Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Indiana Faculty Council (IFC)
Minutes
May 1, 2018 ~ Campus Center 450A ~ 3-5 p.m.

Faculty and Guests Present: Kacy Allgood, Marta Anton, Rachel Applegate, Leslie Ashburn-Nardo, Rafael Bahamonde, Tina Baich, Mark Bannatyne, Kristy Beach (alt: Barb Hanes), Ed Berbari, Nicolas Berbari, Ben Boukai, Camy Broeker, Angela Bruzzaniti, Theodore Cummins, Thomas Davis, Mary De Groot, Cornelis De Waal, Kimberly Donahue (alt: Emily Murphy), Rob Elliot, Sahsa Fedorikhin, Margie Ferguson, Amanda Friesen, James Gladden, Jeff Gruenewald (alt: Dena Carson), Joan Haase, Michele Hansen, Brittney-Shea Herbert, Krista Hoffmann-Longtin, Matthew Holley, Robin Hughes, Kathy Johnson, Kevin Jones, Justin Kani, Joan Kowolik, Lindsey Mayo, Marc Mendonca, Debra Mesch, Willie Miller, Robert Minto, Miriam Murphy, Megan Musgrave, Bethany Neal-Beliveau, Nasser Paydar, Tod Perry, Becky Porter, William Potter, Stephen Randall, Simon Rhodes, David Russomanno, Eric Saak, Jim Scheurich, Kristina Sheeler, Deborah Stiffler, Peggy Stockdale, Sean Stone, Jennifer Thornton Springer, Mark Urtel, Kathleen Visovatti Weaver, John Watson, Jeff Watt, Elizabeth Whipple, Marianne Wokeck, and Michelle Yip-Schneider


Agenda Item I: Welcome and Call to Order
IUPUI Faculty Council Vice President Jeff Watt called the meeting to order.

Agenda Item II: Adoption of the Agenda as the Order of Business for the Day
The Agenda was adopted as the Order of Business for the Day.

Agenda Item III: Updates/Remarks from the Chancellor
Nasser Paydar, Indiana University Executive Vice President and Chancellor of IUPUI

Paydar reported on the following:
- The Fairbanks School of Public Health at IUPUI, Eskenazi Health Centers, the Marion County Health Department, and others have received $7 million from Lilly Endowment for the launch of a new neighborhood-based, data-driven pilot in Indianapolis to help address the high incidence of diabetes.
- Enrollment for Fall: Numbers look good. Heads are up by 3 percent from last year and credit hours are up by 4.5 percent. Summer enrollment seems flat.
- Research: Focusing on grants compared to last year, we are up by $60 million as a campus; 26 percent with the School of Medicine and 36 percent without the School of Medicine.
- This is the last IFC meeting of the year. By the time we meet again, IU Fort Wayne becomes a center of IUPUI on July 1. Enrollment has begun and looks good.
- Michigan Street: Project will be done at the end of June.
- Renovation of Bridges on I-65 and I-70: Between 21st Street and Meridian Street, I-65 will be closed after June 1 and renovation will be done before August 4. Indiana Department of Transportation has a website with more information and updates.
• Commencement: Commencement will be held at Lucas Oil Stadium on Saturday, May 12 (Not on Mother’s Day). There is an estimation of 6,940 students graduating. 75 percent are IU degrees and 76 percent are Purdue degrees. The oldest graduate is 64 and the youngest is 19. 23 percent of the graduates are students of color.
• Paydar thanked Rachel Applegate and Jeff Watt for their wonderful work saying that they are committed to shared governance and have worked well together.

**Agenda Item IV: Updates/Remarks from the IFC President**
Rachel Applegate, IUPUI Faculty President

Applegate reported on the following:
• The IFC has worked hard to interview dean candidates over the past several years. We have interviewed quite a few, but it is participation that counts.
• Constitution and Bylaws vote to add Non-tenure-track Faculty to the IFC: The campus has voted and approved the changes to the Constitution and Bylaws. Schools will need to look at their Constitution and Bylaws and change if they want to add non-tenure-track faculty to the voting.
• The School of Health and Human Sciences will be a new school by fall, IU Fort Wayne is coming and will have representation on the IFC, and the School of Education will come on board soon.
• The May newsletter of the Office of Academic Affairs will include an announcement about a three-day training for informal mediation skills. You are encouraged to participate.
• The UFC is reviewing a “master teacher” rank.

**Agenda Item V: [Action Item–Vote] Election of President and Vice President of the IFC and University Faculty Council**

Jeff Watt introduced the slates as follows:

**IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for President**
Term: July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2020
Need to elect 1; number to slate 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mendonca</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for Vice President**
Term: July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2020
Need to elect 1; number to slate 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodlett</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of these two elections will be reported later in the meeting.

**IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for University Faculty Council**
Term: July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2020
Need to elect 4; number to slate 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copeland</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Informatics and Computing</td>
<td>Library and Information Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Pediatric Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodlett</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UFC balloting was held electronically after this meeting.

[First Read] Election Slates for the IFC Executive Committee, At-Large Representatives, and Nominating Committee

Jeff Watt introduced the slates as follows:

IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for Executive Committee – Tenure Track Faculty

Term: June 2018 through June 2020
Number to Elect: 4; Number to Slate: 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boukai</td>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrs</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>Lindsey</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendonca</td>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Willie</td>
<td>Associate Librarian</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheurich</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Urban Education Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffler</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Science of Nursing Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urtel</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>PETM</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watt</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Mathematical Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No two elected members of the committee shall be from the same academic unit, except from the School of Medicine which may have two members: one each from the basic science and clinical departments. *Ruling suspended by action of the IFC on April 3 for 2018 Election.*

IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for Executive Committee – Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Term: June 2018 through June 2020
Number to Elect: 2; Number to Slate: 4 (one – one-year term; one – two-year term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angermieer</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>PETM</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donahue</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>E&amp;T</td>
<td>Computer Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesth</td>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Community &amp; Health Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herold</td>
<td>Debra</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londino-Smolar</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Chemical Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwina</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Communication Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yip-Schneider</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visovatti Weaver</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Senior Clinical Lecturer</td>
<td>PETM</td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yost</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No two elected members of the committee shall be from the same academic unit, except from the School of Medicine which may have two members: one each from the basic science and clinical departments. *Ruling suspended by action of the IFC on April 3 for 2018 Election.*
Need to elect 40; number to slate 60 (there are 59 candidates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baich</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>LT2</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhatwadekar</td>
<td>Ashay</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blazer-Yost</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boehm</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boukai</td>
<td>Benzion</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant</td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakrabarti</td>
<td>Subir</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer</td>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-AHLT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Waal</td>
<td>Cornelis</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumortier</td>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SPEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckerd</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-SPEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrow</td>
<td>Vance</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-HERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedorikhin</td>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesen</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganci</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-HERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gruenewald</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SPEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacker</td>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-NURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug</td>
<td>Steven</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrold</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-CPhL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-PBHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hovde</td>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>Tambra</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janga</td>
<td>Sarath</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-INFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keele</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-PHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koskie</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowolik</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippert</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macy</td>
<td>Katharine</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>LT3</td>
<td>IN-LIBR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markel</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxcy</td>
<td>Brendan</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minto</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Gwendolyn</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-LART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parvez</td>
<td>Shahid</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-PBHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peng</td>
<td>Hanxiang</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>Tod</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-BUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramras</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheurich</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-EDUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schild</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-ENGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soto</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srinivasan</td>
<td>Mythily</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT2</td>
<td>IN-DENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towers</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-COLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidal</td>
<td>Ruben</td>
<td>TEN</td>
<td>FT1</td>
<td>IN-MED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Lixin</td>
<td>NTK</td>
<td>FT3</td>
<td>IN-SCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IUPUI Faculty Council: Slate for Nominating Committee
Term: June 2018 through June 2020
Number to Elect: 4; Number to Slate: 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berbari</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>T 01</td>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruzzaniti</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>T 02</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Biomedical and Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goff</td>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>T 01</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Religious Studies/American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haug</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>T 01</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Prosthodontics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowolik</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>T 02</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Pediatric Dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Willie</td>
<td>T L02</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>T L02</td>
<td>Law – Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schild</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>T 02</td>
<td>Engineering and Technology</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering/Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watt said that since this is the last meeting of the year, we need to move forward with the elections for these groups.

A motion was made and seconded to suspend the second reading of these slates. The motion passed unanimously.

Election Results for Board of Review Pool and Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel
Marianne Wokeck, Nominations Committee Chair

The election results for the Board of Review Pool and Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel were announced as follows:

Election Results: Board of Review Pool
Term: February 1, 2018, through January 30, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baich</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Tenured L02</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deWaal</td>
<td>Cornelis</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holley</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Tenure Track 03</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kostroun</td>
<td>Danielle</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtadha</td>
<td>Khaula</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picard</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Tenured 03</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Biology and Forensic &amp; Invest. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiffler</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Science of Nursing Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tezanos-Pinto</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>World Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Tenure Track L03</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>Special Collections/Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>L. Jack</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Oral Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Election Results: Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel
Term: February 1, 2018, through January 30, 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Department Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodlett</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Tenured 01</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Tenured L02</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Josette</td>
<td>Tenured 02</td>
<td>Informatics/Computing</td>
<td>Informatics/Computing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item VI: [Action Item – Vote] IUPUI PLUS+ (PULs Refresh)
Mark Bannatyne, Chair, Academic Affairs Committee
Document and Timeline: http://go.iupui.edu/1T1y appended to the minutes.

The Academic Affairs Committee moved to accept the PLUS+. No second was needed. The motion passed with one negative vote.

Agenda Item VII: [Information Item] Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Margie Ferguson, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Gail Williamson, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs
Circular 2018-10: P&T Recommended Changes appended to the minutes.

Ferguson presented the appended presentation.

Election Results
Before the next item of business, Wokeck announced the results of the election of president and vice president of the IFC.

John Watson was elected president and Jeff Watt was elected vice president. A motion was made to destroy the ballots. A second was given. The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item VIII: Call for IFC or UFC Standing Committee Reports

Board of Review (Rachel Applegate, IFC president)
Circular 2018-12: Board of Review Report 2017-18

Annual Report on Board of Review Activity
Since May 2017

Rachel Applegate, President
IUPUI Faculty Council meeting
May 1, 2018

Total Number of Board of Review Cases: 2
(Appointed in 2017-2018)
Total Number of Requests Denied: 1

Number of Review Cases (Approved) for:
- Dismissal
- Academic Freedom
- Non-Reappointment
- Tenure 2*
- Promotion 1*
- Salary Adjustment
- Nature or Conditions of Work
- Office of Equal Opportunity

*Same case.
Case Carried Over from 2016-2017 (This case is not included in the count above.):

Board of Review Case 17-01: A board of review was appointed, and a formal hearing was held on April 28, 2017, regarding the nature or conditions of work. The board’s findings did not fully support the grievant. The chancellor supported the board’s recommendations.

Requests Approved 2017-2018:

Board of Review Case 17-02: A board of review was appointed, and a formal hearing was held on August 18, 2017, regarding promotion and tenure. The board’s findings did not fully support the grievant; however, recommendations were made for improvement. The chancellor acknowledged the findings and referred the recommendations to Executive Vice Chancellor Kathy Johnson for review and possible action.

Board of Review Case 18-01: A board of review was appointed after a negative tenure decision, but the case has not been given to the board at the time of this meeting. The outcome of this case will be reported during 2018-2019.

Requests Denied:

A request for a board of review was received after a negative promotion and tenure decision. The IFC Executive Committee did not agree to move the case forward to a formal review.

Total Number of Grievances Referred to the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel: 2
Members of the Faculty Grievance Advisory Panel reported one contact by faculty members or librarians during the 2017-2018 academic year.

