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A. INTRODUCTION

Promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions for faculty tenure-track appointments and lecturer appointments are among the most important decisions that are made at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). The future of the University and the School of Engineering and Technology are largely determined by these decisions. It is essential that each candidate for promotion and/or tenure be treated fairly and be measured against these guidelines and criteria as objectively as possible. It is expected that faculty will find this document useful in assessing their personal progress toward promotion and tenure. Periodic discussions with the department chair and other administrative officials may help clarify any questions or uncertainties and help to prevent misconceptions. It is required that the department chairs will conduct annual reviews and expected that they will provide faculty members with written assessments of performance. Each year, tenure-track faculty member may also request an evaluation of his or her progress toward tenure and promotion by submitting a dossier to the Primary Board as stated in the School bylaws. Likewise, lecturer appointees may request an evaluation of progress toward promotion to senior lecturer positions.

This document is intended to supplement the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties Promotion-and-Tenure Dossier Guidelines

http://www.academicaffairs.iupui.edu/appd/faculty_appts.htm

This document is also accessible from the school website reference on promotion and tenure:

http://facstaff.engr.iupui.edu/ptd.shtml

The latter reference should also be consulted as an aid for document preparation. The Purdue School of Engineering and Technology Constitution and Bylaws should be referenced, particularly in regard to promotion and tenure Board composition.

Faculty members should find these guidelines useful in planning their progress toward promotion and tenure. However, it is recommended that the individual faculty members also familiarize themselves with the general criteria for promotion and tenure as outlined in the above documents. If these documents change during a faculty member's probationary period, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated under the written standards in effect at the time of appointment (as stated in the Indiana University Academic Handbook).

A.1 THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY FACULTY HANDBOOK

For promotion, the Indiana University Academic Handbook states:

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

With regard to tenure, the Indiana University Academic Handbook states:
"After the appropriate probationary period, tenure shall be granted to those faculty members and librarians whose professional characteristics indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. The criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion are similar, but not identical. Tenure considerations must take into account the mission of the particular unit and the individual's contribution to that mission. Tenure will generally not be conferred unless the faculty member achieves, or gives strong promise of achieving, promotion in rank within the University."

A.2 PURDUE UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES

The Purdue University guidelines, under which the School of Engineering and Technology operates, state:

"Service to the institution, the community, the State, and the nation constitutes an important mission of University faculty members. As an institution of higher education with commitment to excellence and a diversity of missions, Purdue University values creative endeavor, research, and scholarship; teaching in its many forms; and extension and outreach activities. To be considered for promotion, a faculty member should have demonstrated excellence in at least one of these areas. Ordinarily, strength should be manifest in more than one of these areas. Faculty members may contribute in many ways such as assisting in the production of scholarly publications, devising curricula, organizing laboratories and libraries, officiating in professional societies, and so on."

For promotion to different ranks, the Purdue guidelines state:

**Promotion to Assistant Professor**
A tenure-track instructor may be promoted to assistant professor upon attaining the level of professional accomplishment that would justify appointment to an assistant professorship.

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

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

The above are minimal criteria applicable to the Purdue Schools at IUPUI or Purdue University regardless of their interests and missions. It is quite appropriate and desirable within this framework that the School of Engineering and Technology articulate explicitly criteria pertinent to the School.

Note that within the School of Engineering and Technology, promotions are granted by Purdue, but tenure is granted by Indiana University either upon their concurrence after Purdue recommends promotion to associate professor or alternatively after consultation with Purdue if promotion is not simultaneously recommended.

The basic, underlying principle of promotion and tenure decisions is that of peer review and thus these decisions must be made substantively at the department level, where the faculty member's activities are best known and can best be evaluated. At the department, or Primary Board level, the review and decision should be based upon the stated criteria and what is in the best long-term interests of the department. Subsequent
evaluations at higher levels will concentrate on whether stated criteria have in fact been met and whether the procedures followed have been satisfactory. However, each evaluation at all levels is substantive in nature.

It is important to recognize that criteria stated in this document are intended to make the evaluation process as objective as possible. Evaluators at every level will use their own experience, judgment, and expectations to decide whether criteria have in fact been satisfied.

**A.3 THE SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY**

The School of Engineering and Technology requires that for promotion to any rank, the candidate's performance shall be excellent in at least one of the three general categories of (1) teaching, (2) scholarship, and (3) professional service, and to be at least satisfactory in the other two. Marginal or unsatisfactory performance in any category precludes promotion or receipt of tenure. The balanced case cited in the IU Handbook is not applicable to Purdue E&T faculty. Nor is the automatic achievement of tenure upon promotion to associate professor cited in the Purdue University document applicable to E&T faculty.

Indiana University and IUPUI have a lecturer appointment policy that applies to the lecturer appointees of the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology at IUPUI. In the case of lecturer-track positions, two ranks exist, lecturer and senior lecturer. For promotion to the senior lecturer rank, evidence of excellence in teaching and evidence of satisfactory performance in service is required. Lecturers are not held to an expectation of research nor are lecturers on tenure track. (Refer to the IU, IUPUI, and E&T lecturer appointment documents for further information on lecturer policies.)

The ultimate objective of the promotion and tenure procedures is to keep and to reward faculty who have made significant contributions to the department, school, and university and whose performance is expected not only to continue but also to grow. Thus each individual should be evaluated with this primary objective in mind, recognizing the multiplicity of ways in which faculty contributions can be made.

The interpretation of the promotion and/or tenure guidelines for any of the categories of teaching, scholarship, and professional service, by necessity must be interpreted within the proper context. Consideration should be given whether the category is the primary category and whether the candidate is an applicant for promotion to the associate professor or professor level or whether tenure is being sought. The following exemplify the position of the School of Engineering and Technology:

- Promotion to associate professor is based on achievements in the area of excellence reflecting a level of performance which brings documented recognition to the individual from outside IUPUI and promise of continued professional growth and recognition.

- Promotion to professor is based on achievement beyond the level required for an associate professor. Accomplishments in the area of excellence should reflect documented national or international recognition as an authority in the field of specialization, and value for intramural contributions as a member of the faculty.

