. All activities and accomplishments are labelled (“binned”) as research/creative activity, teaching, or service.

³ In campus guidelines, there are no specific themes indicated. Relevant themes may be drawn from the Values section above: these three Values are all noted as “faculty work...that should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.” Civic Engagement; Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; and Translational Research. Honors College, Profiles of Learning..., RISE to the IUPUI Challenge, and University College are also listed but would fall more directly into a Teaching excellence case. Schools and departments may develop their own templates for particularly relevant themes.

- In the area of research, the candidate’s work has attracted favorable academic peer review and commentary notes promise.
 - Significant dissemination of scholarship is required.
 - Successful grant and external support have been obtained [as appropriate for type of scholarship and departmental expectations] and continuing efforts and promise are documented.
- In the area of teaching, evidence of accomplishment that is clearly beyond satisfactory can include:
 - Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for extraordinarily effective and innovative instruction.
 - Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes.
 - Where applicable, mentoring and advising document important impact and student achievement
 - Scholarly activities demonstrate:
 - Evidence of regular and significant local/regional/national peer reviewed dissemination contributing to pedagogy in the discipline or profession. Peer-reviewed dissemination is required for highly-satisfactory in teaching.
 - Grants or awards at the department, campus, or national level
 - Work with national or international bodies on standards, protocols, assessment, accreditation, etc., in support of university teaching, may be placed here or in Service.
 - Professional development efforts in teaching:
 - High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers.
 - Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues. Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments.
- In the area of service, some of these would be evident. Peer-reviewed dissemination is not required, but candidates must present evidence of the quality and impact of their activities, that demonstrates achievement at a highly satisfactory level.
 - University (campus, school, unit) service:
 - Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance by Faculty Council) “wrote a policy that was approved by committee” “not required or expected.”
 - Played a major role in initiatives over a period of time that contributed to campus or unit goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others.
 - Service to discipline:
 - Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants, scope and quality indicators, “organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered”).
 - Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to discipline’s goals or organization’s mission, with independent evidence of significance, impact, role, and effective communication to others.
 - Service to community organizations, governmental bodies, etc.:
 - Accompanied by independent evidence of impact. “chaired a committee of a board that accomplished X, Y, and Z”; “played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization.”

- Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to community goals, with independent evidence of the significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others.

Balanced-Integrative Case-Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion-Tenure-Track

In this case type, the candidate's activities and accomplishments are interrelated. Individual items need not be labelled or separated as belonging exclusively to teaching, research, or service. However, the candidate should demonstrate how teaching, research, and service are expressed by the items: for example, a particular grant may have both teaching and research aspects or a publication may advance disciplinary knowledge (research) and but also be a result of collaboration with practitioners (service). Candidates will state their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated impact and quality.

- Top level expectation: The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities aligned with diversity, equity, and inclusion, consistent with IU policy on balanced cases: “a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.” (ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions; “comparable” to a single-area-of-excellence case)
 - To associate: Candidate will have led or been an essential part of endeavors with distinct and demonstrable local outcomes. Local refers to either or both of campus/university and local community. National or international dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of work.
 - To full: The candidate will be seen as a local leader and will also have achieved a national or international reputation through their work.
- Integrative Excellence in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: The following should be evident, using multiple sources of information.
 - Evidence of at least satisfactory performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
 - Diversity, equity, and inclusion: The candidate articulates a philosophy⁴ of diversity, equity, and inclusion, including if appropriate any specifically targeted aspect.
 - Integrated activity: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUPUI faculty member in teaching, research, and service which demonstrably support and advance diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidates need to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
 - Scholarly⁵ impact: Often but not exclusively facilitated by peer-reviewed dissemination⁶; a variety of venues for dissemination are accepted.
 - Direct impact: Effective evaluation of diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives should demonstrate distinct outcomes. Tying to unit (program, department, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact (e.g., contributing to a local community's using professional

⁴ Similar to the requirement for a teaching philosophy in teaching excellence cases (which is incorporated into the candidate statement or presented separately.)

⁵ In the current guidelines, in the Service area, this is phrased as, the work is *academic in nature*. This is described as “characterized by “command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contribution to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity, and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact.”

⁶ Peer-reviewed dissemination is the standard language already used in the IUPUI guidelines, broad enough to cover the wide range of research and creative activities pursued by IUPUI faculty across all schools.

expertise, recruiting diverse students to undergraduate or graduate programs, diversifying curricula, etc.). See Appendix: Quality and Impact.

- Increasing development over time. A candidate's statement should describe plans for the future.

Balanced-Integrative Case-Thematic

In this case type, the candidate's activities and accomplishments are interrelated, around a chosen theme. Individual items need not be labelled or separated as belonging exclusively to teaching, research, or service. However, the candidate should demonstrate how teaching, research, and service are expressed by the items: for example, a particular grant may have both teaching and research aspects or a publication may advance disciplinary knowledge (research) and but also be a result of collaboration with practitioners (service). Candidates will state their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated impact and quality.

- IUPUI P&T Guidelines (section I above, "Institutional Values") name three areas with "should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process":
 - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Balanced-Integrative-DEI case above)
 - Civic Engagement
 - Translational Research
 - Teaching: Honors College; Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success, RISE to the IUPUI Challenge/Experiential Learning, University College.

Balanced-Integrative cases may address one of these values as their philosophy, but this list is not exhaustive. The strongest cases will be tied to unit missions and goals. Schools and departments may develop templates and expectations for themes particularly relevant to their units.

Balanced Integrative cases will demonstrate that the candidate possesses these characteristics:

- Evidence of at least satisfactory performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
- A clearly articulated philosophy / defined theme which is reflected in the interrelated activities across teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
- Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidates need to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
 - Scholarly and direct impact and demonstrated quality. Academic peer review is required as a component of assessing scholarly (research, creative activity) impact; professional or academic peer review as well as other indicators of quality and impact would support assessments of teaching- and service- oriented activities.
 - A cumulative record that supports an argument for overall excellent contribution to the unit and university.
 - Increasing development over time. A candidate's statement should describe plans for the future.

Clinical Faculty

- Top level expectations:
 - To associate rank: "record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence."
 - To full rank: "record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence." *Some units may require a national reputation.*

- Disseminated scholarship is a requirement; the candidate would demonstrate how their scholarship supports their teaching, their service, or both. Clinical faculty may not present “research” as a criterion for promotion.⁷ (ACA-18 Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Faculty,
- Clinical faculty may choose:
 - Excellent in service and satisfactory in teaching
 - Excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service
 - A balanced-binned case, highly satisfactory in service and teaching
 - A balanced-integrative DEI case, with integrative activities supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - A balanced-integrative-thematic case, with integrative activities supporting a chosen theme.

Service-excellent-clinical

- When service is presented as an area of excellence, it consists of significant contributions that clearly go beyond satisfactory university or organizational service (see Service in Definitions.)
- Service when presented as evidence for excellence can involve any of the following:
 - Work with or for individuals as clients or patients.
 - Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners.
 - Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit’s teaching, research, or service missions. Administrative work primarily concerned with teaching may be presented as “service” or as “teaching” excellence.
- Service must be significant work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of advanced knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of quality and impact.
 - Disseminating their work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong support for a case for excellence.
 - Some disseminated scholarship is required for excellence in service. The candidate must address how their scholarship advances their service and documents their excellence. Precise distinctions between “research” scholarship and “service” scholarship are not necessary for clinical faculty as long as their disseminated scholarship supports their accomplishments. Per IU policy, scholarship labelled as research may not be presented as evidence of excellence for a non-tenure track faculty member. Disciplinary research may be used as evidence of supporting the teaching mission (for teaching-excellence) or the service mission (for service-excellence) of the unit.
 - If service involves patients or clients, the candidate must document that their work is-in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. Overall, this work would demonstrate impact

⁷ [ACA-18](#), Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments: “continued appointment and advancement in rank must be based on performance in teaching and service.”

beyond the direct recipients (patients/clients) of the service through appropriate professional or academic peer-review dissemination activities.

- Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care. Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
- ⊖ Faculty presenting administrative, committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate distinctive outcomes and evidence of quality.
- ⊖ Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:
 - Appropriate evaluation of individual activities may be accomplished by professional or academic peers.
 - For external evaluators of candidates, a majority of evaluators should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. These evaluators can assess the entirety of the candidate's case within academic responsibilities and expectations.
 - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
 - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
 - Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.
- Also: acceptable university service
- NOTE: Particularly for the clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate's work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination.

Service-satisfactory-clinical

- University citizenship: Routine department expectations; chair's determination that service is more than mere participation.
- Discipline and community: Routine, required, or expected.

Teaching-excellent-clinical

- Required for all:
 - Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes.
 - Information on teaching load
 - Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers
 - Evidence of the quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students
 - Instruction:
 - Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes
 - The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy
- Some of the following:
 - Course or curricular development:

- In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation, or other means.
 - Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence.
 - Mentoring and advising:
 - Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach
 - High accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor
 - Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented
 - Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students
 - External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work
 - Scholarly activities, including awards:
 - Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels
 - Positive departmental evaluations of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals)
 - Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods
 - National or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects
 - Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required.
 - Professional development efforts in teaching:
 - High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers
 - Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues
 - Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments (For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence.)
 - Clinical faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching or service and satisfactory in the other area, or document a balanced case. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship that supports their area of excellence is required.
 - Clinical faculty must have disseminated scholarship. This scholarship need not address pedagogical theory or techniques. The candidate must demonstrate how the scholarship supports their teaching and their case for teaching excellence.
- NOTE: Particularly for clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this faculty should be explained and those evaluating the candidate's work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination.
- For associate rank: record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching
- For full rank: record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching.

Teaching-satisfactory-clinical

- Required for all:

- Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes.
- Information on teaching load
- Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers
- Evidence of the quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students
- Some of the following:
 - Evidence of new course development or significant course revision presented with evidence on effectiveness.
 - Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized; student satisfaction is indicated by evidence; satisfactory impact on student achievement clear
 - Awards and recognition: Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning; some recognition of teaching efforts
 - Professional development:
 - Record of some activity such as conference or workshop attendance, personal experimentation, or reading
 - Record of mentoring other teachers
 - Reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching
 - Peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth or mentoring of others

Balanced-binned case-clinical

- Clinical faculty may present accomplishments and activities which are “highly satisfactory” and among them achieve the same benefit to the university as excellence in one and satisfactory in another.
- It is understood that academic or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required to demonstrate overall excellence in a balanced case. (Language adapted from IU policy on balanced cases.)
- In a balanced-binned case, individual accomplishments and activities will be labelled as teaching or service. Dissemination is required in the teaching area; dissemination is not required (but is acceptable as evidence) in the service area.
- If accomplishments and activities are highly integrated with an overall theme, choose the Balanced-Integrative Thematic case type.

Balanced-integrative-DEI case for clinical

- The candidate must demonstrate satisfactory performance in both areas of responsibility: teaching and service. The candidate statement, the CV, and the supporting document establish that the candidate:
 - Is a satisfactory teacher. Evidence includes peer evaluations, student evaluation input, and a reflection on professional development in teaching over time.
 - Participates in appropriate service to the unit and campus.
- **In addition**, the candidate demonstrates excellent contributions to the mission of the program, department, school, campus and/or university, evident in both teaching and service. (Candidates whose excellence is demonstrated exclusively in teaching or service should use the single-area-of-excellence case.)
- All of the following are included:
 - DEI: The candidate articulates a philosophy of diversity, equity and inclusion, including if appropriate any specifically targeted aspect. This philosophy is a part of, or in addition to, or encompasses, the candidate's teaching philosophy.

- Integrated: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUPUI faculty member in teaching and service which demonstrably support and advance their unit’s mission with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion.
- Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidate needs to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
- Peer-reviewed (academic or professional as appropriate) dissemination: for clinical associate professor candidates, dissemination at the local or regional level; for full clinical professor, dissemination at the national or international level.
- Direct impact: Effective evaluation of candidate’s diversity, equity, and inclusion work demonstrates distinct outcomes. Typing to unit (program, department, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact.
- Future plans: Increasing development over time. A candidate’s statement should describe plans for the future. For clinical full professor, sustained excellence over time is expected.

Balanced-integrative-thematic case for clinical faculty

In a thematic case, a candidate describes a particular theme or overarching emphasis that provides unity and purpose to most activities and accomplishments.

- IUPUI P&T Guidelines (section I above, “Institutional Values”) name four areas with “should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process”:
 - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Balanced-Integrative-DEI case above)
 - Civic Engagement
 - Translational Research
 - Teaching: Honors College; Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success, RISE to the IUPUI Challenge/Experiential Learning, University College.
- Balanced-Integrative cases may address one of these values as their theme, but this list is not exhaustive. The strongest cases will be tied to unit missions and goals. Schools and departments may develop templates and expectations for themes particularly relevant to their units.
- The candidate must demonstrate satisfactory performance in both areas of responsibility: teaching and service. The candidate statement, the CV, and the supporting document establish that the candidate:
 - Is a satisfactory teacher. Evidence includes peer evaluations, student evaluation input, and a reflection on professional development in teaching over time.
 - Participates in appropriate service to the unit and campus.
- **In addition**, the candidate demonstrates excellent contributions to the mission of the program, department, school, campus and/or university, evident in both teaching and service. (Candidates whose excellence is demonstrated exclusively in teaching or service should use the single-area-of-excellence case.)
- All of the following are included:
 - Theme: The candidate articulates an overall organizing principle to their work, including if appropriate any specifically targeted aspect. This philosophy or theme is a part of, or in addition to, or encompasses, the candidate’s teaching philosophy.
 - Integrated: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUPUI faculty member in teaching and service which demonstrably support and advance their unit’s mission.
 - Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within their work initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as

contributions to group achievements; the candidate needs to describe their own roles and responsibilities.