0 Grievances were resolved prior to any request for a Board of Review.
1 Grievance was sent to a Board of Review.
1 Grievances have not been referred to a Board of Review.

Questions/Comments

Mesch asked if the Board of Review was the group that reviewed tenure case grievances. Applegate said the board looks at the process when grievances are brought to them and encouraged Mesch to review the guidelines on the IFC website. Mesch also asked if there is a process to appoint a Board of Review and if there are opportunities for members to recuse themselves. Applegate said they do have recusals.

Agenda Item IX: Question / Answer Period
There were no questions.

Agenda Item X: Unfinished Business
There was no Unfinished Business.

Agenda Item XI: New Business

- Ed Berbari, representing the IFC and IFC-EC, thanked Applegate and Watt for their terms as president and vice president of the IFC. They were presented with thank you gifts.
Agenda Item XII: Report from the IUPUI Staff Council
Barb Hanes, First Vice President

Hanes reported on the following:
- The nominations are open for at-large members and first vice president. Nominations will close May 4 and voting will be in June.
- The Staff Council Mini Conference will take place on May 25.
- The Rewards and Recognitions Committee opened nominations for three internal Staff Council awards to be presented at the Staff Council retreat in July:
  - Outstanding New Member, Outstanding Committee Chair, and Member of the Year.

Agenda Item XIII: Final Remarks and Adjournment
Chancellor Paydar thanked everyone and wished them well during the summer.

With no further business appearing, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Kasey Cummins, communication and administrative specialist of the Office of Academic Affairs
University Hall 5002/274-8974/fcouncil@iupui.edu/http://www.facultycouncil.iupui.edu


Committee Assignments

Academic Affairs Committee
Assigned:
- Student Achievement Record - part of Comprehensive Student Record Project - [http://www.aacrao.org/resources/record](http://www.aacrao.org/resources/record)
  - Invite Mary Beth Myers and Jay Gladden to EC meeting to discuss project. Key issue is whether student can/should be credited for learning on “achievement record” (co-curricular transcript) if there already is a RISE designation on transcript.
- Potential Policy on Credit Hour Overlap Between Minor to Major or Major to Second Major (Porter email of 5-14-14) (Reported at February 3, 2015, IFC Meeting: The committee concludes that the academic units should have such policies and is generating a draft.)
- Potential “refreshing/updating” of Principles of Undergraduate Learning. [Partner with Undergraduate Affairs Committee.] Can they be integrated with Principles of Co-Curricular Learning?
- Policy on the use of transferred credits being counted for award of both major and minor programs

Carry Over to 2017-18:
- Credits transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside these systems are viewed by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus.

New for 2017-18:
- Proposal to move Commencement to Saturday (Provisional approval given by email vote by 2016-17 committee.)
- Review PULs including merging PULs with Principles of Co-Curricular Learning (create ad hoc committee from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs Committee, and Undergraduate Affairs Committee)

Budgetary Affairs
Assigned:
- Banded tuition results
- Midwest Student Exchange
- IU Fort Wayne
- RCM Review
- Campus Conversations
- Change in Resource Planning Committee

Campus Planning Committee
Assigned:
Carry Over to 2017-18:
- Review and comment on Continuing Student Campus Survey
- Review and comment on PULSE surveys (e.g., campus safety, diversity, common theme).
- Review and comment on National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and other tools that gather information about students and faculty
- Request updates on implementation of IUPUI Strategic Plan and Welcoming Campus Initiative. Report any concerns to IFC.

New for 2017-18:
- Campus Conversations (annual)
- Monitor impact on faculty and campus from changes in medical school operations. Make recommendations for responding to changes.
- Monitor impact of Ft. Wayne integration.
- Welcoming Campus refinement
- Higher Learning Commission mid-cycle report about IUPUI meeting criteria.

**Constitution and Bylaws Committee**

**Assigned:**
- Carry Over to 2017-18:
- New for 2017-18:
  - Amend the Bylaws Grievance Procedures to allow for a Unit Recommendation Report to follow a completed Board of Review. The purpose of the Unit Recommendation Report would be for the Board of Review to recommend to the Chancellor or dean structural changes in the operations of an academic unit that would benefit the prevention of future grievances. (Received by the Committee in e-mail message from Rachel Applegate on April 24, 2017.)
  - Collaborate with Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity regarding charge and function.
  - Inclusion of Ft. Wayne as a unit.

**Distance Education Committee**

**Assigned:**
- Carry Over to 2017-18:
  - Monitor Graduate Faculty Council for graduate-level policies
  - Follow-up with Unizin
  - Follow-up with online proctoring
  - Follow-up with the transition to Zoom from Adobe Connect
- New for 2017-18:
  - Updates from IU Online
  - Updates from Quality Matters
  - Support structures for students who are fully online.
  - Follow up on CTL “The Forum.”

**Diversity Committee (Ad Hoc)**

**Assigned:**
- Consult with Gina Gibau, associate vice chancellor for faculty diversity and inclusion, to identify faculty to serve along with you.
- Develop a charge for the standing committee (yet to be proposed to the IFC)
- Address the strategic plan’s goals and objectives of:
  - Create pathways for success for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff
  - Develop cross-cultural awareness and competence among all members of the IUPUI community (focusing on faculty)
  - Becoming an employer of choice for faculty by providing meaningful work, improved workplace culture and communication, and advancement opportunities

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Assigned:**
- Carry Over to 2017-18:
  - NTTF Voting
  - Need for systematic analysis of policies and procedures in the Faculty to assure definitions for “faculty” and “full-time,” for example, are consistent and correctly and appropriately applied: The SAVCAA and the Constitution and Bylaws Committee need to be involved in coordinating this effort.
  - Review policies and procedures for tenure, practice plan, and compensation in the School of Medicine.
  - Determination of “full-time” for School of Medicine faculty, especially with those whose “effort” and compensation is primarily in IU Health.
  - Discuss the creation of a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the campus P&T Committee to review core school policy of P&T at IUPUI.
  - Discuss matching Kelley School of Business (IUB) promotion and tenure up through IUPUI.
  - Create a formal pathway to feed into the community for discussion.
- New for 2017-18:
  - Promotion and Tenure Committee (primary/department and unit/school) size – 4 vs. 7. Is additional language necessary to further clarify expectations with regard to committee size and the minimum number of positive or negative votes. **REFERENCE - 2017-18 Guidelines, page 13:** Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities (per email from Gail Williams, July 10, 2017).

**Faculty Guide Committee**

**Assigned:**
- Carry Over to 2017-18:
  - Revisit the status of Circular 2017-07.1 – Creation of an IUPUI Ombudsteam (up for second read/vote at IFC)
- Action Items:
  - Review the Faculty Guide to identify any policies that are potentially outdated and recommend to the IFC that the identified policies be assigned to the appropriate council committees for currency review.

**Fringe Benefits Committee**

**Assigned:**
- Monitor benefits

**Library Affairs Committee**

**Assigned:**
- Carry Over to 2017-18:
  - Continue to monitor Open Access policy
  - Link open access uploading to Activity Insight.
• Providing input to and advocating for the University Library at IUPUI
• Evolving nature of the scholarly record
• Explore adding doctoral student thesis information to IUPUI transcripts
• University Library budgetary concerns: Advocate for increase in budget.

New for 2017-18:
• Library Town Halls and Campus Tour
• Improve communication with faculty

**Promotion and Tenure Committee**
Assigned:
• Reviewing major/substantive changes to the guidelines each year (distinguishing between cosmetic or procedures changes and those involving substance)

**Research Affairs Committee**
Assigned:
• Policy Reviews:
  o Dual Use Research of Concern: [http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/research/ IU-Research-Policies/durc.shtml](http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/research/ IU-Research-Policies/durc.shtml)
• Policy on Centers and Institutes
• Indirect Cost Recovery guidelines to the IFC.
• Center designation process – inventory of active/inactive centers as a first fact-finding step.
• IUCRG Program – faculty input into future directions/funding priorities if the program continues.

**Staff Relations Committee**
Assigned:
Carry Over to 2017-18:
• Review policies and procedures in the bylaws that govern the IFC’s Staff Relations Committee and, comparably, the ISC’s Faculty Relations Committee and change them to current practices.
• Review impact of HR 2020
• Search committee training (better and more systematic across campus and at all levels)
• Effective ways of communication about issues and concerns of interest to all IUPUI employees.
• Overcome incompatible technologies that hinder effective communication across campus and systems.

New for 2017-18:
• Campus pedestrian safety

**Student Affairs Committee**
Assigned:
• Review of sexual misconduct policy brought forward by the UFC
• Off-campus student conduct (note new Greek policy)
• Review PULs including merging PULs with Principles of Co-Curricular Learning (create ad hoc committee from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs Committee, and Undergraduate Affairs Committee)

Carry Over to 2017-18:
• Update the Academic Misconduct portion of the Student Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct
• Campus climate for adult learners
• Campus climate for adult learners

**Technology Committee**
Assigned:
Carry Over to 2017-18:
• How does the committee become informed about policies, guidelines, recommendations, proposed technologies, etc., and how can it provide input before a decision is made? Matt Gunkel shared a proposal about a better dissemination plan for existing UITS resources (January 2017). We also worked on sending questions to presenters ahead of time so that they would be able to be prepared with answers and make efficient use of everyone’s time.
• Updates on new classrooms and classroom technology. Matt Gunkel, Julie Johnston, and Mary Beth Myers gave a presentation in January 2016, but were willing to return to given an update.
• Update on web collaboration tools
• Canvas update
• New Electronic and IT Accessibility Coordinator
• Have Marcia Gonzales (compliance office) come and talk about the role of UITS for accommodations and accessibility. Also launch of an ADA course for faculty that is supposed to be ready in fall 2017.
• Continue meeting in different locations to try out the technology. Can alert faculty and UITS of the joys and struggles with different technology setups.
• Top hat has a dedicated contact for IUPUI.

New for 2017-18:
• Find a better way to keep faculty informed.
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$^1$ A note on implementation: Upon approval of the IUPUI+, we will move into the implementation phase during 2018-2019. During this academic year, individual units will be able to participate in professional development, reflect on the PLUS as they relate to specific units, and develop examples and assessment mechanisms at the introductory, benchmark and capstone levels appropriate for students to progress along each profile. Individual units have the flexibility to interpret the profiles as they relate to student learning and growth from first year to culminating experiences. We will also engage the Registrar to develop an appropriate way to code the profiles for courses, programs, and co-curricular experiences.
Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success: IUPUI+

IUPUI prepares all students to communicate, innovate, and engage local and global communities to solve the problems of the 21st century. Along this journey, students have many opportunities to reflect upon their classroom and co-curricular learning, develop expertise in their chosen field(s), and grow as human beings. Students become acquainted with each of the profiles of communicator, problem solver, innovator, and community contributor in general education and first year experiences and progress along these pathways through their major coursework and co-curricular activities toward the capstone/culminating experience. Each profile is not distinct but supports and enhances the others in multiple ways, providing students with various occasions to deepen disciplinary understanding and refine what it means to be a well-rounded, well-educated person prepared for lifelong learning.