Evidence of recognition requires that persons be contacted for external evaluations by the Primary Board chair or designee. In accordance with the expectation of university administration, no less than six letters of recommendation should be solicited. Candidates should be consulted about reviewers selected to provide evaluations. Candidates should not solicit their own letters, and solicitation of letters of recommendation from present students, present employees, or personal friends is not encouraged. It is the candidate's responsibility to work with the chair to select references from distinguished and appropriate persons who can attest to the significance of creativity and innovation associated with accomplishments; adoption by others in whole or in part of creative or innovative work; work in progress; potential; and national/international recognition. All letters received must be included in the dossier. Membership and strong, consistent volunteer activity in
national professional organizations are strongly recommended to establish "networking" with prominent peers who can write knowledgeably about a candidate's accomplishments and potential.

It is required that a brief (two or three sentences) statement of the expertise of each external letter writer be provided by the department; these statements may be collected on a single sheet. If the letter writer is acquainted with the candidate personally, this circumstance should be noted and explained.

**A.4 GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

**A.4.1 Introduction**

The School of Engineering and Technology consists of both engineering and technology departments. The engineering departments offer engineering degree programs; the technology departments offer technology degrees programs. More specifically, the engineering faculty educate engineers while the technology faculty educate technologists. Engineers and technologists are valuable technical members of technology teams in many organizations. However, there are important differences in their education and training and they perform quite different functions in an organization. Some major differences in their functions and education may be summarized as follows:

- Engineers are often required to conduct both basic and applied research for designing and developing new devices and processes.

- Technologists apply the existing technology, and primarily perform computations and experiments and prepare design drawings in collaboration with engineers. They are involved in the direct application of their education and experience to make appropriate modifications in designs as needed. Technologists are also required to have acquired a basic knowledge of mathematics and sciences to complement manual skills that enable them to collaborate technically with engineers and scientists.

Therefore, the technology faculty need to be application-oriented, to teach courses which are designed for the solution of problems with more basic calculations than in engineering, and to emphasize teaching and practice of current industry-standard technical knowledge and skills. A technology faculty member is required to have relevant industrial experience and relevant Master's degree. The engineering faculty need to be more research-oriented in their technical fields in order to prepare engineering students for new and future scientific developments.

Because of the above differences in the programs in mission, focus, and workload, it follows that the specific details of tenure and promotion requirements of the faculty in engineering and technology departments be different in the *teaching* and *research* categories, but the same in the *service* category. Regardless of the program, however, each faculty member in the School of Engineering and Technology is evaluated, with respect to the proposed rank, based on the record of performance in: 1) *teaching* and *teaching scholarship*, 2) *research, scholarship, or creative activities*, 3) *professional service and scholarship of application*, and 4) *university service and citizenship*.

**A.4.2 Technology Faculty**

In view of the technology programs' special requirements for teaching and training of technologists, a candidate for promotion in technology is generally expected to have demonstrated and documented excellence in teaching. In addition, consistent with the University's promotion criteria, technology candidates must demonstrate satisfactory accomplishments in the areas of applied research/creative endeavor and service. Their research and/or creative contributions may be closely tied with their teaching activities.
For technology candidates, the activities associated with *scholarly work on instructional methods* may provide evidence for evaluation of performance in research, depending on the level of the activity.

**A.4.3 Engineering Faculty**

In view of the engineering programs’ special requirements for basic and applied research and development in education of engineers, a candidate for promotion in engineering is generally expected to have demonstrated and documented excellence in research and/or creative endeavor. In addition, consistent with the University's promotion criteria, engineering candidates must demonstrate satisfactory accomplishments in the areas of teaching and service.

Engineering candidates who excel in teaching are required to have a *satisfactory* record of basic and/or applied research accomplishments in their respective technical fields to support the graduate programs in the School.

**A.4.4 Summary**

The above distinction of requirements between engineering and technology programs is consistent with the requirements of similar programs in the nation. This document, therefore, lists the tenure and promotion requirements of technology and engineering faculty separately.

**A.5 GENERAL CRITERIA FOR TENURE**

The expectations for achievement of tenure in the School of Engineering and Technology are similar to those for academic promotion. It is important to understand that tenure is a distinctly different and separate consideration and issue from promotion to an advanced academic rank (associate professor or professor).

In some instances, tenure may be granted to a faculty member in his/her existing rank. Achieving tenure in rank is an exception rather than normal practice and the awarding of tenure at the rank of assistant professor occurs only in exceptional cases. The awarding of tenure at the rank of assistant professor is not the general practice of the School and occurs only in highly exceptional cases. Primary boards must explain the rationale for such a tenure-only recommendation in their reports.

Under some circumstances, it is warranted to grant tenure to newly appointed and highly experienced faculty members who are hired at an advanced rank (e.g., associate professor or professor). In that case, the Primary Board of the faculty member's prospective department shall provide a recommendation regarding tenure at the time of appointment.
B. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR TECHNOLOGY FACULTY

B.1 EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP

Instruction is the primary mission of each of the departments of technology. Technology department faculty members are assigned heavy teaching loads; in addition, the heavy weighing of laboratory-oriented courses increases the technology instructor's contact-hour load. With this mission and this personal concentration of time and effort focused on instruction, a technology department candidate for promotion and/or tenure should demonstrate an excellent teaching record; it is usually the case that technology department candidates declare their area of excellence as teaching. In the case that the declared area of excellence is teaching, the University's promotion criteria require that candidates must also demonstrate satisfactory performance in the other areas of. Achievements in service and scholarship generally reinforce the teaching mission through advancing the faculty member's breadth and depth of knowledge of the discipline and through involvement with the department, school, university, and community.

Teaching is evaluated on the basis of instructional delivery and instructional development. Excellence requires accomplishments in both categories. An equitable teaching load for courses and programs is expected. Activities associated with instructional delivery and instructional development are suggested in Listings B.1 and B.2.

Achievement of excellence in teaching is judged by several measures:

- Accomplishment as a teacher such as course improvement, program development, and instructional development.
- Demonstrable evidence such as developed material, teaching awards, internal and external peer reviews, student evaluations, graduate reviews, and widespread recognition.
- Documented student learning outcomes.
- Scholarly publications about teaching.
- Awards of external grants for teaching and laboratory equipment.

Although helpful, teaching awards are neither necessary nor sufficient to demonstrate innovative excellence in teaching. For excellence in teaching, the candidates are advised to prepare a teaching portfolio, which is defined as a collection of annotated syllabi, case studies, instructional innovations, related publications, homework assignments, tests, and quizzes. Evaluation of the faculty member's teaching portfolio by recognized authorities forms a basis for establishing widespread recognition.