- Peer-reviewed (academic or professional as appropriate) dissemination: for clinical associate professor candidates, dissemination at the local or regional level; for full clinical professor, dissemination at the national or international level.
- Direct impact: Effective evaluation of candidate's work demonstrates distinct outcomes. Typing to unit (program, department, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact.
- Future plans: Increasing development over time. A candidate's statement should describe plans for the future. For clinical full professor, sustained excellence over time is expected.

Librarians

- Top level expectations:
 - Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction.
 - Excellence in Performance
 - Beyond satisfactory in either Professional Development or in Service
 - Satisfactory in other area
 - For full rank:
 - Excellence in Performance
 - Excellence in either Professional Development or in Service
 - Record of superior performance as an associate librarian and attainment of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession. Record of exceptional achievements in performance and a record of distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community in the secondary area of excellence.

Performance-excellent-librarian

- Refer to the Librarian Faculty Handbook for examples and more information.
- The placement of 'scholarship' (disseminated publications or presentations) into performance, professional development, or service, depends on librarian-handbook guidelines, and differs from clinical, lecturer, research, and tenure-track faculty.
- Because all librarians must be excellent in performance, librarians do not use any type of balanced case. DEI and other activities will be considered part of excellence in performance; see Librarian guidelines.

Lecturer Faculty

- Top level expectations:
 - For all:
 - Excellence in teaching based on a distinct teaching philosophy and resulting in extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes
 - Leadership in support of teaching and learning
 - For teaching professor:
 - The above, on a sustained level of excellence, plus academic or professionally peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship that supports teaching and learning.

Teaching-excellent-lecturer

- For all (senior lecturer and teaching professor):
 - Achievement of excellence in instruction
 - Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes. The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy.
 - Student learning outcomes (e.g., at course, program levels). Documentation includes (but is not limited to):
 - Student input into teaching (e.g., student evaluations)
 - Documented student learning
 - Distinct teaching philosophy. Documentation includes (but is not limited to):
 - Teaching philosophy statement
 - Reflection on input from student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and peer evaluations
 - For teaching professor⁸:
 - Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship which supports teaching.
 - Excellence is sustained over time.
 - And also (one of these areas):
 - Excellent achievement in course or curricular development
 - In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas locally or internally (for senior lecturer)//within the profession or generally (for teaching professor) through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means
 - Excellent achievement in mentoring and advising
 - Mentoring and advising (of students) is characterized by a scholarly approach
 - High accomplishments of students mentored or advised are consistently linked to the influence of mentor, demonstrating impact
 - Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented [locally or internally (for senior lecturer)//within the profession or generally (for teaching professor)]
 - Excellent achievement in service in support of teaching and learning
 - Course coordination, training of other faculty, support of student learning experiences, support of community in area of expertise, etc.
 - Scholarly and reflective approach to service in support of teaching and mentoring and advising is documented [locally or internally (for senior lecturer)//within the profession or generally (for teaching professor)]

Service-satisfactory-lecturer ranks

- University citizenship:
 - Routine department expectations
 - Chair's determination that service is more than mere participation
- Discipline and community: routine, required, or expected

⁸ After the 2022-2023 cycle, all evidence of excellence for promotion to teaching professor must occur in-rank as a senior lecturer (end of phase-in period).

Lecturer-integrative DEI case:

- Diversity, equity, and inclusion: The candidate articulates a philosophy of diversity, equity and inclusion, including as appropriate defining the exact nature of the population/s targeted. This philosophy is a part of, or in addition to, or encompasses, the candidate's teaching philosophy, which is also required.
- Integrated activity: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUPUI faculty member in teaching and service which demonstrably support and advance the teaching mission with respect to diversity, equity and inclusion.
- Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidate needs to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
 - For senior lecturers, a leadership role is expected.
 - For teaching professor candidates, leadership would result in some relevant peer-reviewed dissemination.
- Direct impact: Effective evaluation of diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives should demonstrate distinct outcomes. Tying to unit (program, department, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact.
- Future plans: Increasing development over time. A candidate's statement should describe plans for the future.
 - For teaching professor, sustained excellence over time is expected.

Research Scientists/Scholars

Refer to school documents for specific guidance.

- Top level campus expectations:
 - To associate rank:
 - Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research
 - Evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline
 - To full (senior):
 - Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research
 - Evidence of independent work
 - Evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline
 - Service expectations if any, set by unit.

Research-excellent-research scientist

- Required of all:
 - Significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that clearly demonstrate attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of research.
 - Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support [as required by unit], including the degree to which the process was competitive.
 - Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others.
- For full: Evidence of independent work.

Service-research-satisfactory

- [May not be needed.]
- Service expectations, if any, set by unit.

Documentation (Dossier-Candidate Sections)

Candidate's Sections

- The main sections of the dossier plus the candidate statement are limited to 50 total pages. The CV is not included in the limit.
- Within each main section (teaching, research, or service), candidates may prepare one PDF document with a table of contents into the first folder or may upload separate documents into each folder. All documents should be in pdf format.
- There is no page limit on the appendices. All materials must be in pdf (for archiving)—any relevant materials in other formats should be housed elsewhere with stable links embedded in pdfs.

Candidate's Statement

- Length:
 - This document counts toward the 50-page limit on the main parts of the dossier.
 - Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a maximum of seven single-spaced pages for their candidate's statement that reflects their own assessments of their accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, and service (for tenured or tenure-track faculty); teaching and service (for clinical and lecturer faculty); or performance, professional development, and service (for librarians). Prospects for continued development in these areas must be addressed.
 - Candidates have the option to limit the Candidate's Statement to five pages and include two single-spaced pages, addressing the area of excellence, as a section introduction in the chosen area of excellence (either Teaching, Research, or Service).
 - Candidates who do not choose the Balanced-Integrative DEI Case type have the option to include a discussion of diversity, equity, and inclusion, according to department or school requirements, as an addition⁹ to the candidate statement itself. This should be part of the same file (PDF) but clearly marked as separate. This does not count as part of the 5- or 7-page limit but does count as part of the overall 50-page limit (candidate statement, addition, and main dossier). Candidates using the Balanced-Integrative DEI Case Type will including DEI within the regular five- to seven-page candidate statement.
 - For the Balanced-Integrative DEI Case, the candidate statement:
 - Presents a philosophy of diversity, equity, and inclusion that is evidenced through related activities and achievements. This is similar to a teaching philosophy in that it spells out, when necessary, specific targeted areas of focus within DEI-related activities. (A separate philosophy of diversity, equity, and inclusion statement may be presented, with a more condensed version included in the candidate statement itself.)
 - Articulates how the candidate's activities and achievements are interrelated; shows that the candidate's work is intentional and coherent.
 - Ties work to the unit, campus, or university mission.
 - Highlights key accomplishments in both:

⁹ We are currently unable to change the overall eDossier structure, so this is a temporary approach to finding a place for such a statement.

- Contributions to scholarly discourse (peer-reviewed dissemination)
 - Local impact
 - Establishes both independence and initiative—articulates the candidate’s own role in multi-person endeavors and shows where the candidate fits in initial conception, execution, and/or expansion.
 - In cases where the candidate undergoes unit-level review at another campus (Kelley and O’Neill Schools; IU-N Social Work), an accommodation with the page-length expectations of those campuses may be needed.
- Style:
 - Candidates are cautioned to describe their work in clear language that can be understood by readers from other disciplines.
 - The Candidate’s Statement is a place for reflective commentary focused on the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
 - Candidates should especially address their own assessment of the impact and significance or value of their work to their discipline or profession to the unit and campus and to society as a whole.
 - The Candidate’s Statement should address the interrelated aspects of a whole, integrated career. Few candidates make sharp distinctions among the various aspects of their work as they do it, and the statement should indicate how the candidate views the integration of these aspects, even while assessing achievements in each. Special attention should be given to work that cut across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.
 - The candidate’s case for excellence should be made in relation to department, school/unit, and university criteria. The specific case type should be stated immediately in the statement.
 - The candidate should not include any confidential personal medical information in their dossier. Candidates can note that extensions were granted by the campus but do not need to explain reasons. Approved tenure clock extensions are not to be considered in the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure.
- Interdisciplinary and community-engaged work:
 - Candidates engaged in interdisciplinary work or team science should make every effort to represent their contribution to collaborative scholarship clearly, as well as the significance and value of any interdisciplinary approach they are pursuing. Candidates should carefully document their individual contributions within this context and should also demonstrate some level of independent research beyond the team science work.
 - Candidates should be careful to provide clear and sufficient information about their individual roles in collaborative projects, publications, presentation, or grants.
 - Candidates involved in public scholarship or civic/community engagement should clearly articulate the nature of their work and how it differs from traditional scholarship, evidence metrics and dissemination outlets.
- Other important points:
 - Candidates should make clear to readers their independence and the impact of their work.
 - As appropriate, the candidate should discuss their grant history including their success and commentary regarding grants that were submitted but not funded.
 - Candidates should explain how their service has contributed to the common good of the campus and university and how these contributions reflect department and school/unit expectations.
 - Candidates should also indicate the prospects for continued personal development in their defined areas of professional activity.

- Faculty members should state specific plans for a research or creative activity agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, for excellence in performance, and for continued participation through professional service in their profession, the campus, and a community, as appropriate to their areas of responsibility.
- Candidates who have received an extension of the probationary period should include the following in the Candidate Statement: “I received a one-year extension of the tenure probationary period, consistent with IU policy.”¹⁰ (Or, two one-year, as applicable.) Do not include reasons or any personal medical information.
- Candidates whose scholarship, teaching, or service have been affected by the COVID pandemic should be specific about the effects and their adaptations.

Curriculum Vitae

- A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard IUPUI P&T format.
- The curriculum vitae is not part of the 50-page limit.
- The following distinctive markings may be used:
 - * to indicate work in rank *or use a grey font for not-in-rank work.*
 - † < dagger, Unicode 2020> to indicate student/mentee co-authors
 - # to indicate diversity, equity, and inclusion items
 - *If candidates wish to indicate other author types, such as community members, they should select a specific symbol (not one of the above) and define it briefly at the beginning of the relevant sections.*
- Except in the Balanced-Integrative Case types, candidates must determine and list each grant, presentation, and publication under one appropriate category: teaching, research, service as appropriate for their appointment.
- In the Balanced-Integrative Case types, items are organized in the following categories. No item can be listed more than once; indicators such as T, R, or S or a combination may be used to signal the main goals of particular items.
 - Education
 - Appointments [IU, auto-loaded]
 - Administrative roles [at IUPUI, if not already auto-loaded]
 - Past appointments
 - Licensure, Certification, Specialty Board Status
 - Professional Organization Memberships
 - Professional Development
 - Teaching Assignments [Auto-loaded¹¹]
 - Mentoring
 - Other teaching [includes curriculum development]
 - Grants [Auto-loaded for IU, added if not]
 - Awards
 - Service activities [roles]
 - Presentations
 - Refereed
 - Invited

¹⁰ This would apply to extensions due to research problems, family leave, COVID-19, or other. Details are not needed.

¹¹ Within DMAI, there is an Integrative P&T CV format. Use the *regular* (“Vita-IUPUI P&T”) report to generate a version with the classes listed in detail. This is not available in any other DMAI report.

- Other
- Publications [dissemination, creative activities]
 - Invited
 - Other
- *Order and sub-division depend on disciplinary conventions (chronological, type of venue, etc.)*

Main Section: Research and Creative Activity

General notes

- Clinical and lecturer faculty do not use this section.
 - Tenure-track and research faculty use this section.
 - Level of detail depends on whether this is the candidate's area of excellence.
 - Librarians use the Professional Development section.
 - Documents in this section count toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
- NOTE: ALL SUPPORTING MATERIALS FOR ANY INTEGRATIVE CASE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY WILL BE PLACED IN THE FIRST FOLDER IN THIS SECTION. THIS IS REQUIRED BY THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE EDOSSIER AND DOES NOT IMPLY ALL ITEMS ARE 'RESEARCH.' SEE SEPARATE SECTION FOR GUIDANCE.
- CLINICAL AND LECTURER FACULTY USING THE INTEGRATIVE CASE TYPE WILL USE THE FIRST FOLDER IN 'TEACHING.'
- Research or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty at IUPUI, as well as all research faculty, scientists, and scholars. For these faculty members, a threshold of documented satisfactory performance is required for promotion and/or tenure.
 - In some units, funded research is an expectation and has become incorporated in departmental or school/unit standards for assessing excellence or satisfactory performance. Candidates should be careful to understand departmental or school/unit standards for external funding. Expectations should be applied consistently and equitably to all faculty within units. Information regarding the expectation for externally funded research should be available to all faculty in written form if it is a requirement for advancement. Candidates should provide evidence regarding research funding as required to support their current and ongoing program of research.
 - Peer review of research and creative activity is required, for satisfactory, highly satisfactory, and for excellence levels of evaluation.