Communicator
The IUPUI Student conveys ideas effectively and ethically in oral, written, and visual forms across public, private, interpersonal, and team settings, using face-to-face and mediated channels. Communicators are mindful of themselves and others, listen, observe, and read thoughtfully, ask questions, evaluate information critically, create messages that demonstrate awareness of diverse audiences, and collaborate with others and across cultures to build relationships.

| Evaluates Information | Listens Actively | Builds Relationships | Conveys Ideas Effectively |

Problem Solver
The IUPUI Student works individually and with others to collect, analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information to implement innovative solutions to challenging local and global problems.

| Thinks Critically | Collaborates | Analyzes, Synthesizes, and Evaluates | Perseveres |

Innovator
The IUPUI Student builds on experiences and disciplinary expertise to approach new situations and circumstances in original ways, is willing to take risks with ideas, and pose solutions. Innovators are original in their thoughts and ask others to view a situation or practice in a new way. Innovators are good decision makers, can create a plan to achieve their goals, and can carry out that plan to its completion. Innovators use their knowledge and skills to address complex problems in order to make a difference in the civic life of communities, and to address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues.

| Investigates | Creates/Designs | Confronts Challenges | Makes Decisions |

Community Contributor
The IUPUI Student is an active and valued contributor on the campus and in communities locally and globally. They are personally responsible, self-aware, civically engaged and they look outward to understand the needs of the society and their environment. They are socially responsible, ethically oriented, and actively engaged in the work of building strong and inclusive communities, both local and global.

| Builds Community | Respectfully Engages Own and Other Cultures | Behaves Ethically | Anticipates Consequences |
Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success: IUPUI+

**COMMUNICATOR**
- Evaluates Information
- Listens Actively
- Builds Relationships
- Conveys Ideas Effectively

**PROBLEM SOLVER**
- Thinks Critically
- Collaborates
- Analyzes, Synthesizes, and Evaluates
- Perseveres

**INNOVATOR**
- Investigates
- Creates/Designs
- Confronts Challenges
- Makes Decisions

**COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTOR**
- Builds Community
- Respectfully Engages Own and Other Cultures
- Behaves Ethically
- Anticipates Consequences

This visual is a snapshot for ease of illustration. For a richer description of each profile, please read the details in the pages that follow. Upon approval of the PLUS, we will work with IU Communications to make sure the visual reflects the colors and branding of IUPUI.
**Communicator**
The IUPUI Student conveys ideas effectively and ethically in oral, written, and visual forms across public, private, interpersonal, and team settings, using face-to-face and mediated channels. Communicators are mindful of themselves and others, listen, observe, and read thoughtfully, ask questions, evaluate information critically, create messages that demonstrate awareness of diverse audiences, and collaborate with others and across cultures to build relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluates Information</th>
<th>Listens Actively</th>
<th>Builds Relationships</th>
<th>Conveys Ideas Effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicators scrutinize information prior to opinion formation and knowledge dissemination. They comprehend, interpret, analyze, and assess ideas, facts, and arguments. Communicators challenge assumptions and ask questions; they use complex information from a variety of qualitative and quantitative sources, personal experiences and observation to draw logical conclusions, form a decision or opinion, and/or advance an argument.</td>
<td>Communicators listen attentively to others, observe and read actively, and respond appropriately. Communicators are aware of personal biases.</td>
<td>Communicators actively engage with others to deliberate, negotiate, build consensus, navigate conflict, define values, or meet shared goals. Communicators operate with civility and cultivate healthy and meaningful relationships with others.</td>
<td>Communicators are able to express and adapt information and arguments to diverse audiences across formats and settings. They speak, write, and communicate visually with a purpose, make informed and principled choices and foresee consequences of these choices on self and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Determine key issues for consideration and access information using well-designed search strategies.</td>
<td>• Observe, listen, and read for information.</td>
<td>• Evaluate and apply diverse perspectives to complex topics in the face of multiple or conflicting positions.</td>
<td>• Develop a central message that is compelling, stylistic, and strongly supported with credible evidence relevant to the intended audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Find and use a variety of credible information sources.</td>
<td>• Paraphrase ideas.</td>
<td>• Engage in reflection to increase self-awareness and personal growth.</td>
<td>• Rely on language and visual choices that are clear and appropriate to diverse audiences and purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpret/evaluate oral, written, visual, and mathematical evidence to develop comprehensive analysis or synthesis.</td>
<td>• Perform self-reflection.</td>
<td>• Engage others respectfully; motivate others.</td>
<td>• Convey information mathematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ask questions to consider thoroughly diverse viewpoints.</td>
<td>• Respectfully engage others in ways to facilitate their contributions.</td>
<td>• Tailor communication strategies to express, listen, and adapt to others to establish relationships to further goals.</td>
<td>• Deliver polished and organized informative and persuasive presentations to diverse audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are some examples?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are some examples?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are some examples?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are some examples?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Academic:</em> Advance class discussion with peers. Summarize in-class group meetings or class sessions for the purpose of checking perceptions and getting input from all members.</td>
<td><em>Academic:</em> Work with others to accomplish a team project; work with classmates and community members on a service learning (RISE) project.</td>
<td><em>Co-curricular:</em> Facilitate a Democracy Plaza event; go through intergroup dialogue facilitation training and facilitate a difficult dialogue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Analyze own and others’ assumptions.
- Evaluate relevance of contexts (e.g., historical, political, cultural) when presenting position.
- Express logical position that accounts for complex perspectives.
- Acknowledge limitations.

**What are some examples?**

**Academic:** Engage in the research process to produce a paper or report; design and conduct an experiment or survey and convey the results to diverse audiences (RISE)⁴.

**Co-curricular:** Analyze data on student organization participation to convey conclusions to student affairs.

**How could it be evaluated?** An assignment, such as one of the examples above, evaluated according to the relevant VALUE⁶ Rubric or a rubric included with the REAL⁷. Evaluation conducted at various points in the curriculum to meet introductory, milestone, and capstone expectations.

**Co-curricular:** Work with student organization to accomplish a shared goal. Build community with residential living cohort.

**How could it be evaluated?** An assignment or classroom approach, such as one of the examples above, developed in alignment with the RISE Service Learning Taxonomy⁸ and evaluated according to the Teamwork or Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric or a rubric included with the REAL. Evaluation conducted at various points in the curriculum to meet introductory, milestone, and capstone expectations.

- Use visual imagery effectively with oral and written ideas.
- Write informative and argumentative reports or essays for diverse audiences.
- Use credible information sources.
- Reflect on speaking, writing, and visual choices.

**What are some examples?**

**Academic:** Convey information orally, in writing, and visually to audiences inside and outside topic area. Express ideas mathematically using the Greek alphabet.

**Co-curricular:** Present information during a student organization new student induction ceremony; participate in a theatre performance. Develop and present a poster or

---

³ Examples are provided for illustration only and are not meant to be prescriptive. During the implementation phase, each unit will be able to develop examples that align with its goals for student learning.

⁴ RISE to the IUPUI Challenge is an acronym referring to Research, International, Service Learning, and Experiential Learning. For more information, see [https://due.iupui.edu/student-success/student-initiatives/rise-program/index.html](https://due.iupui.edu/student-success/student-initiatives/rise-program/index.html).

⁵ These evaluation mechanisms are provided for illustration and are not meant to be prescriptive. During the implementation phase, each unit will be invited to develop assessment mechanisms to evaluate student learning at the introductory, benchmark and capstone levels.

⁶ VALUE is an acronym that refers to Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education, an initiative of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). Sixteen VALUE rubrics are available for faculty to assist developing and evaluating student work. For more information, see [https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics](https://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics).

⁷ REAL refers to the Record of Experiential and Applied Learning. The REAL is being developed at IUPUI as a complement to a student's official transcript and will record other experiences to provide a fuller picture of a student’s undergraduate learning.

⁸ For more on the RISE Taxonomies, see: [https://rise.iupui.edu/resources/course-development/taxonomies/index.html](https://rise.iupui.edu/resources/course-development/taxonomies/index.html).
An experience developed and assessed using the RISE Research taxonomy.

**Problem Solver**
The IUPUI Student works individually and with others to collect, analyze, evaluate, and synthesize information to implement innovative solutions to challenging local and global problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinks Critically</th>
<th>Collaborates</th>
<th>Analyzes, Synthesizes, and Evaluates</th>
<th>Perseveres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solvers think critically and from multiple perspectives about the world and their place in it; using their disciplinary expertise, they evaluate information resources carefully and conduct research independently to determine the most reliable and useful sources for their work.</td>
<td>Problem Solvers know how to work with others; they make the results of research understandable to a variety of audiences, including using visual forms of communication and communication tools; they listen to, respect, and incorporate a diversity of opinions and experiences into their plans.</td>
<td>Problem Solvers are curious about other perspectives and use their disciplinary expertise, along with knowledge and skills from a variety of fields, in their own work; they work to understand the details of a problem and break down ideas into manageable segments; they solicit and integrate information from scholars and community members to enrich their knowledge; they translate complex ideas into action plans and assess the effectiveness of their solutions.</td>
<td>Problem Solvers are comfortable with ambiguity and do not give up when the task they’re facing is difficult; they seek solutions from professionals, mentors, friends, and academic resources to work through challenging moments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Define a problem through creating an actionable problem statement.</td>
<td>- Cultivate healthy, meaningful relationships with others.</td>
<td>- Identify and adjust behaviors by applying previously understood</td>
<td>- Recognize and effectively manage ambiguous ideas, experiences and situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify and propose solutions for problems using qualitative and quantitative tools, reasoning, and creative thinking.</td>
<td>- Operate with civility in complex local and global environments.</td>
<td>- Manage adversity and life challenges in a flexible and ethical manner that promotes individual growth and development.</td>
<td>- Manage adversity and life challenges in a flexible and ethical manner that promotes individual growth and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Listen attentively to others and respond appropriately.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstrate transferrable life skills (e.g., time management,</td>
<td>- Demonstrate transferrable life skills (e.g., time management,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Use complex information from a variety of sources including personal experiences and observation to draw logical conclusions and form a decision or opinion.
- Apply cultural, historical, and scientific knowledge to contemporary global contexts.

**What are some examples?**
*Academic:* Conduct academic research for a research paper; design and implement an experiment or survey on a topic of the student’s own choosing; use visual representations of work to present research findings.

*Co-Curricular:* Participate in Fall Alternative Break Program by completing short-term project for a community agency in addressing social issues.

**How could it be evaluated?**
A signature assignment that requires extensive research using primary and/or secondary sources, evaluated according to the Critical Thinking or Information Literacy VALUE rubrics; a signature assignment involving quantitative or qualitative data analysis, evaluated according to the Quantitative Literacy VALUE rubric.

---

- Actively engage with others to build consensus, define values, or meet shared goals.

**What are some examples?**
*Academic:* Work with a small group to create a report; Successfully design and implement a scientific procedure or study involving multiple people.

*Co-Curricular:* Join a student organization and participate in its activities; Volunteer with a local nonprofit organization.

**How could it be evaluated?**
A group project that tracks both individual contributions and the quality of the completed project, evaluated using the Teamwork VALUE rubric.

---

- Modify one’s approach to an issue or problem based on the contexts and requirements of particular situations.

- Create knowledge, procedures, processes, or products to discern bias, challenge assumptions, identify consequences, arrive at reasoned conclusions, generate and explore new questions, solve challenging and complex problems, and make informed decisions.

- Examine the effectiveness and impact of solutions and make specific recommendations for future improvement.

**What are some examples?**
*Academic:* Work with a group of students and community members on a service learning project assessing a significant problem in the community. Use quantitative/mathematical techniques to answer research questions.

*Co-Curricular:* Examine the effects of social issues on communities through discussion and reflection on varied lived experiences. For example, the Tunnel of Oppression, alternative spring breaks, international communication, and problem solving) developed while participating in classroom and co-curricular activities.

**What are some examples?**
*Academic:* Resolve conflicts in group work to move on with the assignment; takes criticism as an opportunity to improve skills and ideas.

*Co-Curricular:* On-campus employment experiences; participation in campus leadership programs.

**How could it be evaluated?**
Student journals written over the course of a large project or reflection papers at the end of an assignment; active and thoughtful student participation in group meetings to resolve differences; frequent one-on-one meetings with students; self-evaluations of student participation in group work.
experiences, and/or film series aimed at highlighting contemporary social justice issues of oppression, micro aggressions and the “isms” faced in communities.