B.1.1 Instructional Delivery

Teaching delivery may be documented in several ways. Peer evaluations may be made by class visits, interviews, and/or videotapes. Student evaluations may be made by scoring sheets and comments; the scores may be normalized for the department and/or the school; the scores may be accompanied by the statistics of the grades assigned to the respective class. Also, the teaching load of the faculty member is a significant factor and should be documented. All candidates whose declared area of excellence is teaching should have peer reviews of classroom instruction by qualified reviewers, and written reports of the reviews shall be included in the dossier (see Section E.5 for information on portfolios). Evaluation of the delivery of instruction includes several forms of activities given in Listing B.1.

B.1.2 Instructional Development and Teaching Scholarship

Instructional development is also necessary to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Instructional development is defined as those activities that precede and support instructional delivery, including activities that keep the faculty member current in his/her field. For most departments of technology candidates,
instructional development can be the foundation of a secondary strength in creative endeavor and/or scholarship. For instance, faculty members are encouraged to share their instructional innovations with other institutions and peer groups through scholar works such as conference presentations and journal publications. A faculty member may develop textbooks, laboratory manuals, casebooks, workbooks, and software that may ultimately evolve into published or presented scholarly works that disseminate instructional concepts and techniques. Additionally, a faculty member may participate in continuing education and professional association activities that inspire or support growth in technical expertise and improved teaching.

Course syllabi, lecture notes, and ordinary visual aids are expected products of normal class preparation, and by themselves, are not usually considered distinctive enough to demonstrate excellence in instructional development. However, development of special instructional materials, e.g., study guides, laboratory manuals, laboratory equipment, case studies, software tools, textbooks, coursework, and laboratories are considered to be distinctive and significant. This is true whether or not the materials have been published.

Contributions to transportability and compatibility of courses to other campuses and sites are considered distinctive in the area of instructional development. Adoption of courses elsewhere is considered important in the area of instructional development. Contributions to the internationalization of curricula and courses are also considered distinctive and significant. External adoption of innovative instructional techniques or materials is especially important for consideration in promotion to full professor.

Because the departments of technology operate and maintain a large number of instructional laboratories, excellence in instructional development is recognized for those faculty who conceive, create, and maintain such laboratories. The securing of grants and gifts or donated equipment (hardware or software) is considered distinctive and significant. A candidate's laboratory development accomplishments are evaluated for distinctive contributions as related to the teaching mission as well as to the needs of industry.

Innovation and experimentation in course development, instructional materials, and instructional delivery are considered especially distinctive. Evidence of experiments and documentation of results are important for evaluation of significance.

The elements of instructional development consist of:

- Development as a teacher.
- Creativity as a teacher.
- Contribution to improvements in teaching.

Publication of textbooks, workbooks, casebooks, tutorials, reference manuals, laboratory books, and software involve sustained effort and time. Consequently, for promotion to associate professor, it is not mandatory that such works be in print prior to the time the candidate is considered for promotion. Alternatively, a candidate's works may be evaluated on criteria such as publisher agreements to publish the work, contribution (for team projects), status, percentage completed, peer reviews, publication schedules, and the like. For promotion to the rank of professor, such works should be published and demonstrably well received by their intended audiences and/or reviewers. Reviews, adoption lists, market share, number of editions, and similar criteria, can demonstrate this. Also for promotion to the rank of professor, significant accomplishments, national recognition, and external adoption of innovations are expected.

Publication of refereed and non-refereed articles in sources such as educational journals, educational conference proceedings, magazines, and trade publications that target others teaching in the candidate's technical or professional field are also expected for achieving excellence in teaching. Such activities often have impact on both those teaching the content and those who are practitioners of the discipline involved.

Because of the departments of technology's primary teaching focus, opportunities to participate in funded research projects may be limited. Faculty are, however, encouraged to maintain technical competence
through some combination of applied research, professional association, consulting, international activities, summer employment, continuing education, or other professional and scholarly activities to update their technical knowledge and teaching skills. Consequently, technology candidates are expected to demonstrate a history of professional growth and development.

The major aspects of instructional development sub-category are given in Listing B.2.

**Listing B.1 Activities for instructional delivery.**

1. Peer reviews of delivery of instruction.
2. Evaluations by students who have graduated.
3. Documented teaching awards (department, school, regional, national).
4. Technical currency in the area of specialization.
5. Student evaluations of courses taught during the recent three or more years.
6. Documentation of effective senior project advising.
7. Breadth of courses taught from freshman to graduate level.
8. Documentation of student mentorships.
9. Documentation of effective student advising.
10. Documentation attesting to effective delivery of instruction.
11. Fair share of student contact hours and number of students.
12. Willingness and ability to develop and teach new courses or challenging courses.
13. Regular updating of course materials.
14. Student learning outcomes.

**Listing B.2 Activities for instructional development.**

1. Publication of textbooks.
2. Development new courses and/or significant revision of existing courses.
3. Adoption of textbooks published.
4. Adoption of courses developed.
5. Development of instructional innovations that are the result of competitive acquisition of external and internal funding, equipment, and/or software.
6. Development of international student/faculty exchange programs.
7. Development of instructional manuals, instructional innovations, computer-aided instruction, interactive videodiscs and/or supplemental instructional computer software.
8. Active pursuance of instructional funding with documented reviews.
9. Scholarly publications in refereed journals that disseminate results of research and/or scholarly work on educational methods.
10. Scholarly publications and/or presentations at national meetings that disseminate results of research and/or scholarly work on educational methods.
11. Competitive external funding for instructional innovations, laboratory equipment and course development.
12. Invited speaker, organizer or chair of major conferences, workshops and short courses related to instructional development.
13. Other publications including abstracts related to instructional methods.
14. Participation and/or attendance at conferences, seminars, or short courses on teaching methods.

**B.2 EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES**

The primary focus of the Departments of Technology is teaching. Even so, there are avenues for research, scholarship, or creative activities available to the technology faculty. Often significant publications result from the innovative application of new technologies or techniques that far exceed the requirements of day-to-day teaching. Other times it may be journal articles discussing new emerging trends in a given technical or professional discipline, or publications may be research-based critiques of recommended practices. Published
reports of funded research projects, and professional society and conference presentations of scholarly or creative endeavor are among other potential activities appropriate for inclusion in this section. It is expected that a technology candidate seeking promotion or tenure should produce refereed articles related to the candidate’s discipline.

Faculty members who wish to be evaluated for promotion and tenure on the basis of scholarship or creative endeavor must demonstrate steady progress in the items given in Listing B.3.