Dossier folder checklist

- The following folders appear in the IUPUI eDossier. Not all candidates will have materials in each section. The Candidate Statement should present a clear, reflective, and evidence-based discussion of research accomplishments and plans; the main section will contain details, explanations, and documentation which support the Candidate Statement.

- ▾ Research/Creative Activity
 - ▢ Research/Creative Activi...
 - ▢ Research load, expectati...
 - ▢ Discussion of 3-5 most s...
 - ▢ Significance of grants a...
 - ▢ Significance and impact ...
 - ▢ Documentation of individ...
 - ▢ Future plans for ongoing...
 - ▢ Research Recognition - A...
 - ▢ Appendix: Research or cr...
 - ▢ Appendix: Grant related ...
 - ▢ Appendix: Review(s) of c...
 - ▢ Appendix: Additional evi...

- ✓ Research/ Creative Activity Statement (if applicable) ←needed only if candidate statement is 5 pages
- ✓ Research load, expectations, goals
- ✓ Discussion of 3-5 most significant publications/ exhibitions
- ✓ Significance of grants and awards
- ✓ Significance and impact of research presentations/ exhibitions
- ✓ Documentation of individual contributions to collaborative/ interdisciplinary work
- ✓ Future plans for ongoing program of research
- ✓ Appendix: Research or creative publications / works [If not in pdf format, provide a link to an external site]
- ✓ Appendix: Grant related materials
- ✓ Appendix: Review(s) of candidate’s books, creative performances, exhibitions
- ✓ Appendix: Additional evidence

Documentation

- Candidates can format this as one PDF with a table of contents, or, put information into separate dossier folders; do not replicate sections of the curriculum vitae or of the Candidate Statement.
- Candidates should provide the following evidence to document research or creativity in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:
- Identification and discussion of the three-to-five most significant publications that reflect the candidate's major research accomplishments in rank.
 - IUPUI places a higher value on quality and impact of research than number of publications.
 - In order to help reviewers outside the discipline to understand the importance placed on the order in which authors are listed in a publication notation, candidates should include descriptions of these conventions in their dossier.
 - Increasingly, research or creative activity involves collaboration. Such collaboration across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work. They should make clear their individual role (e.g., conception of work; acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing, revisions, and other communication; administrative and material support; corresponding, or primary authorship) in such collective activity, preferably as related by colleagues involved in the joint work. Department or school/unit assessment of the individual contributions of the candidate who works with more than one author or collaborator must be included.

- As appropriate, the candidate should address achievement of independence from mentors and the establishment of an independent line of inquiry from prior mentors.
- The candidate's own description of a continuing program of research or creative activity that will carry forward into the future.
- If invited presentations are vital evidence for candidates' reputation in their field, discussion of the significance and impact of peer reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.
- Where applicable, there should be an assessment of the candidate's contributions to interdisciplinary research, including written evaluations from appropriate peers in research centers or other departments.

Main Section: Librarians: Documentation of Professional Development

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

Dossier folder checklist: Librarians

- The following folders appear in the IUPUI eDossier:



- ✓ Statement on Professional Development
- ✓ Evidence of Quality and Impact of Professional Development
- ✓ Professional Development – Grants, Awards, Honors, Fellowships
- ✓ Continuing Education Activities
- ✓ Documentation of Individual Contributions to Collaborative/Interdisciplinary Work
- ✓ Appendix – Professional Development
- Librarian Professional Development includes all scholarship (including any scholarship of performance, professional development, and service).
 - Documentation may take many forms, such as research (both applied and theoretical), publications, or presentations to professional or disciplinary groups.
 - Documentation should include a definite continuing program of professional development that advances ideas, knowledge, and technical ability to the whole profession and academic life, including internal and external peer review. Annual reviews may also be included.


Main Section: Teaching

General notes

- Research faculty and librarians do not use this section.
- All tenure-track, lecturer, and clinical faculty use this section.
- Level of detail depends on whether this is the candidate's area of excellence.
- Documents in this section count toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
- IUPUI requires evidence of at least satisfactory teaching by each faculty member for tenure and for advancement in rank (with the exception of those classified as research faculty, scientists, and scholars). When teaching is the designated area of excellence, it is important to provide documentation that will enable external reviewers to make informed judgments. This type of documentation should be discussed with the department chair in advance of solicitation for external review.

Dossier folder checklist

- The following folders appear in the IUPUI eDossier. Not all candidates will have materials in each section. The Candidate Statement should present a clear, reflective, and evidence-based discussion of teaching; the main section will contain further explanations and documentation which support the Candidate Statement.
- ALL CLINICAL AND LECTURER FACULTY WHO ARE USING BALANCED-INTEGRATIVE CASE TYPES WILL PLACE ALL DOCUMENTATION INTO THIS SECTION.



- ✓ Teaching Statement (if applicable) → only if using a 5-page Candidate Statement
- ✓ Teaching load and goals
- ✓ Peer review of teaching (aggregated)
- ✓ Student evaluation of teaching (aggregated)
- ✓ Disseminated scholarship on teaching and learning
- ✓ Impact of instruction on student learning outcomes
- ✓ Course, curricular, and professional development
- ✓ Teaching recognition-grants, awards, honors, fellowships
- ✓ Appendix: Teaching publications
- ✓ Appendix: Sample of course materials
- ✓ Appendix: Student course evaluations
- ✓ Appendix: Peer evaluations
- ✓ Appendix: Unsolicited letters from former students
- ✓ Appendix: Additional Evidence

Documentation

- This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to teaching. Candidates can format this as one PDF with a table of contents, or, put information into separate dossier folders; do not replicate sections of the curriculum vitae or of the Candidate Statement. *Raw materials such as individual course evaluations should ONLY appear in the Appendices.*
- It may be prefaced in the first folder by a 2-page general statement, or the Candidate Statement may be 7 pages total.
- Candidates should provide the following evidence to document teaching and advising in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below. The information in the first sections (teaching load, peer evaluation, student input, and student learning outcomes) should be provided for all faculty with responsibilities for teaching.
- Information on the teaching load of the candidate should be reported.
 - While the teaching load is reported on the curriculum vitae, an indication of whether it is greater or less than the average teaching load in the department should be reported in this section.
 - A large number of students is not *per se* evidence of achievement; teaching and student learning must be evaluated.
 - Similarly, teaching a small number of students does not indicate diminished achievement if the teaching load is appropriate and there is a sufficient threshold for evaluating the quality of the teaching.
- Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers (required for satisfactory level or higher).
 - Peer review of teaching is as important as peer review of research and creative activity.
 - Review of teaching is a formative activity to facilitate improvement and skill development in teaching. Rank requirements such as those used for external evaluators are not applied to the formative teaching review processes.
 - Local disciplinary peers can provide essential information and assessment based on observation of the classroom, studio, laboratory, or other learning environments, including those based on technology. Additionally, local peers outside the discipline can provide an additional perspective of excellence in teaching, including practices in the classroom, teaching materials, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
 - Peer review of classroom instruction is most effective when it is based on multiple visits to classes and examination of materials; isolated observations are rarely helpful.
 - It is much more difficult for external peers (i.e., external to IUPUI) to observe actual teaching, and thus local peers should prepare reports sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers along with other documented results of effectiveness.
 - In addition, it is recommended that external reviewers are provided with peer reviews and summaries of student evaluations to facilitate the evaluation of excellence in teaching.
 - Evidence in the dossier should summarize statements, checklists, and methods used by peers to comment upon the quality of classroom performance and the quality of course design as evident in the syllabus and other course materials reviewed by colleagues. Similar statement or summary evidence of instruments may be submitted to document impact on student learning based on peer review of such indicators as student work (papers and projects), performance on standard exams, or personal experience with students in subsequent courses or institutions of higher learning. This evidence from peers may have resulted from in-person review or from review of materials in print or electronic form by those at a distance who teach in similar fields or use similar methods.

- Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or better).
 - Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years.
 - **Only summaries** should be included in dossiers. The summary may include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year, and item to establish trend lines where applicable.
 - Numerical comparisons are neither required nor advised.
 - Candidates should demonstrate how they use the results of student input for continuous improvement of teaching.
- Evidence that courses taught contribute to the overall student learning outcomes specified by the unit and evidence that students have met or exceeded course or curricular learning objectives should be provided.
 - The role of the faculty member in assisting students to meet learning objectives should be documented and assessed in ways appropriate to the discipline and to the mission of the unit.
 - This may be captured through peer review or through systematic assessment of student achievement or from standardized, nationally-normed profession-related tests.
 - Faculty who teach undergraduate students should also address how their courses and scholarship of teaching contribute to learning outcomes specified by their academic unit and the Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success (formerly the Principles of Undergraduate Learning – PULS) in the statement they submit for this section.
 - At the graduate and graduate professional levels, comparable assessment measures for student learning should be developed if they do not yet exist and the Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGPLs) should be addressed.
- Philosophy of teaching (required for promotion in the lecturer ranks). An explanation of the candidate’s philosophy of teaching that is informed by best practice, and in a program of continual improvement. This should be summarized in the Candidate Statement with further details and evidence presented here. Candidates using an Integrative DEI case may combine their DEI philosophy with philosophy of teaching.
- Teaching-domain achievements (required for promotion to senior lecturer). These may be one or several of the following:
 - Curricular leadership: course development; program development; assessment; authorship of teaching materials/methods.
 - Service in support of teaching and learning: support of other faculty; support of student learning experiences; support of community in area of expertise, etc.
- Evidence of the use of scholarship to support teaching. Dissemination is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence for tenure-track and clinical faculty, and for the rank of teaching professor. Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
 - Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in teaching should have peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning.
 - Clinical faculty using teaching as an area of excellence and lecturer faculty may use different forms of scholarship, not limited to contributions to scholarship of teaching and learning, in so far as those works of scholarship demonstrably advance their teaching.
 - If invited presentations are vital evidence for candidates’ reputation in their field, discussion of the significance and impact of peer-reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of

scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.

- In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate's work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination. Candidates and department chairs (or deans) may wish to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may better fit with standards in the field.
- The following sections (mentoring, curricular development, graduate student advising, awards, grants, leadership roles, interdisciplinary work, use of technology, and efforts in retention) will vary according to each individual faculty member.
 - Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable. This evidence can be provided by listing co-authored papers or joint conference publications with students on the curriculum vitae or by discussing the nature of the student outcomes in the statement for this section.
 - Evidence of the nature and quality of course and curriculum development and implementation to enhance the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of teaching is expected.
 - Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present these aspects of course design (even experimental use), and how they conform to or extend principles of good practice.
 - Course and curriculum development and implementation activities not reported in the Candidate's Statement or in the curriculum vitae may be included in this section.
 - Evidence about student learning associated with these activities can be part of the peer review, especially when reviewers have been asked to comment on these specific innovations.
 - Improvement in teaching for probationary faculty can be compelling when documentation demonstrates that the improvements can be sustained.
 - External peer evaluation of course development is highly recommended for faculty documenting excellence in teaching.
 - The number of student graduate committees the candidate has served on or chaired and the evidence of the quality of results as documented by student achievements should be provided, as appropriate.
 - Local, regional, national, or international teaching, advising or mentoring awards, including information about their nature and significance (e.g., criteria, competitiveness, pool of applicants, number awarded) should be listed. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae, but if explanatory details are needed, they may be included in this section.
 - Teaching or advising grants (including training grants) received and their outcomes should be included. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae with outcomes information included in the statement for this section.
 - Leadership roles in professional associations in organizing conferences, in presenting papers at conferences related to teaching, advising or mentoring, and in advancing other aspects of teaching should be included. While these can be listed as professional service on the curriculum vitae, they may be included in the statement for this section if explanatory details are needed to support the candidate's case.


- Interdisciplinary work: Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary teaching are encouraged to describe the significance and impact of bringing multiple disciplinary approaches to their area of interest.
- Retention: Since retention of students is of considerable importance to IUPUI, faculty members involved in retention efforts should include a description of these activities. Include any evidence that indicates the impact these activities have had on increasing retention, either in their own classrooms or in a broader school/unit or campus setting.

Librarians: Documenting Performance

- The *Indiana University Academic Policies* require that the primary area of excellence for every librarian be performance. This section consists of supporting documentation related to librarian performance. Any scholarship related to performance is considered librarian professional development.

Dossier Folder Checklist: Librarians

- The following folders appear in the IUPUI eDossier:



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

Main Section: Professional and University Service

General Notes

- Research faculty use this section if applicable to their responsibilities.
- All tenure-track, lecturer, and clinical faculty use this section, unless using the balanced-integrative case type.
- Clinical faculty and tenure-track faculty may have service as an area of excellence.
- Librarians use the similar Service section.

- Documents in this section count toward the 50-page limit on the dossier. Candidates can format this as one PDF with a table of contents, or, put information into separate dossier folders; do not replicate sections of the curriculum vitae or the Candidate Statement.