**How could it be evaluated?**
A signature assignment or project that proposes a course of action or solution to a problem, evaluated using the Problem Solving or Integrative and Applied Learning VALUE rubrics. Quantitative/ mathematical knowledge and skills tests.

---

Innovator
The IUPUI Student builds on experiences and disciplinary expertise to approach new situations and circumstances in original ways, is willing to take risks with ideas, and pose solutions. Innovators are original in their thoughts and ask others to view a situation or practice in a new way. Innovators are good decision makers, can create a plan to achieve their goals, and can carry out that plan to its completion. Innovators use their knowledge and skills to address complex problems in order to make a difference in the civic life of communities, and to address the world’s most pressing and enduring issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigates</th>
<th>Creates/Designs</th>
<th>Confronts Challenges</th>
<th>Makes Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **What does it look like?**
Innovators know how to investigate; they are inquisitive, can carry out research (fieldwork, international or community-based, bench science, humanities, arts, technology and social science), apply disciplinary expertise, are proactive, can advocate for issues, and work toward building consensus with others. | **What does it look like?**
Innovators are original in their thoughts and ask others to view a situation or practice in a new way. Students combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways. | **What does it look like?**
Innovators confront challenges by building on experiences and disciplinary expertise to approach situations and circumstances in original ways. They use the tools and resources available, are willing to risk failure, and understand that failure is a step on the road to success. | **What does it look like?**
Innovators are good decision makers, can create a plan to achieve their goals, and can carry out that plan to its completion. Students see possibilities/need for change, and demonstrate/use their skills, talents, abilities, and disciplinary knowledge to pursue change/improvement/advancement/ innovation/knowledge creation in their own communities and beyond. |
| **What do you do?**
- Explore a topic in depth. | **What do you do?**
- Use divergent thinking to work in an imaginative way.
- Take risks either personally (in terms of embarrassment or rejection), or risk of failure in going beyond expectations. | **What do you do?**
- Modify an approach to an issue or problem based on the contexts and | **What do you do?**
- |
- Indicate an intense interest in an area; show substantial knowledge and understanding of at least one field of study.
- Reflect on future self by building on experiences and responding to new challenges.
- Use quantitative data to inform decision-making.

**What are some examples?**

*Academic:* Conduct research, describe, and explain a complex historical event in a coherent manner, employing the conventions and standards of the discipline.

*Co-curricular:* Identify an area of interest and pursue it with others in a meaningful way toward mastery.

**How could it be evaluated:** Assignments that require identification of an area of interest or question for investigation, a plan to carry out that investigation and report on findings.

---

- Embrace contradictions.
- Provide novel or unique solutions to a situation.
- Connect, synthesize, or transform ideas into new ones.
- Transfer skills, theories, abilities, methodologies by adapting or applying to new situations.
- Create knowledge, procedures, processes, or products to discern bias, challenge assumptions, identify consequences, arrive at reasoned conclusions, generate and explore new questions, solve challenging and complex problems, and make informed decisions.

**What are some examples?**

*Academic:* Create the electronic structure of health data to meet a variety of end user needs.

*Co-curricular:* Develop a new program for student involvement.

**How could it be evaluated?** Assignments that present new ideas and solutions to a problem; includes creation of procedures, products, or materials that have viable application or implementation.

---

- Requirements of particular situations.
- Connect to relevant experiences and academic knowledge across disciplines and perspectives at both local and global levels.
- Integrate communication in ways that enhance knowledge and understanding.
- Envision solutions to global challenges.
- Recognize and effectively manage ambiguous ideas, experiences and situations.
- Identify and adjust behaviors by applying previously understood information, concepts, and experiences to a new situation or setting.

**What are some examples?**

*Academic:* Collaborate with an agency, organization or external mentor to articulate the ethical implications of such research partnerships, and understand the goals of the scholarly project for academics and community partners alike.

*Co-curricular:* Use disciplinary knowledge in a co-curricular setting to develop solutions for new applications.

**How could it be evaluated?** Assignments like research papers, lab reports, musical

---

- Create a plan based on available evidence to achieve a goal related to a meaningful issue.
- Advocate for change or improvement with others that uphold values.
- Carry out a plan to implementation.
- Anticipate and avoid difficult situations before they become an issue both in academic life and career.

**What are some examples?**

*Academic:* Design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs within realistic constraints such as economic, environmental, social, political, ethical, health and safely, manufacturability, and sustainability.

*Co-Curricular:* Develop a proposal to create mechanism or system to meet a student need across campus.

**How could it be evaluated?** Signature assignment that identifies a need, develops a plan, carries a plan to implementation.

---

- Create inappropriate data to inform decision-making.
Community Contributor
The IUPUI Student is an active and valued contributor on the campus and in communities locally and globally. They are personally responsible, self-aware, civically engaged and they look outward to understand the needs of the society and their environment. They are socially responsible, ethically oriented, and actively engaged in the work of building strong and inclusive communities, both local and global.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builds Community</th>
<th>Respectfully Engages Own and Other Cultures</th>
<th>Behaves Ethically</th>
<th>Anticipates Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong> Community Contributors are active participants in their communities. They are willing to contribute their talents and knowledge in ways that improve the world around them. They are respectful, inclusive, and have developed a civic identity.</td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong> Community Contributors appreciate and seek to understand their own culture and society as well as the culture of others. Strong community members learn to navigate effectively in a complex world by working in a civil and collaborative manner with others.</td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong> Community Contributors develop a value-based code that directs their personal behavior and social interactions. They are aware of and respect the ethical conventions of local and global communities. They create the conditions for good ethical behavior by others.</td>
<td><strong>What does it look like?</strong> Community Contributors have strong personal insight and are able to understand their needs and motivations. They are able to make sound, evidence-based decisions and they can predict the reasonable consequences of their choices and actions on themselves and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong> • Make informed and principled choices. • Learn to recognize your own cultural rules and biases. • Communicate effectively with others in a variety of settings. • Builds and connects local and global communities. • Cultivate health and meaningful relationships. • Adjust behaviors by applying previously understood information,</td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong> • Understand the diversity and universality of human experience. • Engage others civilly, and with respect. • Understand and appreciate the interconnectedness of local and global communities. • Recognize and appreciate cultural differences and initiate interactions with those who are culturally different.</td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong> • Understand and articulate your personal values and beliefs. • Advocate for your values and beliefs in a civil and respectful manner. • Consider the consequences of your choices and actions. • Make principled choices in your life and in your relationships with others.</td>
<td><strong>What do you do?</strong> • Engage in meaningful self-examination and reflection. Track these efforts by including them in your E-PDP.⁹ • Manage adversity in a flexible and ethical manner. • Change course when doing so is prudent or necessary. • Care for your personal and emotional health. • Set and pursue personal goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁹ An E-PDP is an electronic personal development plan. More information can be found here: [https://pdp.iupui.edu/](https://pdp.iupui.edu/).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are some examples?</th>
<th>How can it be evaluated?</th>
<th>What are some examples?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic:</strong> Learn to communicate ideas and beliefs in a clear and concise way to a variety of audiences. <strong>Co-curricular:</strong> Join and participate regularly in a campus or community organization. Identify a cause or activity important to you and volunteer your time.</td>
<td>Assignments that require students to work in groups to study a public policy or community issue within their discipline and to propose solutions to community problems.</td>
<td><strong>Academic:</strong> Develop strategies that allow you to identify and use information critical to sound decision-making in multiple areas. Take courses that expand your ability to think creatively as well as critically. <strong>Co-Curricular:</strong> Take advantage of campus resources, including classes, seminars and campus support services to learn how to best care for your physical and mental health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are some examples?</strong></td>
<td><strong>How can it be evaluated?</strong></td>
<td><strong>What are some examples?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic:</strong> Take courses focused on a period of time, a religious tradition, a culture or a language other than your own. <strong>Co-curricular:</strong> Explore the art, music, or food of other cultural or ethnic communities. Live or work with others whose culture and traditions are different from your own.</td>
<td>Complete group project that requires students to consider and explain multiple perspectives on an issue, event or concern. Assign a project that requires students to examine a disciplinary based problem in another part of the word.</td>
<td><strong>Academic:</strong> Study the ethical systems of other cultures. Examine ethical dilemmas within your discipline. <strong>Co-curricular:</strong> Live or work with others whose culture or legal systems are different from your own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed P&T Guidelines Changes for 2019-20

### 8 TEAM SCIENCE: confirmed

New Language - Add after bullet 4 under Year 5 Candidate responsibilities:

- 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.

### 34 Institutional Values:

Insert on page top of page 34 after international work and publication

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 collaborative skills needed for future team-based and population focused models of health and wellness.
  - Interprofessional education occurs when learners from two or more 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 across 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 this 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 scholarly 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.
  o 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.

Recommended Revisions from the Executive Vice Chancellor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline – Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insert after 5th bullet point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Department Chair Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline – Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o It is recommended that email communication that solicits external reviews include a request for a 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12</th>
<th>Dean’s Responsibilities – add sub-bullet to bullet 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>Administrative Sections – add after 1st bullet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative letters from the dean, unit/school committee, departmental 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17</th>
<th>Candidate’s Statement – add after last bullet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The candidate should not include any confidential personal and/or medical information in their dossier. Reasons for approved tenure-clock extensions will not be considered in the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 30 | Additions of Materials/Comments |

DRAFT April 12, 2018
Although new information may be added at any level up to and including the campus P&T committee level of review, once the dossier is submitted for review in eDossier, neither the vitae nor the candidate’s personal statement may be updated. A candidate may add a note, either about new information or in response to a level of review, for inclusion in eDossier via the supplemental folder, up to and including the campus P&T committee level of review. No further additions or comments can be added to the dossier subsequent to the campus P&T committee level of review.

### Editorial Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Office of Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA) Academic Affairs (OAA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FAA OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attend Promotion and Tenure workshops offered by Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA) the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FAA OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FAA OAA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10 | Department Chair Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline – Year 3  
  - Ensure that a copy of the completed three-year review is sent to IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs FAA by May 1. |
| 12 | Dean’s Responsibilities – add as first bullet  
  - 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 1st. |
| 12 | FAA OAA |
| 14 | Appendices – available in eDossier as subfolders under Teaching (Performance), Research and Creative Activity (Professional Development), and Professional and University Service (Service). |
| 16 | FAA OAA |
| 24 | Appendices – add as first bullet  
  - Appendix folders are available in eDossier as subfolders under research, teaching and service for faculty and as subfolders under performance, professional development and service for librarians.  
  Delete  
  - Librarians, in accord with guidelines for librarian dossiers, should add separate appendices that include supporting documents for: (1) performance; (2) professional development; and (3) service.  
  - Appendices are to be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested. If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in electronic copies of their dossier; however, this is not required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28</th>
<th>FAA-OAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- October 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Table - FAA-OAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Resources page of the Academic Affairs website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA) Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 16, 24, 28 move to page 65 under O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION
Promotion and/or tenure reviews are significant transitions in a faculty member’s career, and often the source of considerable anxiety. These guidelines are intended to decrease that anxiety by clarifying campus-level expectations and processes. Criteria for promotion and/or tenure for faculty and for librarians are outlined in the Indiana University Academic Policies. These University criteria for faculty and librarians are interpreted in each Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) school and/or department according to their respective disciplinary cultures. Those interpretations are defined in school-level and department-level guidelines. More specific criteria relating to librarians are contained in the Library Faculty Handbook.

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 & 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 Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines interpret University policy and criteria to assist in the preparation of promotion and/or tenure dossiers. The guidelines should prove 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, whether full-time, part-time, volunteer or adjunct;
  - faculty who hold appointments in Purdue schools at IUPUI, faculty based at medical centers, faculty based at IUPUC, 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 and members of the Faculty Council Executive Committee. 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.
- 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 Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA). These documents need to be approved by the school’s appropriate faculty governance process and by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for their compliance with campus standards. They also should be publicly available on the school’s web site 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.
In this document, the term “candidate” refers to both faculty and librarians who are seeking promotion and/or tenure.

**DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN PROMOTION AND TENURE**

These guidelines should be used in preparing dossiers for promotion and/or 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 emphasizes an implicit reciprocal commitment between tenured faculty members and the University. The University provides academic 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.
- 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.
- Some faculty members—most notably those in the School of Medicine—may be assigned to other campuses, yet their tenure is sited 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.
- Both tenure-track and non-tenure track candidates may seek promotion in rank when their achievements warrant this recognition. The Indiana University Academic Policies define the standards for each rank, and each department and/or school interprets those standards in relation to the disciplinary culture.

**Nine-year Tenure Probationary Timeline for School of Medicine**

As of July 1, 2011, tenure track faculty newly hired in the School of Medicine will have a nine-year tenure probationary timeline. This was approved by the Board of Trustees at their February, 2011 meeting. 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. Their timeline will need to be adjusted to reflect the nine-year timeline, with the actions of years 4, 5 and 6 listed below, correlating with years 6, 7 and 8 for those with a nine-year probationary cycle.
ADVICE REGARDING PREPARING FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

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

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:

- 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 departmental 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 the 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 Appendices.
- 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 Research Development provides helpful workshops and other research support for faculty. These resources can be found at http://research.iupui.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 in 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.

“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 UB-2009)
- Become familiar with the University, campus, unit/school, and primary/department guidelines for promotion and/or tenure. Attend primary/department and/or unit/school promotion and/or tenure workshops. Attend Promotion and Tenure workshops offered by Faculty Appointments and Advancement (FAA) and 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:
- The three-year 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 initiatives as 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 Chief Academic Officer’s 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. If data are available, present your performance in relation to peer average scores.
- Analyze peer reviews to determine again how you might improve student learning in your classes.
- Analyze your grant and scholarly dissemination record in relation to department norms and expectations.
- You will receive feedback on your three-year review 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:
- 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 in order 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 reappointments.

Year 5:
- 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 this year in your primary/department and/or unit/school as well as at the campus level. Your perceptions and understanding will be different from what
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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 the other two areas. 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.
- You are asked to provide to the department chair and primary committee, the reviewer comments for any grants that you submitted that were not funded. These can be put in the appendices.
- 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:

- 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 process. It is considered an ethical breech 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.

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 your knowledge by reviewing the latest version of the Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines each year (found at: http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines).
- 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) for tenure or promotion to associate and full rank is on file with FAAOAA. 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.
- Develop a system of departmental peer review of teaching that ensures 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.
- Meet individually with each new faculty member to discuss departmental expectations for promotion.
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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 the CTL, CRL, CSL, and the Office of Research Development.
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- Provide guidance for faculty annual reporting procedures.
- Provide a written annual review that addresses frankly 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.
- Provide guidance for the faculty member to select an area of excellence 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 chair).
- 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 is addressed and that the candidate is documenting at least satisfactory performance in the other areas. Satisfactory performance in the candidate’s areas of responsibility, teaching and service (and research for tenure-track faculty) is required for continued probationary reappointments.
- Ensure that a copy of the completed three-year review is sent to the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs EAA 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.

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 external and internal peer reviewers for each candidate in accordance with the directions set out by the Chief Academic Officer in the section on External Assessment.
- Excellence in teaching or professional service requires similar peer review by persons outside the local context who can place the individual’s accomplishments within the larger academic and disciplinary context. The same expectations of rigorous peer review by qualified faculty/librarians apply to teaching, professional service, research and creative activity where applicable to the candidate. Department chairs should give special attention to identifying external evaluators who can assess the impact of an individual’s activities in teaching or service if one of those areas is the declared area of excellence.
- 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. Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at “arm’s length” or independent as described in the section on External Assessment. 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.
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- Provide external reviewers with the appropriate materials to make informed judgments.
  - While unit/school or primary/department policies may detail particular kinds of evidence that should be sent to reviewers (often the C.V., the candidate’s statement, and selected publications), the basic goal is to match evidence to criteria. For example, if the candidate is presenting excellence in teaching then teaching products, such as syllabi or course materials produced by the instructor, should be provided to the reviewer. If the candidate has named service as an area of excellence, documents or products detailing the intellectual work related to service and its impact should be sent to the reviewers. Primary/department or unit/school criteria as well as the IUPUI excellence tables located in the Appendices of these Guidelines should be provided to the reviewers.
  - Occasionally, a candidate decides to change the area of excellence after external reviews have already been solicited. In these cases, reviewers should be notified of the change and provided supplementary evidence, if needed. 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.
- 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.
  - It is recommended that email communication that solicits external reviews include a request for a 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 Appendices should accompany the letter of request.
- The Sample Letter to Request an External Evaluation, found in the Appendices, differentiates advancement on the basis of teaching, research or creative activity, and service; references the rank and expectations for that rank; states the chair’s letter (and other references available to 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. The committee should be of sufficient size to produce a minimum of four votes.
  - 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 should be of sufficient size to produce a minimum of four votes.
  - 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.

Year 6 of candidate appointment:
- Oversee the timeliness and procedural integrity of the primary committee (see Primary and Unit 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:
  - 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.
- 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 recent years, electronic journals have emerged in some fields that may contain material that is comparable in quality and stature to print media. If there is any question about the quality of electronic publications, the chair should address this issue explicitly. 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.
- 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.

- 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:
  - Relationship of candidate’s evidence of achievement, such as student evaluations or publications, to departmental norms and expectations.
  - Indications of professional or disciplinary benchmarks used in the field and relevant to the recommendations being made by the primary committee and the chair.
  - 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.
  - Specifically address if excellence is achieved in the stated area of excellence and validate if the other area(s) of performance are at least satisfactory.
- 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.
- Provide 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.
- 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 his or her vote in the vote record and upload his or her report.

- Meet with 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 deliberations.

### Dean (and Libraries Personnel Officer) 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 Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines each year (found at: http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines).

- 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 P & T process.

- Ensure that a current copy of the unit/school’s promotion and/or tenure document is on file with FAA 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 to comment on or to respond to such additions. The added information and the responses become a part of the dossier. (See Additon 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 FAA. The campus will return a dossier that does not meet the six-reviewer, arm’s-length minimum.

- 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 of the requirements found in the Primary and Unit Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committees Responsibilities section below.

- When divergent evaluations of a dossier result in different recommendations on tenure, the unit committee may wish to consult with the primary committee and/or department chair. The dean should ensure that such consultation, when necessary, has occurred before the dean considers a case. The consultation should note the relative importance of criteria, principles, or evidence used in the evaluation that led to the contrary recommendation. The consultation must be noted in the unit committee’s report, including notice of whether or not the vote of a committee was changed as a result. When there are divergent evaluations with respect to promotion, 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 with regard to 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.
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• 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 excellence is achieved in the stated area of excellence and validate if the other 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 his or her vote in the vote record and upload his or her report.

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

Primary/Department and Unit/School level promotion and/or tenure committees must comply with the following guidelines:

- 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.
- Voting members must fully participate in committee deliberations. There can be no proxy voting on promotion and/or tenure cases at any level.
- 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 are a minimum of four 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” and “highly satisfactory.” For example, “beyond satisfactory” is used for the Associate Librarian secondary area of review and “highly satisfactory” is used in a balanced case review.
- 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.
- 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.
- Invited presentations are vital evidence for candidates’ reputation in their field, the quality of these invited presentations should be addressed at the departmental level.
DOSSIER CONTENT

As of the 2015-16 P&T cycle, eDossier is used university-wide for dossier submissions. For up-to-date information on how dossiers will be submitted for 2018-2019, please visit the eDossier Resources page on our website.

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 into 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, please consult the PDF Instructions posted on our website or contact UITS or the CTL 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. These include but are not limited to:

- **External Assessments**
  - Before the review process begins, external reviews will be added by the primary/department or school/unit person designated to collect them.

- **Committee/Administrator reviews**
  - Evaluative reports will be added to the dossier by each committee or administrator. Copies of the evaluative reports are to be sent to the candidate as the dossier is forwarded. As these evaluations are added, they become a permanent part of the dossier.
  - The dean is expected to certify that the above condition has been met.
  - The candidate is not expected to respond to or comment on these evaluative reports.

Dossiers for tenure-track/tenured faculty and librarians generally include the following:

**Administrative Sections**
- Review letters and votes from:
  - Dean
  - Unit/School Committee
  - Department Chair
  - Primary/Department Committee
- External Assessments
- Solicited Reference Letters
- Assessment of dissemination outlets in the candidate’s area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case)

**Candidate Sections**
- Candidate’s statement
- Curriculum Vitae
- Teaching (For Librarians: Performance)
- Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: Professional Development)
- Professional and University Service (For Librarians: Service)
- Appendices - available in eDossier as subfolders under Teaching (Performance), Research and Creative Activity (Professional Development) and Professional and University Service (Service).

Dossiers for non-tenure eligible faculty (clinical, research and lecturer ranks) should only include sections relevant to the candidate’s appointment and required areas of evaluation. (See Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories in the Appendices.)

**ADMINISTRATIVE SECTIONS**
- These sections of the dossier are not prepared by the candidate.
- Administrative letters from the dean, unit/school committee, departmental chair and primary/department committee should not contain any confidential personal and/or medical information about the candidate.
Reasons for approved tenure-clock the candidate may have received will not be considered in the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure.

- These sections contain the following:
o 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). 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 school/unit 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.

o 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. 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-level review letters are written, it is strongly recommended that references to external referees by name are not included in the letter. If the names are included, they should be redacted in the copy presented to the candidate at each level of review.

o 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. 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.

o 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 in terms of excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. In the case of tenure recommendations, the statement should include an evaluation of the likelihood that the candidate will continue his or her 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 committee review.
For schools that do not have this level of review, this section will be omitted.

- **External Assessments**
  - This document is added by person who requests the external assessments. This may be the primary committee chair, department chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee.
  - Please note that external assessments must comply with the criteria defining “arm’s length” or independence of external reviewer (See External Assessment). No candidate dossier should be forwarded to FAA 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 candidate.
    - A list containing brief statements (two or three sentence) on the expertise of each external referee (see External Referee List for format). Please do not include CVs of 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

- **Solicited Reference 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.
  - 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 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.

**CANDIDATE SECTIONS**

- **Candidate’s Statement**
  - This document counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
  - Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a maximum of 7 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-
Candidates going up on a balanced case should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate’s statement, inclusive of the three areas of highly satisfactory work. In cases where the candidate undergoes unit-level review at another campus (e.g., Core Schools like Business, Education, etc.), an accommodation with the page-length expectations of those campuses may be needed.

- 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.
- 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 cuts across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.
- 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 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.
- Candidates should be careful to provide clear and sufficient information about their individual roles in collaborative projects, publications, presentation, or grants.
- 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 especially address their own assessment of the impact, significance or value of their work to their discipline or profession, to the unit and campus, and to society as a whole.
- Candidates should also indicate the prospects for continued personal development in their defined areas of professional activity.
  - Whenever possible, tenure-track faculty members should state specific plans for a research or creative activity agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, and for continued participation through professional service in their profession, the campus, and a community.
  - Faculty in non-tenure track appointments should focus on their respective areas of performance.
  - Similarly, librarians should indicate the prospects for maintaining excellent performance and for continuing to contribute to their profession through their engagement in professional development and service activities.
- Candidates who seek advancement based on excellence in professional service should be able to demonstrate that such service is, in fact, academic work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers. The application of criteria to professional service should be clear, and professional service must be clearly related to the mission of the University, campus, and school/unit.
- The candidate’s case for excellence should be made in relation to department, school/unit, and University criteria.
  - The candidate should not include any confidential personal medical information in their dossier. Tenure-clock extensions related to any approved medical leave are not be considered in the evaluation of promotion and/or tenure.