**Listing B.3 Activities for creative endeavor, research and/or scholarship.**

1. Refereed research articles that contribute to the advancement of the candidate's discipline as opposed to teaching the discipline.
2. Grants and funded research.
3. Publications and/or presentations at technical conferences in candidate's technical field.
4. Research books or book chapters.
5. Patents and copyrights obtained in rank.
6. Involvement of students in research.
7. Exhibits of creative works: e.g., refereed and/or invited competitions and exhibitions of art illustrations and graphics in the candidate's technical field.
8. Invited lectures or workshops presented at regional, national or international meetings related to research.
9. Development of software and hardware, even if not published or patented. The creativity involved in such components and the potential for copyrights, patents, and subsequent scholarly publications are recognized.
10. Non-refereed articles in publications related to the faculty member's field of technical expertise.
11. International scholarship, research, or development.
12. Review of others' papers, books, and proposals.
13. Involvement in graduate student research.

**B.3 EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND SCHOLARSHIP OF APPLICATION**

Professional service is required of all faculty. Included are those services for which there can be monetary or other material compensation, providing there is also some benefit to the University. While some faculty members donate their time and expertise to various groups, organizations, and agencies, those who act as paid consultants are also generally viewed as engaging in public service. Excluded from the service category are nonprofessional activities such as scouting, and memberships in civic, religious or business organizations.

Professional service is considered here in two sub-categories: professional association, and external outreach activities. Although it may be possible for a candidate to achieve excellence in service, it is expected that attaining promotion and/or tenure with excellence solely in this area will only occur under exceptional cases. For excellence in service, the candidates must demonstrate accomplishments in these sub-categories. It is important that the candidate establish a record of peer review of service -- as of teaching and research.

**B.3.1 Professional Association**

In order to remain current and establish potential/actual national recognition, Departments of Technology candidates should demonstrate a history of professional association activity. Every faculty member should be active in professional organizations related to his/her technical field. A history of contribution to the organization(s), e.g., regular attendance/participation, committee membership, or elected/appointed office, is expected. Such activities assist in documenting national professional recognition for faculty and the university. Activities of Major Professional Association sub-category are given in Listing B.4.
B.3.2 External Outreach Activities

External outreach activities must support the outreach mission of the University. Examples of External Outreach Activities are given in Listing B.5.

**Listing B.4 Professional activities.**

1. Officer of a major national professional organization, including ABET.
2. Organizer of regional, national and/or international research-related conferences or symposiums.
3. Officer in a regional professional organization.
4. Organizer of regional, national and international professional development-related seminars or workshops.
5. ABET evaluator.
6. Participation in professional organizations, including trade shows, product seminars, company site visits, and enrollment in short courses.
7. Member of professional organizations.

**Listing B.5 External outreach activities.**

1. Professional work or consulting for government and industry that does not interfere with primary responsibilities to the School.
2. Public speaker on technical policy issues.
3. Participation in local, regional, state, national, and international economic or educational development activities.
4. Teacher of IUPUI continuing education courses.
5. Registered professional engineer certification/license recognized by faculty member's technical discipline.
6. Presentations to schools, industries and other organizations.
7. Effective media interviews.
8. Consultation to other educational institutions.
9. Participation in accreditation committees, visits, or reviews.
10. Contributions to expand the international dimensions of the University.
11. Student recruitment and graduate placement activities.

B.4 UNIVERSITY SERVICE AND CITIZENSHIP

Internal service activities are those that directly support the Department, School, and University. These activities represent the essential participation of faculty in the administration of the university. Each faculty member must carry her/his fair share of service. This will typically include membership on departmental committees and School committees, as well as chair of committees. Other service includes student advising and recruiting, administrative responsibility for a Department or School program or special event, and representation of the department or School to other units or levels in the University. Candidates for promotion are evaluated for accomplishments in the internal service activities sub-category given in Listing B.6.

**Listing B.6 Internal service activities.**

1. Documentation of satisfactory performance as committee chairperson with demonstrated leadership.
2. Documentation of satisfactory performance as member of department, school, and university committees.
   Activity in department committees has a primary importance.
3. Participation in activities to promote diversity/minority involvement.
4. Participation and contribution to recruiting and retention activities or marketing educational programs to high schools and industry.
5. Documentation of effective assistance in student job placement or advising student organizations.
6. Participation in professional and educational accreditation reviews.
7. Documentation of outstanding performance in student counseling.
C. EXCELLENCE CRITERIA FOR ENGINEERING FACULTY

C.1 EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP

Instruction is an important mission of the departments of engineering; thus instruction is an important function of its faculty. For occurrences where one declares an area of excellence in teaching, the University's promotion criteria requires that a candidate must also demonstrate satisfactory performance in the area of service and professional association and the area of research, creative endeavor, and scholarship.

Teaching is evaluated on the basis of instructional delivery and instructional development. Excellence requires accomplishments in both categories. An equitable teaching load and responsibility for courses and programs are expected. Activities associated with instructional delivery and instructional development are suggested in Listings C.1 and C.2

Achievement of excellence in teaching is judged by several measures:

- Accomplishment as a teacher such as course improvement, program development and instructional development.
- Demonstrable evidence such as developed material, teaching awards, internal and external peer reviews, student evaluations, graduate reviews, and widespread recognition.
- Documented student learning outcomes.
- Scholarly publications about teaching.
- Awards of external grants for teaching and laboratory equipment.

Although helpful, teaching awards are not necessary and sufficient to demonstrate innovative excellence in teaching. For excellence in teaching, the candidates are advised to prepare a teaching portfolio, which is defined as a collection of annotated syllabi, case studies, instructional innovations, related publications, homework assignments, tests, and quizzes. Evaluation of the faculty member's teaching portfolio by reviewers will form a basis for establishing widespread recognition. Prestigious reviewers with distinguished records in the discipline will be conditional for establishing national recognition.

C.1.1 Instructional Delivery

Teaching delivery may be documented in several ways. Peer evaluations may be made by class visits, interviews and/or videotapes. Student evaluations may be made by scoring sheets and comments; the scores may be normalized for the department and/or the school; the scores may be accompanied by the statistics of the grades assigned to the respective class. Also, the teaching load of the faculty member is a significant factor and should be documented. All candidates whose declared area of excellence is teaching should have peer reviews of classroom instruction by qualified reviewers, and written reports of the reviews shall be included in the dossier (see Section E.5 for information on portfolios. Evaluation of the delivery of instruction includes several forms of activities as given in Listing C.1.