Definitions

- For tenure-track faculty whose area of excellence is research or teaching, satisfactory service is required for both university and profession or discipline; it may or may not involve the public. For clinical faculty whose area of excellence is teaching, or lecturer-rank faculty, satisfactory service is required, and may take the form of campus and university service; it may or may not involve the public or the profession/discipline.
- When service is presented as an area of excellence, it consists of significant contributions that clearly go beyond satisfactory university or organizational service (see Service in Definitions.)
- Service when presented as evidence for excellence (or highly satisfactory for balanced cases) can involve any of the following:
 - Work with or for individuals as clients or patients.
 - Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners.
 - Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit’s teaching, research, or service missions. Administrative work primarily concerned with teaching may be presented as “service” or as “teaching” excellence.
- Service must be significant work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of advanced knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of quality and impact.
 - Disseminating their work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong support for a case for excellence.
 - Some disseminated scholarship is required for excellence in service, but not for ‘highly satisfactory’ (balanced-binned case). The candidate must address how their scholarship advances their service and documents their excellence. Precise distinctions between “research” scholarship and “service” scholarship are not necessary for clinical faculty as long as their disseminated scholarship supports their accomplishments.
- Faculty claiming excellence in service, whose professional service consists primarily of patient or client service, must document how their work is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. This work will demonstrate impact beyond the direct recipient of the service through appropriate professional or academic peer-review dissemination activities.
- Publications, presentations, and grant documentation related to service is included in the dossier in the service section, not in the research section.
- As with research, professional service may span traditional disciplinary boundaries. In such cases, candidates and chairs or deans may wish to develop appropriate procedures (e.g., a specially composed primary committee) to ensure that the nature of interdisciplinary professional service is fully and adequately understood and assessed.

Dossier Folder Checklist

- The following folders appear in the IUPUI eDossier.



- ✓ Service Statement (if applicable) ← use only if using a five-page Candidate Statement
- ✓ Evidence of Service to the University, School and Department
- ✓ Evidence of Service to the Profession/Discipline
- ✓ Evidence of Service to the Community/Civic Engagement
- ✓ Significance, impact, quality of professional service
- ✓ Evidence of scholarly publications, presentations, or other means of dissemination
- ✓ Service recognition – grants, awards, honors
- ✓ Appendix: Service publications
- ✓ Appendix: Evaluations by clients, patient or service recipients
- ✓ Appendix: Grant related materials
- ✓ Appendix: Other evidence of service/engagement

Documentation

- This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to service. Candidates can format this as one PDF with a table of contents, or, put information into separate dossier folders; do not replicate sections of the CV or of the Candidate Statement.
- It may be prefaced in the first folder by a two-page general statement, or the Candidate Statement may be seven pages total.
- Candidates should provide the following evidence to document service in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below.
- Documenting service when not an area of excellence:
 - Satisfactory professional service is expected of each faculty member and librarian. For lecturers, service may be directed toward the academic unit, but must be characterized as intellectual work to be considered as professional service. For example, developing standards for the assessment of the portfolios of entering students may be appropriately classified as professional service.
- Documenting service as an area of excellence or for highly satisfactory:
 - The importance assigned to service in considering candidates for promotion or tenure may vary according to individual circumstances and the mission of the unit.
 - Review within IUPUI and by disciplinary or professional peers at other universities or public settings is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service, as it is for teaching and research.

- Evaluations of effectiveness by clients, patients, and other recipients or participants in professional service activities may be critically important as evidence that can be summarized and assessed by disciplinary peers. Evaluation of service impact may include outcome data for the population served, compliance with evidence-based practice guidelines, or comparative data from benchmark groups. See also: Appendix: Quality and Impact.
- In documenting excellence in professional service, faculty must be alert to the need to collect information and evidence at the time services are provided so that it can be used later to demonstrate impact.
- The following information must be included for a case for excellence in service:
 - Description of the candidate’s professional service activities.
 - Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or clinical care. Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
 - Faculty presenting administrative, committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate distinct outcomes and evidence of quality
 - Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as academic work—work advancing academic objectives.
- Evidence of the significance and impact of the professional service should be provided through tangible results that can be assessed in the context of unit and campus mission.
- Evidence of the candidate’s individual contributions, especially when the professional service is collaborative in nature; specific contributions of the candidate should be noted.
- Evidence of leadership in providing professional service, especially when there is a collaborative environment, including contributions that build consensus, help others (including patients or clients) complete required assignments, and reflect the best practices and standards of the discipline; evidence of increasing levels of responsibility and sustained contributions are important.
- Evidence of effective communication of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or service recipients in reports, documents, or other means of dissemination that are designed appropriate to make the results understood and useful. While these reports may not be peer reviewed as a part of the publication and dissemination process, they should be evaluated by disciplinary peers for appropriateness and effectiveness as a part of the advancement review process.
- Evidence and evaluation of the impact of university service. Tenure track and clinical faculty must have acceptable university service in addition to professional service.
- External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service, including refereed and non-refereed publications or other means of dissemination. If solicited by the candidate, these are placed in the main sections of the dossier. Chairs may solicit external evaluation and place it in the Solicited Letters folder. This is distinct from the external evaluators of the case for promotion/tenure as a whole.
 - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
 - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
 - Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.
- Assessments from local faculty colleagues who can place the quality of professional service within a context of departmental, school/unit, or interdisciplinary standards. If solicited by the supervisor or chair, these are placed in the Solicited Letters/Administrative section of the dossier; if solicited or provided by the candidate, they are placed in the Appendix of the Service section.

- Evaluation by clients, patients or service recipients.
 - Faculty should arrange for timely evaluations by recipients and determine appropriate ways to use this information.
- When professional service is highly repetitive, as is often the case in patient care, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated activities. Quantity of patient service ordinarily is not a sufficient factor in promotion or tenure, although it is expected to be high to support an area of excellence.

Librarians: Documentation of Service

- Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If service is selected, a Statement on Service, describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be narrative that is a maximum of two (2) single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian’s service. The notion of professional service, as it is applied to faculty, is seldom applicable to librarians since ‘professional service’ is more typically an aspect of librarian performance. Nonetheless, professional services that do not fall within the scope of a librarian’s position description may be included as evidence satisfying the service criterion. These may take the form of professional consulting or teaching.

Dossier Folder Checklist: Librarians

- The following folders appear in the IUPUI eDossier.



- ✓ Statement on Service
 - ✓ Evidence of Quality and Impact of Service to the University, School, Department
 - ✓ Evidence of Quality and Impact of Service to the Profession/Discipline
 - ✓ Evidence of Quality and Impact of Service to the Community/Civic Engagement
 - ✓ Service Recognition – Grants, Awards, Honors, Fellowships
 - ✓ Appendix – Service
- Documentation of service should focus on impact.
 - A librarian must present evidence of satisfactory service for tenure and, if service is cited as an area of emphasis, evidence of continued improvement beyond the satisfactory level for promotion from assistant to associate librarian.
 - Service to national or international organizations is highly encouraged, but not required. Institutional, local, regional, and national service should be documented through peer and external review.

Main Section: Balanced-Integrative Excellence: Balanced-Integrative-DEI Case and Balanced-Integrative-Thematic Case¹²

- In a Balanced-Binned Case, use the folders as described in previous sections.

¹² Until the eDossier folder structure can be changed, the “Research” folder for tenure track and the “Teaching” folder for clinical and lecturer faculty are arbitrarily designated to hold these materials.

- In Balanced-Integrative cases, combine the following into two PDFs: main section (deposited in the Research (tenure track), or Teaching (clinical/lecturer) folder) and appendices. Each should have a table of contents indicating the sections. Upload the main section into the first folder in Research (or Teaching) and the appendices into the first folder in Appendices-Research (or Teaching)
- Provide substantiation of the statements in the candidate statement including:

Dossier Folder Checklist.

- ✓ Include in candidate statement, with additional details here if needed:
 - For the DEI case: Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Philosophy (unless included in a 7-page Candidate Statement). The case for excellence is grounded in a sophisticated diversity, equity, and inclusion philosophy. The candidate may highlight aspects of DEI that are a particular focus of their work.
 - For the thematic case: The case for excellence is grounded in a sophisticated overarching theme, such as community engagement, interprofessional education, or translational research. This section describes the theme and its philosophy, as well as any specific areas of focus for the particular candidate.
- ✓ Description of teaching, research/creative activity, and service/load expectations throughout time in rank.
 - Include, as applicable, teaching responsibilities including number of sections and courses per semester or year, assigned mentoring or advising loads, percent of time allocated to research/creative activity (whether funded or not), and any administrative responsibilities. Service on committees should be briefly summarized—do not simply copy the CV listings.
- ✓ Discussion of three to five most significant accomplishments
 - “Accomplishments” is inclusive of local, regional, national, or international work; dissemination or direct-impact work. Make evident the intentionality between and among efforts. Initiatives may be at various stages of development at the time of promotion or tenure. Activities may span teaching, research, service, and administration. Do not repeat lists, but identify select key, signature activities.
- ✓ Evidence of quality and impact of activities
 - Quality indicators include but are not limited to traditional metrics such as publication and consequent citations; receipt of internal or external funding; competitive or invited presentations. See appendix: Quality and Impact
 - Qualitative and quantitative input from local constituencies is an essential element of demonstrating impact.
 - Other evidence can include program evaluation reporting generated for funders and other organizations; awards; descriptions of policy or other changes made as a result of efforts.
- ✓ Documentation of individual contributions to collaborative work
 - The candidate must provide a clear explanation of their own role within collaborative work. Confirmation from co-workers is essential for at least the signature activities.
 - The candidate’s role must be unique and essential to the success of the endeavor.
- ✓ Teaching evidence: Summaries of student evaluations, peer evaluations, professional development, and reflection on teaching responsibilities
 - The candidate is expected to engage in regular efforts to obtain and use feedback from learners and peers in order to continually improve their teaching. Numerical comparisons are neither required nor advised. Candidates may include direct measures of learning here or may include it within the evidence of impact or the signature activities section.
- ✓ Recognition: Grants, Awards, Honors, Fellowships
 - The candidate should describe and provide contexts for all awards, so that readers understand the scope and the audience of those awarding the recognition, especially since these may not be obvious to all readers.

- ✓ Plans for future work
 - A brief plan of action is included in the candidate statement. In this section, provide additional detail and description.
- ✓ Appendix:
 - Raw materials, copies of publications, letters, and other materials not included in the regular 50-page limit.

Appendices

- Appendix folders are available in eDossier as subfolders under teaching, research, and service for faculty and as subfolders under performance, professional development and service for librarians.
- Appendices should have either a table of contents or clear informative file names to facilitate review.
- Appendices are not part of the 50-page limit.
- Use PDF format only. For materials which are not in PDF format, place the items in OneDrive folders and include a link within the dossier.
- Appendices should provide documentation for all of the assertions made in the Candidate’s Statement.
- Appendices may include articles published or accepted for publication, grant proposals accepted or under consideration, syllabi for redesigned courses, or any other materials that support a case for excellence in a chosen area and at least satisfactory performance in the other areas.
- Appendices should be a succinct and as carefully selected as possible.

Charts, Templates, and Guides have been moved to a separate document

Process and Responsibilities (Includes Dossier Administrative Sections)

Nine-Year Tenure Probationary Timeline for School of Medicine

Tenure-track faculty members in the School of Medicine have a nine-year probationary timeline. In addition to the three-year review cited below, faculty hired under this policy will be given a formal five-year review if the faculty member has not petitioned for promotion and tenure by that time. The actions of years 4, 5, and 6 listed below, correlate with years 6, 7, and 8 for those with a nine-year probationary cycle. “Extension of the School’s tenure probationary period does not alter the existing school performance expectations for tenure in place at the time of appointment. Schools retain the right to update their faculty performance expectations in the future in keeping with campus and University guidelines, while faculty retain the right to be evaluated for tenure under the written standards in effect at the time of appointment. Individual faculty under the nine-year tenure probationary timeline will be free to submit their dossiers for promotion and tenure at the sixth year point or earlier when appropriate, or at the seventh- or eighth-year point, it being understood that a dossier can only be submitted once for tenure, and that administrators may not disallow or discourage faculty from following a standard seven-year schedule.” (UFC U8-2009)

Department Chair (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline

(In core schools, the associate dean responsible for the program at IUPUI may fulfill this role.)

While candidates are responsible for documenting that they have met the standards and expectations for promotion and/or tenure, the chair is responsible for providing support and guidance throughout the process, and for administrative and procedural tasks. In general, chairs need to:

- Update their knowledge by reviewing the latest version of IUPUI P&T Guidelines each year (found at <https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/promotiontenure/guidelines-and-standards/>).
- Ensure the most current written description of the department's expectations for excellence in each area (teaching [performance for librarians], research and creative activity [performance for artists], and service) or for balanced cases for tenure or promotion to associate and full rank is on file with OAA. These documents need to be approved by your school's appropriate faculty governance process and the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs for compliance with campus expectations. Each tenure-track faculty member also needs a copy of the tenure expectations at the time of hire. Preserve a copy of the standards in effect for each tenure-track faculty member.
- Develop a system of departmental peer review of teaching that ensure each candidate has several opportunities for peer review prior to their candidacy for promotion and/or tenure.
- Provide candid advice throughout the probationary period and assist the candidate in organizing the materials needed for the dossier.