**Curriculum Vitae**
- A copy of the candidate’s current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard format (see Appendices).
- The CV is not part of the 50-page limit.
- Candidates must determine and list publications under the appropriate category; teaching, research, service as appropriate for their appointment.
Teaching (For Librarians: Performance)
- Documents in this section count toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
- This section is excluded for non-tenure eligible research ranks.

Faculty: Documenting Teaching
IUPUI requires documented 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.

This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to teaching and, if this is the area of excellence, the candidate has the option to limit the Candidate’s Statement to 5 pages and add a Statement of Teaching (a narrative analyzing the teaching area that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages as a section introduction). 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:

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 and compared to other faculty in the school/unit.
- Only summaries should be included in dossiers. The summary should include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year and item to establish trend lines where applicable.
- The summary should discuss individual results within the context of the department or school/unit to enhance the usefulness of the information to outside readers. When norms are available for comparison to others in the program, school/unit, campus, or discipline, these should be included. When results of scaled questionnaires are used, the values of the numeric ratings should be stated.
Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media, is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence.
- 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.
- 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.

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 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.

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 or student evaluation evidence, 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.
- 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.
  - Faculty may hold part-time appointments at any rank and in any classification; the expectations and measures for teaching achievement should be proportionate.
- Using technology, distributed education, problem-based learning, community-based learning, international videoconferencing, or other new techniques and tools to enhance student learning.
  - Faculty are encouraged to report their experiments and to document results.
- 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.

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 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.”

- Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: Professional Development)
  - o Documents in this section count toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.
  - o 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.
  - o For these faculty members, a threshold of documented satisfactory performance is required for promotion and/or tenure.
  - o 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.
  - o Peer review of research and creative activity is required, both for satisfactory and for excellence levels of evaluation.

- Faculty: Documentation of Research or Creative Activity
  - o This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to research or creative activity and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Research or Creative Activity (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the research or creative activity area). 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.

- **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 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian's 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.

- **Professional and University Service (For Librarians: Service)**

This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to service and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Service (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the service area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to service in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

- Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:
  - the public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);
  - the profession or discipline; and
  - the campus and University.
- Satisfactory professional service is expected of each faculty member and librarian.
- The importance assigned to service in considering candidates for promotion or tenure may vary according to individual circumstances and the mission of the unit.
- Professional service, including professional service in the community and patient or client services, is characterized by those activities conducted on behalf of the University that apply the faculty member's and librarian's disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge of interrelated fields to issues in society.
- 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.
- To be the basis for tenure or for advancement in rank, University and professional service must be directly linked to the unit and campus mission; the quality and impact of professional service must be evaluated within this context and must be assessed as academic work characterized by the following:
  - command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
  - contributions to a body of knowledge;
  - imagination, creativity and innovation;
  - application of ethical standards;
  - achievement of intentional outcomes; and
  - evidence of impact.

- **Peer 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 of 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.

- Faculty claiming excellence in service, whose professional service consists primarily of patient or
  client service, must document how their work exceeds normative levels of activity and quality and
  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. In all cases, this work must:
    - have impact beyond the direct recipient of the service; and
    - be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities.
- 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.
- Excellence in professional service ordinarily results in the dissemination of results and findings
  through appropriate publication, whether in print or electronic media. The journals, books, or web
  documents in which faculty publish the results of their service activities should be assessed and
  evaluated by department chairs (or deans) in the same manner as they are for research or
  teaching publications.
- As with research, professional service may span traditional disciplinary boundaries. In such
  instances, 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.
- Professional service to clients and patients as well as to the discipline may be local, regional,
  national, or international.
  - This section should minimally include the following items:
    - Description of the candidate’s professional service 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 committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service
        should demonstrate that it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been
        evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work.
      - Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly
        established as academic work.
    - 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 dissemination of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or
      service recipients in reports, documents, or other means of dissemination that are designed
      appropriately 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.
  - 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.
  - While some peers may come from the practice community, a majority should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at “arm’s length” or independent as described in the section on External Assessment.
  - 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.

• Appendices are not part of the 50-page limit.

• Appendices should have a table of contents to facilitate review.

• Appendices should be as succinct and as carefully selected as possible.

• Appendices should be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested. If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in electronic copies of their dossier; however, this is not required.

PEER REVIEW AND EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT

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.
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- This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
- At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed.
- These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research and creative activity, or service, and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

Ongoing Review

- 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.

External Assessment

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 has achieved an emerging national reputation and that each candidate for full professor 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 continues to be refined.

- External assessment (ordinarily in the form of a letter or verified email note) 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 signature. 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. Three additional new letters should be sought at the time of resubmission.
- 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.
- 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.

- **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, 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.

- **Academic external reviewers must be at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate, and at a peer (or higher) institution.** 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.

- **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.

- **Unit/school practices may vary in regard to who solicits external assessment letters,** but the candidate should not solicit or receive his or her own letters. Chairs should indicate how the external reviewers were selected and a sample of the letter sent from the unit/school to external reviewers should be included in the dossier of each candidate. Make sure the External Referee Form is completed and returned by the reviewers (see Appendices).

- **General expectations for external assessment vary with type of appointment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>RANK BEING SOUGHT</th>
<th>EXTERNAL REVIEWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tenure track faculty, research professors, scientists, and scholars | Advancement to full | External independent review is required.  
  - A maximum of 2 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.  
  Academic reviewers must be at full rank. |
| | Advancement to associate | |  
  - A maximum of 2 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.  
  Academic reviewers must be at the rank of associate or higher. |
| Clinical Track | Advancement to full clinical professor | External independent review is required.  
| |  
| | A maximum of 2 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. |  
| | Reviewers should be at the rank of full professor. They may be tenured or on clinical track. |  
| | Advancement to associate clinical professor | External independent review is required.  
| |  
| | A maximum of 2 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. |  
| | Reviewers should be at the rank of associate or higher. They may be tenured or on clinical track. |  
| Lecturers | Advancement to senior lecturer | External peer review of the overall record is not required as long as a sufficient number of IUPUI peers outside the department or discipline provide an objective assessment of teaching. |  
| Librarians | Advancement to full librarian | External independent peer review is required.  
| |  
| | A maximum of 2 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. |  
| | Reviewers should be at the rank of full librarian. They may be tenured or on clinical track. |  
| | Advancement to associate librarian |  

- When excellence in teaching, professional service, 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 a 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.
o Without documented results and without external peer review, candidates 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.
- For further assistance with soliciting letters and for a solicitation template, please consult the appendices.
- When submitted to FAAOAA, all dossiers will be given an initial administrative review to assess whether or not the external assessments appear to meet the requirements of these guidelines. If the dossier appears to be deficient in some way, the department/school will be contacted with the expectation that the deficiency can be addressed before the campus-level review begins.

INSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURES

Submission Deadlines

- Candidates submit dossiers for promotion and/or tenure to their department/school. 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 submit one electronic copy for each candidate to FAAOAA no later than Friday, October 26, 2018.
- If extenuating, school-level circumstances exist, a request for a time extension should be sent as soon as possible before the October 26 deadline to ofaa@iupui.edu. This extension can only be requested by school officials.

Here is an overview of the promotion and/or tenure review year at IUPUI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidates prepare dossiers</td>
<td>No later than spring of 5th year for tenure candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates submit dossiers to primary unit</td>
<td>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. Check with your department/school for exact dates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools submit dossiers to FAAOAA</td>
<td>The last Friday of October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus committee reviews and evaluates all dossiers</td>
<td>December, January and February – sometimes into early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus committee recommendations are forwarded to the Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Immediately following campus committee reviews; early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer reviews cases, completes an independent evaluation and forwards recommendations to the Chancellor</td>
<td>Mid-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor reviews cases and confers with the IU and Purdue Presidents on the joint recommendations that are forwarded to the respective Boards of Trustees</td>
<td>Late March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action by the Boards of Trustees</td>
<td>Mid-April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion takes effect</td>
<td>July 1 (12 month faculty) or August 1 (10 month faculty) to coincide with start of academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure takes effect</td>
<td>July 1 of the following academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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.
- 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.
- As of July 1, 2011, tenure-track faculty newly hired in the School of Medicine will have a nine-year tenure probationary timeline. See the section entitled Nine-year Tenure Probationary Timeline for School of Medicine.
- 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 faculty in eligible classifications may be considered for tenure and their probationary periods should be proportionate to those of full-time appointees. 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.

Area of Excellence

- The Indiana University Academic Policies require that a candidate for promotion in a tenure-related classification excel in at least one area and be at least satisfactory in each of the other two.
  - Candidates determine their area of excellence within the academic norms and context of their primary unit. It is not the role of any review committee to change the area of excellence declared by the candidate. Candidates should select just one area of excellence unless presenting a balanced case. Review committees may comment in their evaluation of the dossiers that one or more additional areas are also excellent.
  - Balanced case: In some circumstances, faculty may present a record of highly satisfactory performance across all areas sufficient to demonstrate comparable long-term benefits to the University. If so, tenure-track faculty have the option of presenting a balanced case dossier across all three areas of endeavor (teaching, research, service) while clinical-track faculty have the option of presenting a balanced case across two areas of endeavor (teaching, service). It is understood that peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving a highly-satisfactory rating in each area of performance in a balanced case. However, the promotion and/or tenure standards in many
Departments/units encourage the choosing of one area of excellence. Faculty should be aware of the requirements of their department/unit.

- Appropriate areas of excellence have been designated for faculty in all categories and are summarized in the Appendices’ chart “Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories.” High expectations for performance within areas defined for each kind of appointment are universal across faculty titles; however, the nature of the work performed by faculty varies and the ways in which faculty accomplish their work and document performance also varies, depending on the context of the work. Similarly, disciplinary expectations will influence the emphasis faculty place on different activities and types of accomplishments and the way in which they are documented.

- In the case of tenure-track faculty, the evaluations of the dean and the department chairperson, as well as the evaluations of the primary and school/unit committees, must address the area the candidate advances as representing excellence: teaching, research and creative activity, or service. Each evaluation should include a general assessment of each of the three categories (e.g., in terms of being excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory). Sometimes faculty work represents excellence in more than one area. When an individual’s record warrants such a claim, reviewers are encouraged to note such an accomplishment.

- Tenure requires performance commensurate with rank and promise of continued service with distinction. Accordingly, candidates for tenure at the rank of assistant professor should understand that such a decision on tenure will be made separate from promotion in only very rare situations, such as documentation of circumstances that make clear the imminent attainment of promotion.

- In addition to having at least one area of excellence (or a balance of strengths at the highly satisfactory level in all three areas to be equivalent), all faculty in tenure-related ranks must be at least satisfactory in all areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service to be eligible for promotion or tenure. A faculty member whose work in any one of these three areas is less than satisfactory will not be recommended for promotion or tenure. Faculty whose University service (often referred to as “academic citizenship”) is not at least satisfactory may not be advanced for this reason as well.

- Maintaining high standards of professional conduct is a requirement for tenure and is expected across teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

  - Librarians are obligated to maintain high standards of performance in the development of library services and in the communication of information and knowledge to others. Evaluations cover the areas of performance, professional development, and service. For tenure, performance must be excellent, and professional development and service must be satisfactory. Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction. For promotion from assistant to associate librarian, performance must be excellent, and the candidate must demonstrate a level of achievement beyond satisfactory in one of the other two areas. The third area must be satisfactory. For promotion to full rank, the librarian must demonstrate superior performance and a continued significant contribution at the state, regional, national, or international level in either professional development or service. Performance in the third area must be satisfactory. Librarians must maintain high standards of professional conduct across all areas of responsibility.