C.1.2 Instructional Development and Scholarship of Teaching

Instructional development is also necessary to demonstrate excellence in teaching. Instructional development is defined as those activities that precede and support instructional delivery, including activities that keep the faculty member current in his/her field. Faculty are encouraged to share their instructional innovations with other institutions and peer groups through scholarly works such as conference presentations and journal publications. Faculty may develop textbooks, laboratory manuals, casebooks, workbooks and/or software that may ultimately evolve into published or presented scholarly works that disseminate instructional concepts and techniques. Additionally, faculty may participate in continuing education and professional association activities that inspire or support growth in technical expertise and improved teaching.
Course syllabi, lecture notes, and ordinary visual aids are expected products of normal class preparation and, therefore, are not usually considered distinctive enough to demonstrate excellence in instructional development. However, development of special instructional materials, e.g., study guides, laboratory manuals, laboratory equipment, case studies, software tools, textbooks, coursework, and laboratories are considered to be distinctive and significant. This is true whether or not the materials have been published.

Contributions to transportability and compatibility of courses to other campuses and sites are considered distinctive in the area of instructional development. Adoption of courses elsewhere is considered important in the area of instructional development. Contributions to the internationalization of curricula and courses are also considered distinctive and significant. External adoption of innovative instructional techniques or materials is especially important for consideration in promotion to full professor.

Excellence in instructional development is recognized for those faculty who conceive, create, and maintain instructional laboratories. The securing of grants and gifts or donated equipment (hardware or software) is considered distinctive and significant. A candidate's laboratory development accomplishments are evaluated for distinctive contributions as related to the teaching mission as well as to the needs of industry.

Innovation and experimentation in course development, instructional materials, and instructional delivery are considered especially distinctive. Evidence of experiments and documentation of results are important for evaluation of significance.

The elements of instructional development consist of

- Development as a teacher.
- Creativity as a teacher.
- Contribution to improvements in teaching.

The major aspects of instructional development sub-category are given in Listing C.2.

Publication of textbooks, workbooks, casebooks, tutorials, reference manuals, laboratory books, and software involve sustained effort and time. Consequently, for promotion to associate professor, it is not mandatory that such works be in print prior to the time the candidate is considered for promotion. Alternatively, a candidate's works may be evaluated on criteria such as publisher agreements to publish the work, contribution (for team projects), status, percentage completed, peer reviews, publication schedules, and the like. For promotion to the rank of professor, such works should be published and demonstrably well received by their intended audiences and/or reviewers. Reviews, adoption lists, market share, number of editions, and similar criteria, can demonstrate this. Also for promotion to the rank of professor, significant accomplishments, national recognition, and external adoption of innovations are expected.

**Listing C.1 Activities for instructional delivery.**

1. Peer reviews of delivery of instruction.
2. Evaluations by students who have graduated.
3. Documented teaching awards (department, school, regional, national).
4. Technical currency in the area of specialization.
5. Student evaluations of courses taught during the recent three or more years.
6. Documentation of effective senior project advising.
7. Breadth of courses taught from freshman to graduate level.
8. Documentation of student mentorships.
9. Documentation of effective student advising.
10. Documentation attesting to effective delivery of instruction.
11. Fair share of student contact hours and number of students.
12. Willingness and ability to develop and teach new courses or challenging courses.
13. Regular updating of course materials.
14. Student learning outcomes.

**Listing C.2 Activities for instructional and scholarship of teaching.**

1. Publication of textbooks.
2. Development of new courses and/or significant revision of existing courses.
3. Adoption of textbooks published.
4. Adoption of courses developed.
5. Development of instructional innovations that are the result of competitive acquisition of external and internal funding, equipment, and/or software.
6. Development of international student/faculty exchange programs.
7. Development of instructional manuals, instructional innovations, computer-aided instruction, interactive videodiscs and/or supplemental instructional computer software.
8. Active pursuit of funding with documented reviews.
9. Scholarly publications in refereed journals that disseminate results of research and/or scholarly work on educational methods.
10. Scholarly publications and/or presentations at national meetings that disseminate results of research and/or scholarly work on educational methods.
11. Competitive external funding for instructional innovations, laboratory equipment and course development.
12. Invited speaker, organizer or chair of major conferences, workshops and short courses related to instructional development.
13. Other publications including abstracts related to instructional methods.
14. Participation and/or attendance at conferences, seminars, or short courses on teaching methods.

**C.2 EVALUATION OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES**

Research is an important mission of the departments of engineering. For faculty in the departments of engineering, research accomplishments and progress are evaluated in three sub-categories: publications, funding, and graduate student activities. To achieve excellence in research, the candidate must demonstrate accomplishments in these sub-categories. A consistent history of creative accomplishments is essential for achieving excellence.

Activities for each sub-category are described in the following sections.

**C.2.1 Publications**

For excellence in research, candidates should demonstrate their ability to publish their work in reputable journals and conference proceedings. Although the papers presented at technical conferences are useful, especially for establishing a professional reputation, it must be remembered that they are not a substitute for refereed papers in quality journals. Talks accepted by abstract only are of even less significance. The candidates are required to demonstrate the impact of their research through references made to his or her work by others in the field. Activities related to research publications are given in Listing C.3.

**C.2.2 Funding**

External grants are important both for the engineering programs and for the professional reputation of the faculty member who receives a grant. One of the best ways of establishing a national reputation is through obtaining research grants. It is recognized that grants and contracts in some fields are more difficult to obtain than in other fields. However, in many fields, there are opportunities, not only from the federal government, but from industry and from foundations as well. One of the important requirements for obtaining outside support is perseverance. Faculty should recognize the importance of obtaining outside grants both for the School and for
their professional development. The value of writing grant proposals should not be underestimated, even if the proposal is not funded. The exercise of organizing one's thoughts and explaining what one wants to do in a grant proposal is very worthy.

Research activities involving students, interdisciplinary research, and collaboration with faculty and students in other departments are encouraged. Different forms of funding are given in Listing C.4.

C.2.3 Graduate Student Activities

The major form of activities related to graduate students are given in Listing C.5. Faculty are expected to have active involvement of students in their research, and are strongly encouraged to provide financial support for graduate student stipends and research work.

Listing C.3 Forms of research publications.

1. Refereed research articles published or accepted.
2. Papers presented at technical conferences and/or published in the proceedings.
3. Books or book chapters of research findings.
4. Generation of patents or software copyrights.
5. Invited lectures or workshops presented at regional, national or international meetings related to research.
6. Reports, monograms, or manuals based on research, and review articles.
7. Review of others' papers, books, and proposals.