Year 1 and 2 of Candidate Appointment

- Ensure that each new faculty/librarian has a discipline-appropriate mentor related to the candidate's area of excellence who is preferably at a rank higher than the candidate. Mentors cannot be the chair or others in the supervisory chain.
- Meet individually with each new faculty member to discuss department expectations for promotion and/or tenure. Provide new faculty members with a copy of the departmental expectations.
- Ensure that each new faculty member is invited to either the department and/or school promotion and/or tenure workshop and encourage attendance at campus-level promotion and/or tenure workshops.
- Encourage new faculty to become acquainted with resources available through the [Forum Network](#).
- Provide guidance for faculty annual reporting procedures.
- Provide a *written* annual review that frankly addresses the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses with suggestions about how to address the weaknesses. Satisfactory performance in the candidate's areas of responsibility, teaching, and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments. This is in addition to any committee review conducted by the unit.
- Provide guidance for the faculty member to select a type of case appropriate to the department's expectations.

Year 3 of Candidate Appointment

- Ensure that each tenure-probationary candidate understands the function of the three-year review.
- Ensure that the three-year review is carried out following IUPUI Faculty Council policy and procedures including review of the candidate by primary/department and/or unit/school committees (as applied by particular requirements of the primary/department, unit/school, or library).
- Ensure that candidates being reviewed receive an annual written assessment of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure, with specific guidance about any issues or concerns that require attention.
- Ensure that the declared area of excellence/case type is addressed and that the candidate is documenting at least satisfactory achievement in every area of responsibility.
- Ensure that a copy of the completed three-year review is sent to the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs by May 1.
- If the candidate's three-year review revealed significant issues, encourage the candidate to seek a fourth-year review or conduct one if required by current school policies.
- For non-tenure-track faculty, follow unit expectations for guidance towards promotion.

Year 4 of Candidate Appointment

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

Year 5 of Candidate Appointment

- Ensure that candidates being reviewed receive an annual written assessment of their progress toward promotion and/or tenure and that they receive specific guidance about any issues or concerns that require attention.
- Ensure that the declared area of excellence is progressing appropriately and that the candidate is documenting at least satisfactory performance in the other areas. Satisfactory performance in all three areas is required for continued probationary reappointments.
- Develop a list of, and proceed with the solicitation of letters from, peer reviewers for each candidate in accordance with the section on [External Assessment](#) in sufficient time to meet school and campus guidelines.
- Committee size and composition:
 - Make sure that the primary (department) committee complies with all of the requirements found in the [Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities](#) section below.
 - If the primary/department committee does not have faculty/librarians at or above the rank sought by the candidate, establish a special primary committee that may include members from outside the department, school, or campus. Such a committee should be composed in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee and should reflect disciplines as similar to the candidate's as possible.
 - If the candidate's scholarship is interdisciplinary, team science, or public in nature, consider adding additional ad hoc members who can appreciate the interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of the work to be reviewed to the primary/department committee for that case. Such ad hoc members should be added in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee.
 - The committee must be of sufficient size to produce a minimum of four yes or no votes (not including absences or abstentions).
 - If members are added for interdisciplinary or size reasons, candidates are to have no role in the identification or solicitation of such additional members.

Year 6 of Candidate Appointment

- Oversee the timeliness and procedural integrity of the primary committee (See [Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities](#)).
- Provide an assessment of the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case), such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance. This assessment **must be a separate document in the dossier; it is not acceptable to simply place a marker that asks the reviewer to refer to the chair's letter or some other place in the dossier.** It is placed in the External Review Letters folder in the eDossier.
 - Analyze the stature of journals, presses, editions, galleries, presentations, and other means of disseminating the results of the teaching, research and creative activity, or professional service of the

candidates, including the quality of electronic publications. **This assessment is required.** Stature may be reflected by acceptance rates, the nature of peer review (such as the stature of the reviewing agency/organization), or other measures and, whenever possible, these indices should be cited. Although the notation for each journal or other entity should be brief (ordinarily two or three sentences), special commentary may be required when faculty are working in interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary areas.

- Address authorship convention for discipline; define if the first, last, or other author position are indicators of intellectual leadership.
- Additionally, journals devoted to practice as well as theory development in teaching and professional service may not be as widely known or understood, even by colleagues within the same department, compared to other scholarly journals. Special care should be taken in assessing the stature of such journals or presses. In circumstances where publication occurs outside the usual disciplinary journals or presses, chairs may wish to seek an assessment of the stature of these publications from chairs or deans in other disciplines. In order to promote and encourage interdisciplinary teaching, research and creative activity, and service, IUPUI encourages dissemination of results in appropriate media of high quality even when these outlets are unusual for the discipline. Peer review of the material, therefore, is especially important. Whenever a chair is not the appropriate administrative officer to provide an assessment of the media of dissemination, deans should arrange to include this information.
- If invited presentations are vital evidence for candidates' reputation in their field, the quality of these invited presentations should be addressed at the departmental level.
- Compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier. (This letter is waived if the department chair does not hold tenure and/or a rank equal to that sought by the candidate.) Include the following:
 - Address the candidate's research independence and grant funding to support the current and ongoing program of research.
 - Review the candidate's unsuccessful grant applications and interpret the reviewers' comments in a short assessment. The analysis of the overall pattern of grant success should be included in the department chair's vote letter for promotion and/or tenure. **This grant assessment is required if applicable.**
 - Relate the candidate's evidence of achievement, such as student outcomes or publications, to departmental norms and expectations.
 - Discuss indications of professional or disciplinary benchmarks used in the field and relevant to the recommendations being made by the primary committee and chair.
 - Provide supporting evidence of the candidate's institutional citizenship, including specific contributions and outcomes of committee membership or campus initiatives that extend beyond mere membership and attendance.
 - Validate that all areas of responsibility have been achieved at at least a satisfactory level (or describe in detail if not.)
 - Specifically address if excellence is achieved in the stated area of excellence, or overall excellence in balanced-integrative cases, or highly satisfactory in balanced-binned cases.
 - If the candidate has received a tenure extension, add a sentence in the letter: "Candidate-Name received a one-year extension of the tenure-probationary period, consistent with IU policy."
- If the candidate holds a joint or adjunct appointment in another school/unit and that joint appointment represents a significant investment of the faculty member or librarian's intellectual activities, include at least a letter of recommendation from the appropriate chair, director, or dean of that school/unit.

- If a school has a structure that includes section chiefs, invite the section chief to write a letter that will become part of the dossier (in the Solicited Letters folder).
- Ensure that candidates receive fair and equitable treatment from the primary committee.
 - The report from the primary committee should explain the reasons for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The report should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate's qualifications.
 - Before submitting to the next level:
 - The primary committee chair should record the committee's final vote in the vote record and upload the primary committee's report.
 - The department chair should record their vote in the vote record and upload their report.
- Meet the candidate to discuss the results of the primary committee's deliberation and the chair's letter. Have the candidate sign for receipt of the documents. In a tenure case, at the first level where there have been negative votes, (if applicable) discuss the candidate's right and the process for reconsideration. **This must be done in a timely manner and prior to the next level of review.**
- Facilitate exchanges between the unit/school committee and the primary/department committee that might be necessary during the unit/school committee's deliberation.

Dean Responsibilities

- At the time of the candidate's three-year review, ensure that a copy of the completed review is submitted to the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs by May 1.
- Update your knowledge by reviewing the latest version of the IUPUI P&T Guidelines each year (found at: <https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/promotiontenure/guidelines-and-standards/>).
- Ensure that all tenure-probationary candidates and all candidates eligible for promotion have information about promotion and/or tenure workshops and the school's calendar of deadlines for the promotion and tenure process.
- Ensure that a current copy of the unit's/school's promotion and/or tenure document is on file with OAA and that every candidate receives a copy. These documents need to be approved by your school's appropriate faculty governance process and the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs for compliance with campus expectations.
- Arrange to include an assessment of the quality of the media used to disseminate a candidate's scholarly work when a department is not the administrative unit.
- Ensure that candidates are informed of any materials added or changes made to the dossier. Candidates and all previous reviewers must be provided with an opportunity comment on or to respond to such additions. The added information and the responses become a part of the dossier. (See [Addition of Materials/Comments](#).). The dean/dean's office is responsible for reminding the unit/school committee chair, departmental chair, and primary/department committee chair that any time a candidate adds new materials to their dossier, the materials must be provided to and considered by all previous levels of review. When addition of new materials occurs after the dossier has reached the unit/school committee, direct oversight should be provided by the dean's office to assure compliance.
- Ensure that all external reviewers meet the guidelines for independence outlined in the section on [External Assessment](#). If not, then secure additional external reviews sufficient to meet the six-reviewer minimum standard prior to forwarding the dossier to OAA. The campus will return a dossier that does not meet the six-reviewer, arms-length minimum.

- If a candidate has received an extension of the probationary period, include a statement to that effect in the solicitation letter.
- All reviews received must be retained in the dossier. Similarly, all supporting letters received must be retained in the dossier.
- Make sure that the unit/school committee complies with all the requirements found in the [Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities](#) section.
- When divergent evaluations of a dossier result in different recommendations on tenure, the unit (school) committee may wish to consult with the primary (department) 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 the vote of a committee was changed as a result. When there are divergent evaluations with respect to promotion, the unit committee should provide feedback to the primary committee. The report from each committee should account for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The reports should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate's qualifications. It is strongly recommended that the letter address the criteria as listed in the Reviewer's Summary Evaluation.
- As noted earlier about the chair's responsibility, deans must similarly ensure that unit committees do not submit minority reports. Only the final vote of committees and administrators should be recorded in the vote record.
- Ensure that the unit committee has given a copy of their summary letter to the candidate. Have the candidate sign and date for receipt of his/her copy of the letter.
- A candidate for tenure **must** be notified at the first level of negative tenure review. This must happen in a timely manner and before the next scheduled level of review. They must be apprised of their right for reconsideration at that time.
- Following review at the unit/school level, compose the dean's letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action and enclose this in the dossier. Specifically address if the requirements for the chosen case type have been achieved and validate that all area(s) of performance are at least satisfactory. Have the candidate sign and date for receipt of his/her copy of the letter.
- Include a perspective for campus and university reviewers on standards that candidates must meet in the school/unit.
- Before submitting to the next level:
 - The school/unit committee chair should record the committee's final vote in the vote record and upload the school/unit committee's report.
 - The dean should record their vote in the vote record and upload their report.

Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities

- Committees should have a minimum number of members sufficient to result in at least four approve/disapprove votes being recorded (in case members cannot vote for any reason). If there are insufficient faculty to comprise a committee resulting in at least four votes from members of the proper rank, the dean should seek additional members (either from another department within the school or from another school) in consultation with the duly constituted committee. Candidates are to have no role in identifying or soliciting additional members.
- Voting members must fully participate in committee deliberations. There can be no proxy voting on promotion and/or tenure cases at any level.

- Persons who will not be able to participate in committee deliberations are not members of the promotion and tenure committee and should not have access to dossier materials for any candidate.
 - Members are recorded as “absent” when they have had access to materials but were unexpectedly unable to participate in deliberations.
 - Members are recorded as “abstain” when they participate in the deliberations but vote at other levels, have conflicts of interest, are not of the required rank, or do not vote for other reasons approved by the promotion and tenure committee.
- Faculty members and administrators who participate in the promotion and/or tenure process must have full access to all materials in the candidate’s dossier and to assessments at all previous levels of review.
 - Except for reconsideration of prior decisions, each faculty member and administrator who participates in the promotion and/or tenure process votes only once on any particular case. The committee member may decide at which level to vote if they serve on more than one level of review, as long as there is a minimum of four yes or no votes at each level.
 - All assessments by review committees or administrators must clearly describe the candidate’s performance by referencing the terminology in the *Indiana University Academic Policies* (“excellent,” “satisfactory,” or “unsatisfactory”) even if additional categories or alternative terminology is also used. At IUPUI, the campus also uses the terminology, “beyond satisfactory” or “highly satisfactory” for the balanced-binned case or for the associate librarian’s secondary area of review. For all cases, each area of responsibility must be at least satisfactory. For single-area-of-excellence cases there are votes on that area of excellence; for balanced-binned cases, there are votes (at least “highly satisfactory” or “beyond satisfactory”) on two (clinical) or three (tenure track) areas, and for integrative cases, there is a vote on overall/holistic excellence.
 - The administrative heads at the primary/department level (usually a department chair or IUPUI executive associate dean for core schools) or unit/school level (the dean) write their own letter of assessment for candidates. Therefore, they may not vote at any other level in the promotion and/or tenure process. Depending on the school’s bylaws, the administrative heads may be present during deliberations of promotion and/or tenure committees within their schools and may seek clarification of issues related to the case, but they may not influence the outcomes of promotion and/or tenure committee votes within the school.
 - Clinical track faculty cannot serve on promotion and/or tenure review committees for tenure-track faculty.
 - Those voting for a promotion must at least hold the rank being sought by the candidate. If committee members at lower rank than the candidate are members of a primary or unit committee, they may be present for the discussion and participate up to the point of vote. During the period of 2021-2024, associate-rank tenured professors may vote on and review (as chairs and as external reviewers), candidates for teaching professor.
 - Those voting for tenure must hold tenure.
 - The report from each committee should account for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The report should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate’s qualifications. The committee chair gives a copy of the summary letter to the candidate. Have the candidate sign and date for receipt of his/her copy of the letter.
 - The primary committee is asked to consider reviews of unsuccessful grant submissions. Analyze the pattern of grant success, where applicable, and include a summary in the committee’s vote letter for promotion and/or tenure. Please review the candidate’s level of funding in light of the present context for funding in the field.
 - If invited presentations are vital evidence for candidates’ reputation in their field, the quality of these invited presentations should be addressed at the departmental level.