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

  - Lecturers are required to be excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence.

  - Research professors, scientists, and scholars are required to be excellent in research or creative work.

  - Expectations for University and professional service will vary by unit and must be articulated in unit policies or in explanatory materials from the dean or chair contained within individual dossiers.

Addition of Materials/Comments

Although new information may be added at any level, up to and including the campus P&T committee level of review, once the dossier reaches the campus level, it is submitted for review in eDossier. Neither the vitae nor the candidate’s personal statement may be updated. A candidate may add a note, either about new information or in response to a level of review, for inclusion in the eDossier via the supplemental folder, up to and including the campus P&T committee level of review. No further additions or comments can be added to the dossier subsequent to the campus P&T committee level of review.
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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.

• Committees at prior levels may elect to re-vote on the case if circumstances warrant this action.

• 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.
  o It is the responsibility of the persons seeking additional materials to provide such material to all concerned parties.
  o These comments then become a part of the dossier. Such additions must be made only when clearly necessary.
  o 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.
  o If including copies of e-mails, the best practice is to print the original e-mail to PDF and send as an attachment, preserving the authenticity of the communication.

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.

• 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 re-vote 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 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.

Campus Level Reviews and Notification

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

• Readers use a summary report form (see Appendices) to present 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 a request.
Following consideration of the reviews of the primary and secondary reader, members of the Campus Promotion and/or 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.

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 processes.

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.

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 the 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.

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 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 across 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 this 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 scholarly 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.

Principles of Undergraduate Learning and Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning

- The intellectual foundation of our general education and baccalaureate programs is articulated through the IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs).
- 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, 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 member’s 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. This may include scholars and experts from outside the academy.

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 and retaining 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.

Service

- The distinction between professional service and service to the University requires some elaboration.
  - Faculty and librarian service to the University through committees and administration is important and required. The community of scholars depends on the mutual responsibility of individuals to support and develop the institution that sustains them.
  - Service must be a factor in these considerations, because unsatisfactory service to the University may preclude successful application for promotion and/or tenure.
  - Administrative service that uses disciplinary expertise for innovative or successful achievements reviewed by peers may be offered as evidence of achievement of professional service when such work:
    - has been planned and stipulated in advance;
    - when it is derived from the mission of the unit;
    - when it is disseminated to a broader audience; and
    - when it is peer reviewed.
- Not all committee service is equal.
  - Some committees, such as an Institutional Review Board, the Committee on Ethics in Research, 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.

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.
# SUMMARY OF AREAS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR VARIOUS FACULTY CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement to</th>
<th>Area of Excellence¹</th>
<th>Other Areas of Performance</th>
<th>Expectation for External Peer Review of Case</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Tenure Track²</td>
<td>Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school</td>
<td>Letters from independent³ peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. Emerging national reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tenure Track³</td>
<td>Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school</td>
<td>Letters from independent³ peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>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. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian³</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Beyond satisfactory in either Professional Development or in Service and satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Letters from independent³ peers outside unit on IUPUI campus</td>
<td>(No Additional requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian⁴,⁵</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excellence in either Professional Development - Research and/or Creativity or in Service and at least satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Letters from independent³ peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of superior performance as an associate librarian and attainment of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession (Indiana University Academic Policies, UFC, 1978). Record of exceptional achievements in performance and a record of distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community in the secondary area of excellence. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity (Library Faculty Handbook, Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Librarians, 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Balanced case expectations are defined by the Indiana University Academic Policies as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University.” This category applies to both tenure-track and clinical-track faculty.
2. For tenure decisions, tenure expectations are for performance commensurate with rank and evidence of continued service with distinction.
3. For tenure decisions, performance must be excellent, and professional development and service must be satisfactory. Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction.
4. Balanced case exceptions for librarians only apply to the secondary criteria (to professional development, research and/or creativity and to service).
5. Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.
6. For more detailed information regarding evaluating librarian performance, please review the “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement to</th>
<th>Area of Excellence¹</th>
<th>Other Areas of Performance</th>
<th>Expectation for External Peer Review of Case</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area and in University Service; Highly satisfactory in both areas for a balanced case</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI or department</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area and in University Service; Highly satisfactory in both areas for a balanced case</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Satisfactory in University and Professional Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to the IUPUI department or discipline</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Professor, Associate Scientist/Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, set by unit</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Professor, Senior Scientist/Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, set by unit</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Balanced case expectations are defined by the Indiana University Academic Policies as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University.” This category applies to both tenure-track and clinical-track faculty.

² Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.
# DOCUMENTING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of teaching performance</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching load</strong></td>
<td>List of courses, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching goals</strong></td>
<td>Goals and/or Teaching Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing professional development</strong></td>
<td>List of formal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of exemplary teaching methods</strong></td>
<td>Description of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of teaching</strong></td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of student learning</strong></td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship of teaching and national leadership</strong></td>
<td>Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course and curriculum development</strong></td>
<td>List of committees, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition (grants, awards)</strong></td>
<td>List of recognitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SECTION I: CV

- List of courses, etc.
- Details on students mentored, advised, etc.
- Comment on relative size of load

## SECTION II: CANDIDATE’S STATEMENT

- Expansion of explanation in statement, if desired
- Comment on fit with IUPUI and unit goals

## SECTION III: STATEMENT CONTAINED IN EVALUATION OF TEACHING

- Details of workshops attended, study, reading, etc and their significance
- Comment on efforts undertaken

## PEER REVIEW (MAY BE PART OF SECTIONS I-DEAN, CHAIR COMMENT OR III-INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL PEERS)

- Details, on specific methods such as teaching with technology, use of PBL, service learning, or other innovative methods, inclusive teaching
- Local peer review, external if knowledgeable

- Results of nationally normed tests, pre-post evaluations of course knowledge gains, analysis of student work, student/alumni reports, approach toward PULs (for UG courses) and PGPLs (for Grad courses)
- Local peer review, external if knowledgeable

- Student report in letters
- Local administrative and peer comments

- Descriptions of scholarly approach
- Local or external peer review

- Details on CV entries
- Local peer review, external if knowledgeable

- Details on CV entries, if needed
- Commentary on stature of awards
### Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance

| Type                     | Unsatisfactory                                                                                     | Satisfactory                                                                                     | Highly Satisfactory                                                                                     | Excellent                                                                                     |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Instruction**          | Incomplete lists of formal instruction                                                             | Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes | Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction | Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes; The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy; Evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice. |
|                          | Incomplete evidence to interpret load                                                               |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |
|                          | Incomplete information about goals of instruction Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative Incomplete information on learning outcomes Absence of peer review evidence or superficial peer commentary not based on systematic review Poor performance on many of the above measures |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |
| **Course or Curricular Development** | Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness | Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes |                                                                                                       | 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 |
|                          | No review by others                                                                                 |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |
|                          | No evidence on how work is connected with department or campus goals                                 |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |
|                          | Poor course or curricular design products                                                           |                                                                                                  |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |
| **Mentoring and Advising** | Numbers of students mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided Comparative load for unit not indicated Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented Poor performance indicated by data | Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized Student satisfaction indicated by evidence Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear | Important impact and student achievement documented | 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 demonstrated 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 | No teaching awards or other recognition of successful teaching and learning. No evidence of dissemination of good practice or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) | Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL. Some recognition of teaching efforts. | Evidence of regular and significant local/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice. Recognition of high quality of teaching. Grants or awards at the department or campus level. (For the lecturer category, this level constitutes excellence.) | 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 to document excellence for clinical and tenure-track faculty. |
| Professional Development Efforts in Teaching | No information about teaching development efforts given. Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise. No mentoring of colleagues. Evidence of ineffective performance in this area. | 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. | 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.) | 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. |
## DOCUMENTING RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE DOSSIER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three to five most significant publications or creative activities which reflect major research accomplishments</strong></td>
<td>List all publications or creative activities and indicate whether in rank and whether refereed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of stature of journals in which articles appear</strong></td>
<td>Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of stature of galleries where works appear or stature of performance venues</strong></td>
<td>May be an indication in CV (stature of gallery or performing venue, city, potential size of audience).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Expectations</strong></td>
<td>As above: a letter often points out unusual circumstances related to work load.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research goals/program of research or creative activities</strong></td>
<td>Letters from Chair and Dean may comment, as may committee reports. (important for tenure, as the University is projecting candidate’s future contributions and productivity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of research or creative activities</strong></td>
<td>Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of contributions when more than one author or collaborator or performer</td>
<td>Departmental evaluation, committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to interdisciplinary research or creative activities</td>
<td>Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and awards (Review the candidate’s funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)</td>
<td>Committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stature of grants and other awards</td>
<td>Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Dean and Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing efforts to enhance research, scholarship and creative activities</td>
<td>Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUGGESTED STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary or Professional Research</td>
<td>Research has not been regularly conducted or there is no evidence of dissemination. Evidence comes only from colleagues, collaborators, or ex-students. Individual role and level of collaborative work is unspecified. Research is of poor quality. No research program has been presented.</td>
<td>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 and other appropriate venues. Research program is clearly articulated.</td>
<td>Candidate’s work has attracted favorable peer review and peer commentary notes. Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and external support (Review the candidate’s funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)</td>
<td>No evidence of attempts to seek support.</td>
<td>Evidence of attempts, which show promise.</td>
<td>Successful grant and external support has been obtained and continuing efforts and promise are documented.</td>
<td>Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support, including the degree to which the process was competitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>Local and external peer reviews have evaluated the work as unsatisfactory. [Procedures require internal and external reviews.]</td>
<td>Departments provide clear information about the stature of journals and the significance of the research publications. Departments affirm the candidates’ plans for continued research.</td>
<td>Regular local and external peer review.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly activities, including awards</td>
<td>None are documented.</td>
<td>Local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred.</td>
<td>Regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred.</td>
<td>Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others. Departmental evaluations of the stature of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# DOCUMENTING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory University Service*</td>
<td>List of university service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence (e.g., assigned responsibilities context, role, growth, impact) and basis for judging it satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals and evidence of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annotation of roles, contributions, and impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External assessment letters evaluate the achievement evident in the products of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance and impact of professional service</td>
<td>List of community, disciplinary/professional, and university service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of significance and impact to the context of the unit or campus mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals and evidence of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of impact on constituencies and intellectual contribution from and to the discipline or profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External assessment letters evaluate the adequacy of the evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of activity and individual’s responsibility</td>
<td>List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of candidate’s contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and intellectual contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External assessment letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and leadership</td>
<td>List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-assessment of growth and leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annotation of specific roles, responsibilities, and intellectual contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications related to service</td>
<td>List of refereed publications and non-refereed publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of significance to the discipline, constituencies, and mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annotation on significance as intellectual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on this criterion within letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of results of service</td>
<td>List of presentations, workshops, and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of significance to the discipline or profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annotation of nature of dissemination as appropriate and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University service is necessary for promotion and/or tenure. It qualifies as professional if it is documented as intellectual work that relates to the discipline or to the mission of the university. For example, the economist on the task force charged with revising university revenue distribution policies may be performing professional service but the English professor would be engaged in university citizenship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Service*</td>
<td>No evidence of activities or results</td>
<td>Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance byFaculty Council)</td>
<td>Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence on outcomes of collaborative work, but no evidence of individual contribution</td>
<td>&quot;wrote a policy that was approved by committee&quot; &quot;not required or expected&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No review by others</td>
<td>Played a major role in initiative over a period of time that contributed to campus or unit goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor performance on service activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Discipline</td>
<td>No evidence of activities or results</td>
<td>Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants) &quot;organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered&quot;</td>
<td>Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence on outcomes, but no evidence of individual contribution</td>
<td>&quot;played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No review by others</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals</td>
<td>Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor performance on service activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Community</td>
<td>No evidence of activities or results</td>
<td>Accompanied by independent evidence of impact &quot;chaired a subcommittee of the board that accomplished X, Y, &amp; Z&quot; &quot;played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization&quot;</td>
<td>Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence on outcomes, but no evidence of individual contribution</td>
<td>Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to community goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No review by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor performance on service activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DOCUMENTING PERFORMANCE IN IUPUI LIBRARIAN DOSSIERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listing of major performance achievements and positions held</td>
<td>May be referenced in all of these sources, list of positions in CV, description in personal statement, may be more fully described in personal statements (changes in job responsibilities and major projects may be highlighted by series of position descriptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of performance</td>
<td>All of the above sources may contain evidence of the effectiveness of the librarian’s performance, self-reflective comments on performance may certainly appear in personal statement, especially achievements of significance or patterns of professional growth, written compilation of performance activities, including summary of annual review statements; supervisor’s statements from annual review (with permission from supervisor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectation</td>
<td>Indication in the materials submitted above (use to cross-check against materials supplied by candidate), referenced in personal statement (# of hours at reference desk compared to others), additional detail, particularly in position descriptions, additional evidence of this, particularly in solicited external assessment letters (i.e., candidate’s performance is particularly noteworthy since he/she is on the reference desk # hours per week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of librarian’s performance to library operations quality of services</td>
<td>All of the above: include a copy of the library’s mission statement, CV notations, particularly if publications or presentations given as part of job responsibilities, reflective comments, supporting materials on any grants received that relate to library services and their impact on the library or materials prepared (bibliographies, research aids, etc.), letters solicited through school procedures from peers or students, faculty, staff and others who have benefited from the librarian’s expertise and contribution in this area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of contributions when more than one librarian is involved in a project</td>
<td>Specific notations in all of the above, list in CV using citing conventions appropriate to the library, reference to contribution, additional detail, joint statements or letters when librarian served as part of a team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of teaching when teaching is part of job assignments</td>
<td>See grid for Teaching, see grid for Teaching, see grid for Teaching, see grid for Teaching, see grid for Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing efforts to enhance performance</td>
<td>Above documents, list of professional development activities related to performance, description of significant continuing education and training activities undertaken to improve performance, highlights in Summary of Performance Activities, letters on the significance of these activities in enhancing the librarian’s performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IUPUI Curriculum Vitae Format