Listing C.4 Forms of research funding.

1. External research funding.
2. Internal research funding. The candidate should demonstrate that "seed" funding resulted in proposals for external funding and/or funded research proposals.
3. Income from patents or software copyrights spent to promote the University's educational mission.
4. Proposal writing for research funding.

Listing C.5 Graduate student activities.

3. Co-authorship with students on publications, especially refereed journals.
4. Serving as a member of Ph.D. or M.S. thesis committees.
5. Documentation of effective mentorship of graduate students.

C.3 EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND SCHOLARSHIP OF APPLICATION

Evaluation of professional service and scholarship of application is identical for engineering faculty and technology faculty; see Section B.3 for these evaluation criteria.

C.4 UNIVERSITY SERVICE AND CITIZENSHIP

Evaluation of university service and citizenship is identical for engineering faculty and technology faculty; see Section B.4 for these evaluation criteria.
D. PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

D.1 GENERAL PROCEDURES

The promotion and tenure process is a lengthy and crucial peer review process during which a faculty member documents his/her credentials and accomplishments, and the Primary Board, the department chair, the Unit Board, and the dean review these. It is therefore important that a new faculty member at the time of appointment establishes a personal plan for scholarly endeavor, teaching and teaching scholarship, and professional development. This is normally done with the encouragement, guidance and assistance of the department chair and senior faculty mentors.

Each new faculty member is strongly urged to prepare a promotion and tenure document during his/her early years of employment and update it annually.

The general procedures and policies of the promotion and tenure review process for engineering and technology faculty are outlined here. The timetable is given in D.2 below.

1. Candidates inform the department chairs in writing of their intention for promotion and/or tenure consideration early in the year prior to their promotion/tenure review. (See TIME IN RANK of the IUPUI guidelines for particular information.)

2. The department chair acknowledges the written request and initiates the formation of the Primary Board (see the School’s Constitution and Bylaws). The Primary Board chair may be the department chair or may be elected by the Primary Board as stated in the School’s Constitution and Bylaws.

3. The candidate works with the department chair in preparing the dossier in a timely manner. For letters of recommendation, the candidate submits the names, titles, addresses, email addresses, telephone numbers, and brief (one paragraph) resumes of at least six persons to the Primary Board chair. This should be done early, to allow a sufficient time for the Primary Board chair to receive written responses from the contacted persons. A sample request letter from the Primary Board chair is included in the IUPUI guidelines and department-specific exemplar letters are also available. The candidate's resume and copies of major publications are sent to reviewers by the chair.

The contents of the promotion and/or tenure dossier and its organization are described in the IUPUI guidelines.

A candidate should be given the opportunity to help create and review his/her promotion documentation and should receive a copy of any document (with confidential statements omitted) that will be submitted to the Primary Board, Unit Board, and IUPUI Committee. The candidate may choose which material to add to his/her departmental file, including the candidate's own brief comments about teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The candidate may choose that these brief comments be attached to the promotion document.

To permit candidates to exercise these rights in a convenient fashion, it is expected that each chair of a Primary Board should, during the first month of each fall semester, publish a timetable setting forth the dates of the Primary Board meetings and suitable deadlines for faculty members to update their files.

4. The candidate supplies the heading information of the IUPUI Tenure and Promotion Dossier Checklist Form, and completes and signs the IUPUI Routing and Action Form for Tenure and/or Promotion Review as part of the promotion and/or tenure dossier.

5. Following review of the dossier and due deliberation, the voting members of the Primary Board vote on each nomination by secret ballot with separate votes taken on promotion nominations and on tenure nominations. At the time of review, the Primary Board Chair designates the member responsible for
preparing the Primary Board's report. Candidates may be informed by the Primary Board chair or the Board’s designee only about recommendations of the Board regarding the dossier, but all review discussion, voting information, and other comments regarding the review shall be treated as confidential and not shared with the candidate or anyone else. (The Dean informs each candidate in writing regarding the Primary Board’s recommendations.) The department chair shall not cast a vote in the Primary Board; his/her recommendation will appear separate from the Primary Board's recommendation in the promotion document.

6. The department chair completes relevant parts of the Promotion Dossier Checklist and forwards this form and the dossier to the dean of the school for consideration by the Unit Promotion and Tenure Board. The dossier includes the Primary Board's and the department chair's recommendations as well as the materials submitted by the candidate and the letters of recommendation (originals are required).

7. Each nomination shall be considered and discussed individually by the Unit Promotion and Tenure Board, after which a secret ballot will be taken on each. The Unit Board will also elect a chair of the Unit Board. The Unit Board chair shall designate the member responsible for preparing the Unit Board report. The dean shall not cast a vote in the Unit Board; the dean's recommendation will appear separate from the Unit Board's recommendation in the promotion document. Each candidate is informed by the Dean regarding the Unit Board's recommendations in writing. (No vote count information is given.)

8. The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee functions as the university committee for tenure and promotion reviews. This Committee is composed of members as voting representatives from the schools of the University and three additional members (faculty or librarian) who are elected by the Faculty Council to serve on the committee as voting members. The Committee chooses its own Chair from among the members. The Dean of The Faculties resides in the meetings as a non-voting ex officio.

9. Recommendations of the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee are forwarded to IUPUI Dean of The Faculties, the IUPUI Chancellor, and the Purdue University Provost for their recommendations. The candidate is informed in writing about the status of promotion and/or tenure at this stage by the IUPUI Dean of The Faculties or the chair of the IUPUI committee.

10. The promotion and tenure process concludes with the action of Indiana University and Purdue University Boards of Trustees after which the candidate is informed in writing by the President of Indiana University regarding the action taken.

D.2 TIMETABLE OF EVENTS

The following timetable (or the first working day after the date shown, if the date given falls on a weekend or holiday) will be observed each year for the tenure-and-promotion decision process:

*Apr 15*: The candidate applies and/or is nominated for promotion and/or tenure consideration.

*May 1*: The department chair declares the formation of the Primary Board and notifies the dean.

*May 5*: External references are determined. The Primary Board chair or designee requests letters of reference and peer evaluation. A copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae and area of excellence portfolio are included with the chair's or designee’s letter of request for a peer evaluation by August 15.