Institutional Procedures

Submission Deadlines

- Review of dossiers begins in the department or schools. As deadlines vary from one academic unit to another, faculty should contact their department/school directly for submission deadlines.
- For campus level review, units/schools need to route the complete dossier (with votes and letters from all levels) for every candidate to OAA no later than the last Friday in October.
- If extenuating, school-level circumstances exist, a request for a time extension should be sent as soon as possible before the October deadline to oa@iupui.edu. This extension can only be requested by school officials.

Here is an overview of the promotion and/or tenure review at IUPUI. **Deadlines other than the campus/last Friday in October are determined by schools.**

Activity	Time Frame
Candidates prepare materials for external reviewers	Spring of the 5th year
Candidates prepare dossiers	No later than spring of 5th year for tenure candidates
Candidates submit dossiers to primary unit <i>eDossier is usually available by the beginning of summer.</i>	Based on school process: in the School of Medicine, dossiers are due in the departments by late May or early June; in most other schools, they are due in early August. <i>Check with your department/school for exact dates.</i>
Schools complete routing e-dossiers to OAA	The last Friday of October
Campus committee reviews and evaluates all dossiers	December, January, and February—sometimes into early March
Campus committee recommendations are forwarded to the chief academic officer	Immediately following campus committee reviews; early March
Chief academic officer reviews cases, completes an independent evaluation and forwards recommendations to the chancellor	Mid-March
Chancellor reviews cases and confers with the IU and Purdue presidents on the joint recommendations that are forwarded to the respective Boards of Trustees	Late March
Promotion takes effect	July 1 (12-month faculty) or August 1 (10-month faculty) to coincide with the start of the academic year
Tenure takes effect	July 1 of the following academic year

If there is uncertainty about what may be required, candidates or chairs should confer with the senior associate vice chancellor for academic affairs as soon as possible.

Addition of Materials/Comments

- Although new information may be added at any level up to and including the campus promotion and tenure committee level of review, once the dossier is submitted for review in eDossier, the candidate sections cannot be changed. Revisions of vitae or statements or new material, or in response to a level of review, may be added via the Supplemental folder, up to and including the campus promotion and tenure committee level of review. No further additions or comments can be added to the dossier subsequent to the campus promotion and tenure committee level of review.
- If additional materials are submitted during the review process for inclusion and consideration in the dossier:
 - 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.

- Accomplishments that are part of or added to the e-dossier in the review are counted as “in rank” for that review and are NOT in-rank for a subsequent promotion.
- Committees at prior levels may elect to revote on the case if circumstances warrant this action. If a committee decides not to revote, a note to that effect should be uploaded.
- 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.
 - All additions must be submitted electronically as searchable PDFs.
 - If including copies of emails, the best practice is to print the original email to PDF and send as an attachment, preserving the authenticity of the communication.
 - Annual and three-year reviews will not be part of the dossier but may be consulted by any of the reviewing bodies without violating the obligation to notify the candidate or earlier reviewers.

Reconsideration

- Under special circumstances, Indiana University policy allows for reconsideration. This policy **applies only to tenure cases where a candidate receives a negative recommendation**. A negative recommendation consists of a majority vote against awarding tenure rather than a single negative vote.
 - Candidates for promotion may add notes or additional materials: See the [Addition of Materials/Comments](#) section. Committees are notified of these materials and choose whether or not to re-meet or to re-vote.
- 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 Policies*. 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.
- 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.
- In the event that the new or corrected information provided by the candidate does not change the initial outcome at the level responding to reconsideration, a revote is not necessary.
- Reconsideration is not an appeals process but an opportunity to correct the record while review is still underway.
- Under unusual circumstances, reconsideration of promotion decisions may be permitted with the approval of the chief academic officer. The procedures noted above for “addition of materials” will be followed in such a situation.

- Nothing in the act of requesting reconsideration or being reconsidered precludes a candidate's later seeking a Faculty Board of Review.
- Candidates may withdraw their dossiers from consideration at any stage.
 - If a tenure-probationary faculty, who is requesting early consideration of tenure, withdraws his or her case, that case can then be submitted only at the mandatory time (a faculty member may have only ONE early tenure consideration).
 - If a tenure-probationary faculty member withdraws his or her case during the mandatory review year, this is considered a failure to obtain tenure and the faculty member will receive a terminal appointment for the final year.
 - If withdrawal happens after external letters have been received, they must be maintained in the dossier for subsequent submissions for three years, unless replaced by updated letters from the same letter writers, or unless the candidate changes his or her area of excellence.

Campus Level Reviews and Notification

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee uses a primary and secondary reader system.

- Primary and secondary readers are assigned to each case; readers are not from the schools of the candidates. Only experienced members are assigned as readers for controversial ("all read") cases.
- Readers use a summary report form to review cases and compose a written report which presents their evaluation/assessment of cases assigned to them for review in advance of the meeting when a particular case is considered.
- All members of the committee read the full dossier when there have been divided votes at earlier levels of review, where fewer than 75% of eligible reviewers approve of promotion or tenure, or when the primary or secondary reader makes such as request ("all read" cases).
- Following consideration of the reviews of the primary and secondary reader, members of the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee discuss the case and vote. Candidates receive the final vote from the campus committee.
- The chief academic officer or a designee attends all meetings, listens to the discussion of each case, and reads the readers' reports.
- Subsequently, the chief academic officer and chancellor read each dossier, review all prior evaluations, and provide an independent recommendation to the next level:
 - For Purdue faculty, recommendations regarding promotion are made to the president and Trustees of Purdue University while recommendations regarding tenure are made to the president and Trustees of Indiana University.
 - For Indiana University faculty and librarians, promotion and/or tenure recommendations are made to the president and Trustees of Indiana University.
- A formal notice of final action is provided to faculty and librarians after the Trustees act on the president's recommendations.
 - In instances where a candidate is not being recommended for promotion, this notification will ordinarily be the only notice of a negative decision.
 - Probationary faculty not recommended for tenure will also receive a notice of non-reappointment from the chancellor in addition to this notification.

Dossier Content-Administrative

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

- The sections of the dossier that the candidate prepares should be no more than 50 pages (includes candidate's statement and evidence in Teaching, Research, and Service sections; excludes CV, department/school guidelines and appendix documents). In general, documents should have one-inch margins, single-spaced copy using typical fonts (Arial, Calibri, Times New Roman) with a font size no smaller than 11 point. All electronic documents will be submitted as searchable PDFs. (When existing electronic files are converted in PDF format, they are usually searchable. When documents are scanned, additional steps will need to be taken to make the document searchable. For help with either process, contact UITS or the Center for Teaching and Learning as they may be able to provide one-on-one help.)
- The candidate owns the dossier; however, certain materials are added to the dossier by others as a regular part of the process such as external assessments and reports of various levels of review.
- Candidate sections of the dossier are discussed in the Document (Dossier-Candidate) sections above.

Dossier Administrative Sections

- These sections of the dossier are not prepared by the candidate.
- Administrative letters from the dean, unit/school committee, department chair, and primary/department committee should not contain any confidential personal and/or medical information about the candidate. Reasons for approved tenure-clock extensions the candidate may have received will not be considered in the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure.
- These sections contain the following:
 - Review letter and vote from the dean
 - Dean's recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure and a summary evaluation of the candidate's professional activities (including performance and professional development for librarians). See "Department committee" section below for descriptions of how voting can be reported. The letter should be clear about strengths and weaknesses of the case and reasons for an overall negative or positive decision. This evaluation should be dated, signed, and printed on letterhead.
 - If the candidate holds a joint appointment in two schools/units in which tenure is being sought or has been awarded:
 - One unit/school will be designated as the primary unit in the letter of appointment (if the appointment letter does not designate a primary unit, the decision about which school/unit will be considered the primary unit for the promotion and/or tenure process must be made prior to the dossier being assembled.).
 - The dean of the secondary unit/school must provide a letter for the dossier with his or her recommendation on the candidate, perhaps in consultation with the promotion and/or tenure committee of the secondary primary school/unit. This evaluation should be dated, signed, and printed on letterhead.
 - If the candidate holds an adjunct appointment in another school/unit, the dean of the secondary unit/school or an appropriate representative should be given the opportunity to provide a letter for the dossier with his or her recommendation on the candidate; however, it is not required. This evaluation should be dated, signed, and printed on letterhead.
- Review Letter and Vote from the Unit/School Committee
 - Unit/school committee's written recommendation and the committee's evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, research and creative activity, and service or librarian's performance, professional development and service. See "Department committee" section below for descriptions of how voting can occur. The letter should be clear about strengths and weaknesses of the case and reasons for an overall negative or positive decision. This evaluation should be dated, signed, and printed on letterhead.

- If the candidate holds a joint appointment in two schools/units in which tenure is being sought or has been awarded:
 - One unit/school will be designated as the primary unit in the letter of appointment (if the appointment letter does not designate a primary unit, the decision about which school/unit will be considered the primary unit for the promotion and/or tenure process must be made prior to the dossier being assembled).
 - The promotion and/or tenure committees in both schools/units and departments may be given an opportunity to conduct a full review of the candidate, with the understanding that the input of the secondary school/unit becomes part of the deliberations of the primary school/unit.
- When school or department level review letters are written, names of external referees are not included in the letter. Specific quotes may be attributed to “reviewer # 1” etc., and other reviewers can refer to the combined external-letter-file in the e-dossier.
- Review Letter and Vote from the Department Chair
 - Department chair’s individual recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure—and a summary evaluation of the teaching, research and creative activity, and service in relation to departmental norms and expectations. See “Department committee” section below for descriptions of how decisions can be reported. The letter should be clear about strengths and weaknesses of the case and reasons for an overall negative or positive decision. This evaluation should be dated, signed, and printed on letterhead.
 - For core schools based in Bloomington, this recommendation is made by the executive associate dean on the Indianapolis campus.
 - For schools with official departments only, if a chair letter will not be included because the candidate is the chair, the chair is of a lesser rank than a candidate, or for another reason, please include a note stating the reason no chair letter will be included as a placeholder.
 - For schools that do not have this level of review, this section will be omitted.
- Review Letter and Vote from the Primary/Department Committee
 - The written recommendation of the primary committee, including the committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching, research and creative activity, and service or the librarian’s performance, professional development, and service. These areas should be evaluated according to the requirements of the individual case-type chosen:
 - Single area of excellence: the chosen area of excellence is voted as excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. A vote of anything other than “excellent” constitutes an overall negative decision. The other areas of responsibility are voted as excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. A vote of unsatisfactory constitutes an overall negative decision.
 - Balanced-binned: each area of responsibility (research/creative activity, teaching, and service for tenure-track; teaching and service for clinical) is voted as excellent, highly satisfactory (or beyond satisfactory), satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. If any area is satisfactory or unsatisfactory, that constitutes an overall negative decision.
 - Balanced-integrative: each area of responsibility is assessed as at least satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If any area is unsatisfactory, that is an overall negative decision. The holistic / combined / cumulative accomplishments are voted on as overall excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. An assessment other than overall excellent constitutes a negative decision.
 - In the case of tenure recommendations, the statement should include an evaluation of the likelihood that the candidate will continue their activity in these three areas based on past performance and future plans. This evaluation should be signed and dated.

- For core schools based in Bloomington, this is the Indianapolis review committee.
- For schools that do not have this level of review, this section will be omitted.
- External Assessments.
 - This document is added by the person who requests the external assessments. This may be the primary committee chair, department chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee¹³.
 - Please note that external assessments must comply with the criteria defining “arm’s length” or independence of external reviewer. **No candidate dossier should be forwarded to OAA without the required six “arm’s length” external reviews.** All external assessments received, even those not deemed “arm’s length” must be included in the dossier.
 - **One searchable PDF will contain the following documents in the exact order listed below:**

- A sample of the external assessment solicitation letter sent to reviewers for the candidate.
- A list containing brief statements (two or three sentences) on the expertise of each external referee. See [External Referee List](#) for format. Do not include curriculum vitae of the external referee.
- Completed External Referee Forms and external assessments placed in the order they appear on the expertise statement list mentioned above. For Example: Form A, Letter A, Form B, Letter B, Form C, Letter C, etc.

- If a reviewer does not return the External Referee Form, please note how you attempted to get it.
- To be accepted, all external assessments must be provided on letterhead stationery and contain the referee’s signature.
- Do not provide lists of external reviewers solicited, only successful submissions. The e-dossier folders, “List of Referees Contacted” (in administrative section) and “Candidate’s List of Prospective Referees” (candidate section/General), are not required, but may be used for school processes.
- Solicited Letters
 - Not all cases will have solicited reference letters. Those that do not will leave this section blank.
 - These documents are added by the person who requests the reference letters. This may be the primary committee chair, department chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee.
 - Letters solicited by the candidate are placed in the evidence section they best support—teaching, service, or research/creative activity. For integrative cases, place all letters into the FIRST folder.
 - All solicited reference letters received must be included. Once a letter is added at any level of review, it becomes a permanent part of the dossier and is not to be removed.
 - Please do not include CVs of reference letter writers.
- Assessment of dissemination outlets in the candidate’s area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case)
 - This document is typically prepared by the department chair (see Year 6 under Chair Responsibilities for complete details); however, it could be prepared by the primary committee chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee. It is NOT prepared by the candidate.
 - Department or school/unit evaluation of the stature of the journals in which the publications appeared, the museums or galleries showing creative work, or other venues for disseminating the results of research or creative activity must be included. Whenever available, the acceptance rates (or other evidence of stature or quality) should be noted. Avoid abbreviations; reviewers outside the candidate’s

¹³ Securing external letters is the responsibility of the academic department chair, or their delegate, even if the chair is not at rank.

field are not likely to be familiar with them. In instances where a candidate is working in an interdisciplinary field and is publishing in journals or media other than the normal disciplinary publications, care should be taken to explain the nature, quality, and role of the journals. If the published work is of demonstrably high quality, the fact that a journal is not (yet) highly ranked or even recognized within a discipline should not by itself be grounds for disqualifying or devaluing the publications.

- **The actual assessment must be a separate document; it is not acceptable to simply place a marker that asks the reviewer to refer to the chair's letter or some other place in the dossier.**

External Assessment of Candidates

- External assessment is essential to provide the committees evaluating each candidate for promotion and/or tenure an objective evaluation of the value and impact of the candidate's work within the discipline, and to demonstrate that each candidate for associate professor in a case for excellence in research¹⁴ has achieved an emerging national reputation and that each candidate for full professor in research has achieved a sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered. External assessment is a summative evaluation process with associated rank requirements.
- As IUPUI grows in complexity and as the nature of faculty and librarian work evolves, expectations for the form of independent, external assessment of the overall record appropriate to each type of faculty appointment continue to be refined.
- External assessment is expected of all candidates at all ranks. To be accepted, all external assessments must be provided on letterhead stationery and contain the referee's signature¹⁵. To provide each candidate maximal opportunity for success, **at least six assessment letters are required. Cases that come to the campus level without six acceptable "arm's-length" letters will be returned to the school.**
- If a candidate is reapplying for promotion within three years of a previous dossier submission (whether as a result of denial of promotion or withdrawal of the case prior to final decision), all original external letter writers must be contacted with a request to update their letter with the new dossier information. If provided, the new letter is substituted in the dossier. If not, the original letter must be retained in the dossier, unless the candidate has changed his or her area of excellence, in which case older and obsolete letters may be discarded. Three additional new letters should be sought at the time of resubmission; there must be a total of at least six arm's-length letters.
- The candidate should not be involved in the selection of external reviewers, with two exceptions: 1) the candidate should be allowed to list those he or she would definitely not want to serve as an external reviewer, and 2) the candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the chair or the chair's designee. The candidate must discuss this list with their academic administrator and should indicate clearly on the list that each meets the "arm's-length" or independent criteria outlined below. Chairs or deans are not required to use the external reviewers identified by candidates.
- If a screening process is used to find out if potential referees would provide a letter if asked, the process must be applied to all candidates within the school. For promotion to senior lecturer, reviewers must be external to the

¹⁴ In IU policy, the national reputation criterion is attached to research excellence cases, not to teaching excellence, service excellence, or balanced cases. Refer to specific requirements of types of cases in the main section above, and to department or school requirements.

¹⁵ This provision is waived during COVID-19, as long as the authenticity of the letter and letter writer are assured.

unit (school or department); for all other cases (including teaching professor), reviewers must be external to Indiana University. Chairs should aim to receive no fewer than six, nor more than ten letters. All solicited external assessment letters received must be included in the dossier whether or not they exceed the suggested maximum of ten. When a reviewer's form indicates they are not at arms' length, the letter must be retained BUT should be uploaded in a separate pdf that is clearly labelled as not at arms' length.

- Chairs/deans may seek additional guidance to identify potential external reviewers, for example, from chairs of similar departments in other universities, from senior faculty in the department in the same or related specialty, or from the scholars quoted in the candidate's publications. Reviewers do not have to be scholars in the identical sub-specialty as the candidate. Chairs should not inform candidates about the identities of the final external reviewers. Biographic summaries of external reviewer should be provided by the department chair and are not to be written by the candidate. Chair, committee, and dean letters of evaluation should not name external reviewers.
- Criteria defining "arm's length" or independence of external reviewers:
 - The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be as independent as possible. To qualify as "arm's length" or independent, reviewers providing external assessment should have no personal, professional, or academic relationship with the candidate that would cause them to be invested in the candidate's promotion. Specific examples of reviewers to avoid include (but are not limited to): 1) former or current mentors and 2) co-authors or scholarly collaborators in the last five years. Exceptions can be made in the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research or service panels. The department chair needs to specifically make the case for including such a reviewer. If in doubt, please contact the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that referees are objective and credible; persons closely associated with the candidate may not be as objective as those who are not personally associated. Reviews deemed to not comply with the "arm's length" criteria will not count toward the six needed reviews.
 - Reviews received that are deemed not at "arm's length" should be placed in the Solicited Letters folder.
 - **Academic external reviewers must be at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate**, except temporarily [through the 2023-2024 review cycle] for the rank of teaching professor as noted below and be employed by a peer (or higher-ranked) institution, either on an institution or program-specific basis.
 - When there are highly qualified academic reviewers who are considered top experts in the field, but they do not meet the rank or peer institution guidelines, the chair must provide sufficient explanation as to why they have been selected as an appropriate reviewer.
 - Reviewers should come from a variety of institutions to provide the widest array of perspectives; more than one reviewer from the same institution should be avoided if possible¹⁶.
 - **Non-academic external reviewers** may be included when a clear explanation of the relevance of such a review is presented by the chair. It is always in the best interest of the candidate to select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible.
- Reviewers for tenure-track faculty should be tenured; reviewers for non-tenure-track faculty should have at least the approximate rank sought, in the terminology of their institution, and may or may not be tenured.
- General expectations for external assessment vary with type of appointment.

¹⁶ There is no current rule prohibiting two or more reviewers based at the same institution, but campus P&T committee members prefer to have reviewers from separate institutions.

CLASSIFICATION	RANK BEING SOUGHT	EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
Tenure-track faculty, research professors, scientists, and scholars	Advancement to full	<p>External independent review is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of two peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. <p>Academic reviewers must be at full rank.</p>
	Advancement to associate	<p>External independent review is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of two peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. <p>Academic reviewers must be at the rank of associate or higher.</p>
Clinical Track	Advancement to full clinical professor	<p>External independent review is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of two peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. <p>Reviewers should be at the rank of full professor. They may be tenured or on clinical track.</p>
	Advancement to associate clinical professor	<p>External independent review is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A maximum of two peers external to the department or from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible. <p>Reviewers should be at the rank of associate or higher. They may be tenured or on clinical track.</p>

CLASSIFICATION	RANK BEING SOUGHT	EXTERNAL REVIEWERS
Lecturers	Advancement to senior lecturer	At least six reviews are required. "External" for senior lecturer candidates is defined as outside the department/school or discipline. They may come from IUPUI, other IU or PU campuses, or externally.
	Advancement to teaching professor	External independent peer review is required. A maximum of two peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered external. During the period 2021-2024, external assessors may be tenured faculty at the associate or full rank, or clinical or teaching faculty at the full rank.
Librarians	Advancement to full librarian	External independent peer review is required. A maximum of two peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered "external" if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. Select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible.
	Advancement to associate librarian	A maximum of two letters from campus faculty, librarians, or administrators external to the unit are acceptable; they should be solicited in the same careful way as external assessment letters to ensure independent review.

- Make the primary/department and/or unit/school protocol for soliciting letters from external peer reviewers available to the candidate. The primary/department (and/or unit/school) protocol for soliciting external assessment letters should be written and should be incorporated into primary/department (and/or unit/school) procedures.
 - Schools/departments should have written guidelines for what materials are submitted to external reviewers for each type of case presented. These procedures should be consistent across candidates per case type, but may consist of a request for candidates to themselves create a materials-portfolio oriented towards their signature accomplishments.
- Schools should maintain consistency in what is sent to external evaluators. This may vary by type of case, but not by candidate.
 - For cases based on excellence in research, a typical package consists of an IUPUI P&T CV, a disciplinary CV, the candidate's statement, and links to or copies of signature research items (or links embedded in the CV).
 - For teaching, service, or balanced cases, each candidate can be asked to create a mini-dossier, containing the CVs and candidate statement, plus select and critical information supporting their case. Candidates should be cautioned that referees do not have unlimited time and attention.
- It is recommended that email communication that solicits external reviews include a request for confirming reply to indicate receipt of all materials. Furthermore, all email communications to external reviewers, including all attachments, should remain electronically archived and not deleted.

- Solicit letters from peer reviewers external to the primary/department, unit/school, and/or external to IUPUI using the standard protocol. The External Referee Form found in the Charts and Templates document should accompany the letter of request.
- The Sample Letter to Request an External Evaluation, found in the Charts and Templates document differentiates advancement on the basis of a single area of excellence (teaching, research or creative activity, or service) or a balanced-binned or balanced integrative case; references the rank and expectations for that rank; and allows chairs to delineate any particular contextual circumstances or expectations for the candidate. These distinctions give reviewers the information they need to provide helpful reviews. Similar letters adapted for peers internal to IUPUI should also be used. Advice on the solicitation of external assessment letters for librarians can be found in the Library Faculty document “Letters in Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers FAQs.”
- The chair (or the person soliciting the letters) provides a brief statement addressing the expertise of each external reviewer which will be placed in the external assessments section of the dossier (see [External Referee List](#) for format). Ensure that all external reviewers meet the guidelines for independence outlined in the section on [External Assessment](#). If not, then secure additional external reviews sufficient to meet the six-reviewer minimum standard prior to forwarding the dossier to the unit committee. All reviews received must be retained in the dossier. The campus will return a dossier that does not meet the six-reviewer, arm’s length minimum.
- When excellence in teaching, professional service, local impact (the integrative DEI case), or public scholarship is a basis for advancement, it is important to provide documentation that will enable external reviewers to make informed judgments.
 - For teaching, most schools/units have effectively sought external evaluation of course design and materials as part of their review of teaching accomplishments. This type of evaluation may be particularly helpful in considering materials prepared for use with new technologies (e.g., internet, multimedia, videos, computer simulations, databases, software) or for judging the incorporation of service learning as part of courses.
 - For professional service, candidates should include sample reports, presentation materials or other items, illustrating their scholarship of service, as well as evaluation or impact data related to their work.
 - For public scholarship, candidates should provide evidence of collaborative, outcomes-focused activities that result in final products that benefit and are valued by the community. Scholarly outcomes may include exhibits, curricular products, community projects or initiatives, policy recommendations and actions, quality of life plans, shared grants, or websites.
 - For direct impact, qualitative and quantitative program evaluation and quality indicators can be used, as well as assessment by local experts and relevant constituencies.
- Without documented results and without external peer review, candidates in the clinical and tenure track ranks for advancement based on excellence in teaching, professional service, or public scholarship should not expect to succeed.
- Librarians should provide external reviewers with materials appropriate to their context, in addition to the standard information on responsibilities and publications and presentations documented in the vitae and candidate’s statement.
- During the department and school levels, administrators should ensure that the external assessments meet the requirements of these guidelines.
- Occasionally, a candidate decides to change the area of excellence, revise the candidate statement, or add additional materials after external reviews have already been solicited. **All reviewers** must be provided with the same materials, and at least six arm’s length letters addressing the candidate’s chosen

area of excellence must be received. All letters received at any stage must be preserved unless explicitly replaced by the letter-writer; label clearly those which are obsolete and have not been replaced. All communications should come from the official requesting party, in most cases, the dean or chair.