*Aug 15*: One copy of the completed dossiers shall be submitted to the Primary Board chair to be checked for completeness. The Primary Board chair shall notify the candidate in writing of any missing material or corrections to be made, and the candidate is required to return the dossier within ten working days.
Sept 1st: The formation of the Unit Board shall be completed and the Dean will set the review date for early October.

Sept 15th: Copies of the candidate's dossier shall be distributed to the members one week prior to the review and by this date, the Primary Board shall have completed its review.

Sept 22nd: The original dossier along with the Primary Board's recommendation and vote plus the department chair's letter will be submitted to the Dean. The Dean will return the dossier to the Primary Board chair if any revisions are needed to be revised and returned in a timely manner.

October: Copies of the candidate's dossier shall be distributed to the Unit Board one week prior to the Unit Board review and the Unit Board shall meet on a schedule as necessary to meet the deadline set by the Office of the Dean of the Faculties. The Dean will inform the candidates of the recommendation of the Unit Board so the candidate can review his/her dossier and add additional information if so desired.

November: The original dossier plus two copies, all of which now include the Primary Board's recommendation, the Chair's letter, the Unit Board's recommendation, the Dean's letter and any other material the candidate has submitted for the Board's review and comment will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean of The Faculties.

D.3 UNIVERSITY POLICIES

The following four points describe university-wide promotion-and-tenure policies that affect faculty members in the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology:

* Academic advancement in rank is conferred by Purdue University upon recommendation of the Chancellor following reviews by the appropriate school and university committees.

* Tenure is granted by Indiana University upon recommendation of the Chancellor following reviews by the appropriate school and university committees.

* In the event that a faculty member elects to declare his/her candidacy for both promotion and tenure, either at term or early, two separate votes are required: one for promotion, one for tenure.

* In the event that a faculty member elects to declare his/her candidacy for promotion only, Indiana University will not automatically grant tenure on advancement to the rank of associate or full professor.
E. PREPARATION OF CANDIDATE’S DOSSIER

E.1 INTRODUCTION

For preparation of the dossiers, the general guidelines published by the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties should be followed, unless otherwise stated in this section. Since the campus-wide guidelines are usually updated each year, the candidates are advised to refer to the most recent version of the Dean of Faculties document that is accessible from the school Web site [http://facstaff.engr.iupui.edu/ptd.shtml](http://facstaff.engr.iupui.edu/ptd.shtml) along with the school-specific information on tenure and promotion. In accordance with these guidelines, all dossiers should include the following six sections:

I. **General Summary of Dossier Content**

1) Complete Checklist (see IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' guidelines).
2) Routing and Action Form (see IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' guidelines).
3) The Primary Board's written evaluation.
4) The Department Chair's written evaluation.
5) The School (Unit) Board's written evaluation.
6) The School Dean's written evaluation.
7) Outside or external evaluations from persons contacted by the Primary Board chair, department chair, Unit Board chair, dean or designee.
8) Peer evaluation letters or reports on teaching and teaching scholarship (needed if teaching is the area of excellence).
9) Peer evaluation letters or reports on professional service (needed if service is the area of excellence).
10) A brief (two or three sentences) statement of the expertise of each external letter writer (to be provided by the department or dean).
11) A brief (two or three sentences) statement on the stature of the major journals and conferences published by the candidate.
12) The candidate's current curriculum vitae in the standard format which must be signed by the candidate as being an accurate and up-to-date professional life summary (see also E&T Template at [http://facstaff.engr.iupui.edu/](http://facstaff.engr.iupui.edu/)). This is intended to be a comprehensive document as described in the standard format. All accomplishments in each category must be listed in chronological order. Achievements prior to the rank and in the rank must be distinguished for all categories as much as possible (see E&T Template).

II. **The Candidate's Personal Statement**

This is the only section of the document, which may be written in the first person style. It should be restricted to five pages. The third person style must be used throughout the rest of the document.

The personal statement should be written to reinforce the consistent growth and increased recognition that is the basis for all promotions and tenure decisions. For additional information, refer to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' guidelines.

III. **Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Scholarship**

This should be a third-person narrative section on teaching, highlighting the accomplishments in rank and their impact. Publications and projects relevant to teaching should be listed in the curriculum vitae and need not be listed again in this section. For additional information, refer to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' guidelines.
IV. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship or Creative Activities

This should be a third-person narrative section on research and/or creative endeavor, highlighting the accomplishments in rank and their impact. Publications and projects relevant to research and/or creative endeavor should be listed in the curriculum vitae and need not be listed again in this section. For additional information, refer to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties’ guidelines.

V. Evaluation of Professional Service

This should be a third-person narrative section on professional service, highlighting the accomplishments in rank and their impact. Professional society memberships should be listed in the curriculum vitae and need not be listed again in this section. For additional information, refer to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' guidelines.

VI. University Service and Citizenship

This should be a third-person narrative section on university service, highlighting the accomplishments in rank and their impact. Committee memberships should be listed in the curriculum vitae and need not be listed again in this section. For additional information, refer to the IUPUI Dean of the Faculties' guidelines.

VII. Collegiality

This is an expected part of the service, but no documentation is necessary in the dossier.

VIII. Voluntary and Community Service

This is a desired part of the service, but no documentation is necessary in the dossier.

E.2 ADDITIONAL NOTES ON DOSSIER PREPARATION

In order for a candidate's achievements and potential to be effectively communicated to the Primary, Unit and University Promotion and Tenure Boards, a comprehensive document must be prepared. This document should present an accurate, thorough and full profile of a candidate including professional preparation, as well as achievements in teaching, research and/or creative endeavor, scholarly activities and professional service. Although there are no absolute size restrictions, it is recommended that the size of the main dossier be limited to 30 pages, including the curriculum vitae, but excluding the General Summary section using 12- or 11-point font size and at least 1” margins. The official school name of “Purdue School of Engineering and Technology” should be used to designate one’s school, or after the first occurrence the school’s shorter name of “E&T” may be used to designate the school. The candidates are urged to follow the template that is available at the School website http://facstaff.engr.iupui.edu/ptd.shtml for preparing their dossiers.

With regard to the documentation of excellence, the following topics should be considered:

1. Candidates should work with their chairs closely in preparation of their dossier. The candidate as well as the chair is responsible for the accuracy of the information provided in the dossier. Effort must be devoted in making the information in the area of excellence the most detailed.

2. All pages must be numbered sequentially starting with the first page of the Curriculum Vitae.

3. The Curriculum Vitae should be in the form of itemized list of achievements.

4. First person narrative style should be adopted in the candidate’s Personal Statement section.
5. Third person narrative style should be adopted in the rest of the dossier.

6. Each main section should be numbered with Roman numerals (I, II, etc.) and start on a new page.

7. While the School recognizes that a specific accomplishment may be representative of more than one of the promotion criteria, it should be cited in only one section of the document for receiving proper credit. Duplicate entries can be misinterpreted as "padding the document", and thus may influence reviewers to question the quantity or substance of the candidate's accomplishments.

8. All accomplishments achieved while in rank should be clearly distinguished from those in previous ranks.

9. All teaching, research and service related publications should be clearly separated into the following categories: (i) refereed articles, (ii) refereed conference proceedings, (iii) non-refereed conference proceedings, (iv) book chapters, (v) abstracts, (vi) book reviews, (vii) bulletins, (viii) essays, etc. All publications in each category should be listed in chronological order.

10. For jointly authored papers, the contributions of the candidate should be clearly identified. The bibliographical references should include the author's name in the same order as in the original paper. The primary author or authors should be indicated by an asterisk*. Students should be identified with a double asterisk**. The page numbers should be given in the list of publications. For example:


11. For all grants:
   - External, internal, and equipment grants should be clearly distinguished
   - The status as PI or Co-PI, or Co-I, should be identified
   - The name of PI should be indicated
   - Percent effort and percent budget in the grants should be indicated
   - Grant approval documents should be submitted to the chair, including letter(s) of the involvement of the faculty member from the PI on grants and contracts outside the school for verification

12. In order to evaluate the quality of the candidate's research, it is important that letters of recommendation be solicited from knowledgeable experts in higher ranks in the faculty member's area. It is recommended that the majority of the references be from academia. Industry references should hold senior staff positions commensurate with the higher ranks in academia. The solicitations for letters must be made by the department chair or his/her designee in consultation with the candidate.

13. Progress in engineering, and technology is achieved primarily through publication of discoveries and their applications in generally available journals, which are refereed. The refereeing process tells much about the quality of the research. The comments of peers, through the refereeing process and through citations to the published work, establish the significance of the work. Accordingly, it is important to publish research results in journals, which require quality refereeing and which are generally available to the scientific community. It is important to obtain feedback from knowledgeable researchers and to recognize the importance of their citations to the faculty member's published work. Enough time should be allowed to permit this system to work.

14. It is very important that the research of the faculty member be evaluated with regard to its significance. The significance can be evaluated by letters solicited from experts. Comments by referees for papers
and proposals are useful. Citations to papers written by the faculty member are important and should be
provided when available.

15. Papers published in refereed journals are more valuable than conference proceedings. In the dossier, the
departments should provide an evaluation of the stature of the journals and conferences where the
candidate's papers are published.

16. Although the papers presented at technical conferences are useful, especially for establishing a
professional reputation, they are not a substitute for refereed papers in quality journals. Such papers do
not go through the same kind of refereeing process as those that are submitted to a quality journal.
Talks accepted by abstract only are of even less significance.

17. Invited talks are also a good way to indicate a national or international recognition.

18. One method for establishing a national reputation is through research grants or contracts. It is
recognized that grants and contracts in some fields are more difficult to obtain than in other fields.
However in many fields, there are opportunities, not only from the federal government, but also from
industry and foundations.

19. The value of writing grant proposals should not be underestimated. The candidates are encouraged to
document such activities with the reviewer's comments. The exercise of organizing one's thoughts and
explaining what one wants to do in a grant proposal is in itself very useful.

20. Papers that have been submitted to journals should be identified. Status of the submission should be
indicated.

21. Papers in preparation should not be listed in the main part of the dossier. This material may be included
in the section on current research interests in the candidate’s promotion and tenure portfolio.

22. Grants received should be identified as external and internal. Internal grants supported by either Indiana
University, Purdue University or IUPUI are useful for new investigators to establish themselves and to
enable them to write external grant proposals. For a faculty member who has been awarded one of these
internal grants, further achievements, preferably a successful proposal to an external agency, will be
considered more important.

23. For grants and activities involving other faculty, the candidate's specific accomplishments as a principal
investigator, co-principal investigator or investigator and his or her share in the grants should be
identified clearly in all listings.

E.3 CAUTION ON REDUNDANCY

While the School recognizes that a specific accomplishment may be representative of more than one of
the promotion criteria, it should be cited in only one section of the document for receiving proper credit.
Duplicate entries can be misinterpreted as "padding the document", and thus may influence reviewers to
question the quantity or substance of the candidate's accomplishments. In such cases, the accomplishment
should be cited in the section that contributes most to the candidate's case of promotion and tenure. Any dual
entries should be cross-referenced.
E.4 PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO

Candidates are encouraged to submit supporting documentation of entries made in the main promotion and tenure dossier in the form of a binder or electronic medium. This supporting documentation should be made available to the Primary Board for its deliberations, and to the Department Chair and the Dean for Unit Board and University Board deliberations to follow. This portfolio is intended to be reviewed by the promotion-and-tenure related bodies on campus; hence they should include information on the activities of the candidate in all three major areas (teaching, research, and service). In addition to this portfolio, the candidates are expected to prepare a separate portfolio specific to their area of excellence for external peer reviews, as described in the next section.

E.5 AREA OF EXCELLENCE PORTFOLIOS FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWS

E.5.1 Teaching Portfolio

Candidates whose area of excellence is teaching and teaching scholarship are expected to prepare a teaching portfolio to be reviewed by external peers (outside the department for promotion to associate professorship rank; outside the campus for promotion to professorship rank). The teaching portfolio should include information on courses taught; pedagogical methods developed; student feedback received; assessment methods used; and teaching-related papers published in journals and conferences while in rank. Electronic format is acceptable. Candidates are encouraged to consult with the Center for Teaching and Learning for assistance in preparation of this portfolio.

E.5.2 Research Portfolio

Candidates whose area of excellence is research are expected to prepare a research portfolio to be reviewed by external peers. The research portfolio should include information on the research program(s) established, research papers published in journals and conferences, and impact made in this area while in rank. Electronic format is acceptable.

E.5.3 Service Portfolio

Candidates whose areas of excellence are service are expected to prepare a service portfolio to be reviewed by external peers (outside the department for promotion to associate professorship rank, outside the campus for promotion to professorship rank). The service portfolio should include information on professional and university services performed; impact made; intellectual achievements reached; and service-related papers published in journals and conferences while in rank. Electronic format is acceptable.