- Candidates should be instructed that they are not to contact external reviewers.¹⁷

IUPUI Chief Academic Officer's Comments Regarding Outside Letters

- Practices and procedures for obtaining outside letters of review vary among the departments and schools. External assessment letters are required for all promotion and/or tenure cases, and are expected to address teaching or performance, research and creative activities, and service, with particular attention to the candidate's chosen area of excellence. In all instances, the relationship between the candidate and external reviewer should be as independent as possible.
- Ordinarily, chairs should solicit outside letters. However, chairs may delegate this responsibility to another member of the department, such as the chair of the primary committee, in accord with established departmental or school procedures. In most instances, the candidate should not be involved in the process of identifying external evaluators with two exceptions:
 - The candidate should be allowed to list those he or she would definitely not want to serve as external reviewer
 - The candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the chair or the chair's designee.
- Generally, the candidate should not provide any outside letters. If outside letters are added by the candidate, these must be clearly designated as letters of reference and candidates should recognize that letters solicited by them do not have the same value as letters solicited by the chair or dean; candidate-solicited letters should be placed in the candidate sections either within the 50 pages or within the relevant appendix subfolder. The value of external assessment letters is greatly enhanced by the objectivity and credibility of the author. Care should be taken to avoid relying on persons closely affiliated with the candidate.
- Please consider these points:
 - The chair (primary or unit committee chair, dean, or other person specified by department or school procedures) should request and receive these letters.
 - The solicitor should use identical letters of solicitation for all referees, and a copy of the letter that was used should be included in the dossier. If circumstances require different letters (e.g., reviewing different areas of the candidate's work), then copies of all letters used should be included.
 - All letters should be solicited at the same time; specifically, additional letters should not be requested following receipt of a negative evaluation. If additional letters must be sought because a referee declines, the reason should be explained.
 - Letters of solicitation must explicitly mention the candidate's case type. Letters of solicitation for candidates choosing to present a balanced case must include an explanation of Indiana University's policy on the balanced case. **It is extremely important that the proper area of excellence/case type is reflected in the request letter. If the wrong area is indicated, this could result in procedural challenges.**
 - Individual letters must be sent for each candidate; it is inappropriate to solicit external reviews for more than one candidate from a particular external reviewer in the same letter.

¹⁷ Candidates will not know who has been solicited as an external reviewer. They should be advised to not discuss their review with anyone of an appropriate rank during the review year unless they are already known to be not at arms-length.

- All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier; neither the candidate nor subsequent reviewers may exclude letters.
- Referees should be selected on the basis of their ability to comment on the candidate’s professional accomplishments.
- Referees for professional service, teaching, and some other areas of creative or scholarly work may not necessarily hold academic appointments, but they should be selected on the basis of having an established expertise to evaluate the evidence presented to them. Letters from former students, of course, constitute a special category and should not be used. Academic referees are expected to hold at least the rank for which the candidate is being considered.
- The dossier should contain a brief statement of professional qualifications for each referee sufficient to establish the authority of the referee in relation to the specific case under review; ordinarily, two or three sentences should suffice. The candidate should not be the person to write the statements of qualification of external reviewers. Academic referees are expected to hold at least the rank to which the candidate aspires.
 - In instances in which a referee is asked to read a book-length manuscript, an honorarium should be provided. Include the External Referee Forms in your request for referees and ask that they complete the form to assure that reviewers meet our “arm’s length” criteria.
- Evaluators should be asked not to make a recommendation on promotion or tenure; they should be asked to evaluate the candidate’s work or activities. *They should not be asked to speculate on whether the candidate would receive promotion or tenure at their own institutions.* The purpose for seeking these letters is to obtain an objective peer review of the work, and, hence, they should be phrased in a neutral fashion without any suggestion about the department’s likely eventual recommendation.
- To provide useful information for review beyond the department level., avoid using abbreviations that are not likely to be known to colleagues outside the field.
- *Special considerations must be given to evaluating creative work (especially when performances or exhibitions are available for a short period of time).* The same degree of objectivity should be maintained in evaluating creative works as in evaluating research. In some cases, it may be necessary to invite external evaluators to campus to view works or performances even though the promotion or tenure review may be several years away.
- While collaborators should ordinarily not be asked to evaluate the quality and importance of shared work, they may be asked to document the extent and nature of the candidate’s individual contributions to a team effort. Such letters should be specific about this purpose and not be confused with external assessment letters from peers asked to evaluate the quality and impact of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- Electronic letters of reference are acceptable if they have been verified; however, they should still be signed, dated, and on letterhead¹⁸.

Advice

Preparation for promotion and/or tenure begins in the first year at IUPUI. Consult both the IUPUI Guidelines as well as those for your department and/or school. Candidates, chairs, deans, the chief academic officer, and OAA all have distinct and significant roles and responsibilities in the promotion and/or tenure process.

¹⁸ If prevented by COVID-19 interruptions, letters need not be on letterhead as long as they are from verified email addresses.

Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline

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

Year 1 and 2 of Candidate Appointment

- Create a collection system for evidence of activities in teaching (performance in the case of librarians), research and creative activity, and service. Collect and organize everything, ranging from syllabi to grant applications (whether successful or not) to results of committee work. In addition to being useful for annual reports, these early materials provide a basis for analysis of improvement.
- Preferably with the advice of the chair, identify a mentor who can guide you through the processes leading to promotion and/or tenure, and orient you to department expectations. Ideally, this person should be at senior rank.
- You are strongly encouraged to identify an area of excellence at this time. Bear in mind that for promotion and/or tenure reviews you must also document at least satisfactory progress in other areas and that each department/unit has defined its expectations about an appropriate area of excellence. For more details, consult [Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations](#) for various faculty categories in the Charts and Templates document.
- Collect, summarize, and analyze student evaluations every year. Areas where students indicate a problem provide excellent opportunities to document improvement from one semester to the next.
- Arrange peer reviews of your teaching. Problems that are identified in the review process provide excellent opportunities to document improvement from one peer review to the next.
- Be sure you know the expectations of your department and school related to grant/contract funding and make sure that your work falls within those guidelines. The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research provides helpful workshops and other research support for faculty. These resources can be found at <https://research.iu.edu/>.
- Scholarly dissemination of your work is required to document excellence in any of the three areas of faculty work; to document highly satisfactory in each area of a balanced case; and also for assessment of satisfactory in research. Be sure you know the expectations of your department and school related to scholarly productivity and make sure that your work falls within those guidelines. Continue to systematically work on your scholarship output.
- In consultation with your mentor, become familiar with campus resources available via theforum.iupui.edu, the [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#), the [Center for Research and Learning \(CRL\)](#), and the [Center for Service and Learning \(CSL\)](#). Take full advantage of the wide range of support available to faculty.
- Become familiar with the university, campus, unit/school, and primary/department guidelines for promotion and/or tenure. Attend primary/department and/or school promotion and/or tenure workshops. Attend promotion and tenure workshops offered by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA).
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching, and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments.
- Prepare for the three-year review.

Year 3 of Candidate Appointment

- The three-year review takes place in the spring of the third year of service. Each person hired in a calendar year is considered to start service as of August of that year. The review provides an opportunity for faculty, primary/departments, and/or unit/schools to take stock of a tenure-probationary candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure.
- Continue all the above activities while you begin to analyze and document progress on your work in terms of improvement and achievement in relation to primary/department criteria, unit/school criteria, university criteria, and the IUPUI Guidelines.
- Your personal statement for the three-year review also provides an opportunity to reflect not only on your work, but also on the focus that is emerging in your work. This focus will provide the coherence to your work that should shape your efforts between now and the time of your candidacy for promotion and tenure.
- By this time, you need to have a well-defined area of excellence which you are actively developing. Distribute evidence of your scholarship under your area of excellence (if other than research) rather than putting all such evidence under "research" in your curriculum vitae. You may only place each item in one area of the CV.
- Analyze teaching evaluations to identify key themes and how they point to teaching achievements or areas for further attention.
- Analyze peer reviews to determine again how you might improve student learning in your classes.
- Analyze your grant and scholarship dissemination record in relation to department norms and expectations.
- You will receive feedback on your three-year review received from your primary committee, your chair, and your dean. Incorporate that advice into a plan to present a compelling case for promotion and/or tenure in your sixth year. Follow the advice you are given. Work closely with your mentor and your chair and seek out appropriate supports at the campus level in developing your plan.
- If there are significant issues identified in the three-year review, ask for a fourth-year review for further guidance and to update your plan.
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching, and service (and research for tenure-track faculty) is required for continued probationary reappointments.

Year 4 of Candidate Appointment

- This is the year to ensure that you are on track with grants and sufficient dissemination of your scholarship as defined by your department. Maintain close contact with your chair and your mentor to identify areas of support to help you progress along that track.
- Arrange for another peer review of your teaching. You might consider inviting someone external to your department to gain additional perspective.
- Address any issues identified in the three-year review.
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching, and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary appointments.

Year 5 of Candidate Appointment

- This is the year you begin to prepare your dossier. If you have kept records from the start of your academic career, you should be in excellent shape to analyze your progress and present your case.
- Be sure to attend the workshops on promotion and/or tenure in your primary/department and/or unit/school as well as at the campus level. Your perceptions and understanding will be different from what they were your first

year at IUPUI, and your needs more focused, so you will probably get much more immediately useful information at these workshops.

- Aim to complete your dossier a month or two before it is due, especially your Candidate's Statement, so that your mentor and other colleagues can provide you with helpful feedback.
- Be sure that your dossier not only makes your case for excellence in your chosen area, but also provides substantive evidence for at least satisfactory performance in other areas of responsibility. Place sufficient evidence of scholarship in your area of excellence (if other than research) rather than putting all evidence under "research" in your curriculum vitae. Describe your scholarship in your dossier, making sure to explain it in layman's terms since faculty from other disciplines will review your case. Minimize abbreviations, jargon, and acronyms.
- If you are engaged in interdisciplinary work or team science, you should make every effort to represent your contribution to collaborative scholarship clearly, as well as the significance and value of any interdisciplinary approach you are pursuing. You should carefully document your individual contributions within this context.
- Confidential personal and/or medical information should not be included in your dossier. Reasons for approved tenure-clock extensions you may have received will not be considered in the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure.
- Your dossier will be submitted for review either at the end of this academic year or at the beginning of your sixth academic year. Make sure you know the timeline for your primary/department and/or unit/school.
- You are not to contact potential external reviewers.
- Be responsive to advice given in your annual reviews, paying special attention to progress in scholarship for your area of excellence. Satisfactory performance in your areas of responsibility, teaching, and service (and research for tenure-track faculty), is required for continued probationary reappointments.

Year 6 of Candidate Appointment

- Take a breather and then begin your next phase of scholarly work.
- You will be notified at each stage of your dossier's consideration. DO NOT attempt to communicate with or influence any individuals who are involved in the various levels of review while the dossier review is in the process. It is considered an ethical breach and will be dealt with accordingly.
- Be familiar with your options if you have concerns about the evaluation of your dossier at any stage. These policies and procedures are outlined in the *Indiana University Academic Policies*.

Ongoing Review (From: Peer Review section of original)

- Traditionally, peer review of research and creative activity has been a standard feature of faculty work.
- Evaluation of work submitted to journals, juried shows, or other outlets for dissemination is considered the routine way to document the quality of this work.
- Expectations for peer review of the quality and impact of teaching and professional service are now well established at IUPUI.
- Peer evaluation of teaching or professional service is expected for all candidates with teaching or professional service as an area of performance and it is required for those whose advancement is based on excellence in teaching or professional service or on a balanced case. In the absence of a clear reason for the omission, dossiers without peer evaluations may be returned as incomplete. Ongoing peer review need not occur every year, but there should be a record of sustained peer review over the interval since appointment or last promotion.
- Ongoing peer review may be provided by local, national, or international peers.
- To be credible, peer reviewers must be identified according to their expertise or competence to comment.

- These peer reviews should be requested at intervals by the department chair as part of the department’s peer review policies and procedures and conducted in the standard way specified by the academic unit.

Appendix: Quality and Impact

Candidates should provide evidence of the quality of their work and its impact for any kind of case. The following measures are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

- Departments are encouraged to consider discipline-specific examples and measures and incorporate them into their guidelines.
- Any individual promotion or tenure case may have a combination of initiatives and metrics. The candidate must clearly articulate how their aggregated accomplishments are deserving of a finding of ‘excellence.’ Review committees should look for persuasive arguments with compelling evidence, simultaneously being open to non-traditional methods of assessment.

The following are elements that add to the strength of the case (case (see also DEI examples [here](#)):

- Scope: the number of people, events, tasks, and other elements involved: more is better.
- Difficulty/challenge: initiatives addressing issues that are both important and have proven difficult to improve: more difficulty the better.
- Innovation/creativity: initiatives where the candidate provides unique and creative ideas, rather than applying known examples: the more innovative, the better.
- Success/outcomes: achievement of planned or secondary objectives—the more successful the better.
- Adoption by others: e.g., citations, use in courses, use in other communities or organizations: the more widespread beyond IUPUI, the better.

None of these are necessary or individually sufficient. For example, a very creative approach to a very difficult problem may have a small scope and limited (initial) outcomes, but also be inspiring to other organizations. A broader application of a known good model (from outside IUPUI, at IUPUI), may have a large scope and more consistent success, but be less innovative.

Examples of activities with impact with examples for the DEI case:

- Policy work: work that supports adoption of DEI-enhancing governmental or organizational policies and practices.
- Grants: securing grants for IU/IUPUI/unit programs for DEI, e.g., funding diverse junior researchers, pipeline initiatives; internal or external.
- Grants-assistive work: work that assists either IU/IUPUI-units or community organizations to secure grants to support DEI goals.
- Mentorship/advising: designing a mentoring program; serving as a mentor—could be junior colleagues, graduate students, undergraduate students, or pre-college individuals, with impact on diversity, equity, and inclusion; advising groups or individuals.
- Inclusive teaching practices
- Innovative DEI-related curriculum design and delivery
- Providing professional development related to DEI