**For Promotion and Tenure Dossiers**

**PREAMBLE:** Preferably, all entries should be listed in reverse chronology with the most recent entries listed first. If your discipline’s convention is for chronological listing, that is acceptable but please be consistent. For tenure and promotion dossiers, the candidate’s complete career history should be included. In rank activities and accomplishments should be indicated by using an asterisk *.* Omit headings that do not apply to your career. If you have additional categories, place them in the most logical area, consistent with this vitae format. Adherence to the following format will foster consistency as well as facilitate effective and efficient dossier review.

As long as you include all the requested information in the order presented on this sample, you are not required to use the tabbed or tabled format provided on the [Resources page of our the Academic Affairs website](#).

#### Name and Contact Information

**EDUCATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Date Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSTDOCTORAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FURTHER EDUCATION:** (Advanced and Specialty Training, Fellowships, Institutes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>Date Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**APPOINTMENTS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rank/Title</th>
<th>Inclusive Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC (i.e. academic appointments, including academic administrative roles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-ACADEMIC (i.e. administrative, hospital or corporate appointments, consultantships)</td>
<td>Institution/Entity</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LICENSURE, CERTIFICATION, SPECIALTY BOARD STATUS** (as applicable for discipline):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Inclusive Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Inclusive Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND AWARDS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Award Name</th>
<th>Granted By</th>
<th>Date Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH
Award Name          Granted By          Date Awarded

SERVICE
Award Name          Granted By          Date Awarded

OVERALL/OTHER
Award Name          Granted By          Date Awarded

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: List courses, workshops or training programs attended to enhance your performance in any area of academic work.
Course/Workshop Title          Provider          Date

LIBRARIAN PERFORMANCE: Provide a composite description of your professional experience and activities in your current position at IUPUI and, where applicable, prior to coming to IUPUI.

TEACHING:
TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS: List the course number, brief title, format (i.e. lecture, lab, clinic, online); your role (course director, lecturer), year and term, enrollment and other information that specifically pertains to your discipline (i.e. contact hours, hours of lab instruction, time instructing students on wards or clinics, course-related advising.) Mean teaching evaluation scores may be included.
UNDERGRADUATE
Course #          Short Title          Format          Role          Term          Enrollment
GRADUATE
Course #          Short Title          Format          Role          Term          Enrollment
POSTGRADUATE
Course #          Short Title          Format          Role          Term          Enrollment
CONTINUING EDUCATION
Course #          Short Title          Format          Role          Term          Enrollment

MENTORING: List mentoring activities that pertain to your discipline such as thesis or advisory committees, students on research rotations, postdoctoral fellows and visiting scholars, advisor to graduating students, mentor for peer and self-assessment review, faculty mentoring committees. Name the individual, identify your role and provide inclusive dates.

TEACHING ADMINISTRATION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: List activities focused on enhancing the teaching and learning environment.

Circular 2018-11
GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS IN TEACHING: Organize grants to differentiate active from pending/under review. Include your history of past support. If a record of effort to obtain funding is expected in your discipline and/or rank, include proposal submitted but not funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE TEACHING GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</th>
<th>Granting Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>% Effort</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED TEACHING GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDING TEACHING GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BUT NOT FUNDED TEACHING GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVITED PRESENTATIONS – TEACHING

LOCAL
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| REGIONAL
| Title | Organization | Date |
| NATIONAL
| Title | Organization | Date |
| INTERNATIONAL
| Title | Organization | Date |

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS IN RESEARCH: Organize grants to differentiate active from pending/under review. Include your history of past support. If a record of effort to obtain funding is expected in your discipline and/or rank, include proposal submitted but not funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE RESEARCH GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</th>
<th>Granting Agency</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>% Effort</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED RESEARCH GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDING RESEARCH GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BUT NOT FUNDED RESEARCH GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Granting Agency</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INVITED PRESENTATIONS – RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SERVICE:

Distinguish between service to the University and service to your professional discipline. If a service activity spans academic levels (i.e. Department, School, Campus, University) list it once. Identify your role in leadership (i.e. member, co-chair, chair).

### UNIVERSITY SERVICE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Inclusive Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Inclusive Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Inclusive Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATIENT CARE/CLINICAL SERVICE: List activities in service to patients, indicating position, clinical venue and inclusive dates. Include role in administrative, organizational and team activities that improve the environment for clinical care. If the activities extend beyond the local level, indicate the sphere or extent of impact (i.e. regional, national, international).

GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS IN SERVICE: Organize grants to differentiate active from pending/under review. Include your history of past grant support. If a record of effort to obtain funding is expected in your discipline and/or rank, include proposal submitted but not funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVE SERVICE GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>% Effort</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED SERVICE GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDING SERVICE GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BUT NOT FUNDED SERVICE GRANTS/FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>% Effort</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INVITED PRESENTATIONS – SERVICE

| LOCAL | Organization | Date |
| REGIONAL | Organization | Date |
| NATIONAL | Organization | Date |
| INTERNATIONAL | Organization | Date |

PUBLICATIONS: List all publications in a format consistent with your disciplinary style standards (e.g. APA), listing all authors in the order in which they appear in the publication. **Bold your name in citations where multiple authors are listed.** All works must be retrievable. Sort publications by the following categories: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, Service and also by refereed and non-refereed. Separate articles, proceedings papers, books, book chapters, invited reviews, letters to the editor, editorials, book reviews, invited commentaries and abstracts (including professional standards, protocols, software, multimedia presentations, films or videos and other scholarly/creative works designed for electronic technologies). **Mark in-rank publications with an asterisk * and those as a mentor with a dagger †.** The nature and extent of the your contribution should be presented in the candidate’s statement or in the documentation of teaching, research/creative activity or service and not in the CV. List only works that are published, accepted or “in-press.” Work submitted, under editorial review or in preparation should not be listed but rather may be reported in the candidate’s statement. Candidates for the Three-Year Review and for promotion to Associate Professor should briefly...
annotate entries to explain the nature and extent of their contribution. If additional explanatory information is needed, include this in an appendix to the dossier.

TEACHING
Refereed

Non-refereed

RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY
Refereed

Non-refereed

SERVICE
Refereed

Non-refereed

(Date)  (Signature of Candidate)
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 THE 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: 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. 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 TO THE DOSIER AND THEY SHOULD NOT BE FORWARD FOR CAMPUSS-LEVEL REVIEW UNLESS THEY OFFER SUPPORT FOR SPECIFIC CLAIMS THAT OTHERWISE WOULD NOT BE ADEQUATELY DOCUMENTED. 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:

1. The chair (primary or unit committee chair, dean, or other person specified by department or school procedures) should request and receive these letters.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Letters of solicitation must explicitly mention the candidate’s area(s) of excellence. 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 is reflected in the request letter. If the wrong area is indicated, this could result in procedural challenges.

5. 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.

6. All letters solicited and received must be included in the dossier; neither the candidate nor subsequent reviewers may exclude letters.

7. Referees should be selected on the basis of their ability to comment on the candidate’s professional accomplishments.

8. 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.
9. 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.

10. When writing to referees, include the vitae, candidate’s statement, and copies of publications, including books, unless you are certain they are available to the referee. 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. Results of teaching, research and creative activity, or service disseminated through electronic media may be as valuable as results published in print media. The same care and concern for objective peer assessment should be observed when reviewing such electronic publications, especially in light of the move toward more on-line publication venues.

15. 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.

16. Electronic letters of reference are acceptable if they have been verified; however, they should still be signed, dated and on letterhead.
### EXTERNAL REFEREE LIST FOR [Candidate’s Name]

**Name of External Referee 1**  
Rank of External Referee 1  
Institution External Referee 1  
Brief bio about External Referee 1’s qualifications

**Name of External Referee 2**  
Rank of External Referee 2  
Institution External Referee 2  
Brief bio about External Referee 2’s qualifications

**Name of External Referee 3**  
Rank of External Referee 3  
Institution External Referee 3  
Brief bio about External Referee 3’s qualifications

**Name of External Referee 4**  
Rank of External Referee 4  
Institution External Referee 4  
Brief bio about External Referee 4’s qualifications

**Name of External Referee 5**  
Rank of External Referee 5  
Institution External Referee 5  
Brief bio about External Referee 5’s qualifications

**Name of External Referee 6**  
Rank of External Referee 6  
Institution External Referee 6  
Brief bio about External Referee 6’s qualifications

*Please use the format above when creating a candidate’s External Referee List. This is the minimum amount of information required by IUPUI and the IU President’s Office.*
EXTERNAL REFEREE FORM

 Please return this form with your letter.

TO: IUPUI Administrator's Name
FROM: External Reviewer's Name

SUBJECT: Relationship to Candidate
CANDIDATE: Faculty Member up for P&T's Name

Relationship to the candidate and his/her work:

Check your response

1. Past and/or present student, trainee or colleague at same institution at which you had a direct or significant role in their development
   - Yes
   - No

2. Family or close friendship
   - Yes
   - No

3. Co-authored scholarly work/grants in the last 5 years (with the exception 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)
   - Yes
   - No

4. Other, please specify:

_________________________________________________________________

Knowledge of candidate’s work primarily based on:

Check your response

1. His/her publications and CV
   - Yes
   - No

2. Scholarly presentations
   - Yes
   - No

3. Personal knowledge and discussions
   - Yes
   - No

4. Participated on review panels (study section, advisory boards, etc.)
   - Yes
   - No

_________________________________________________________________

External Reviewer’s Signature
Date
SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR FACULTY

(Schools may develop their own letters, but they should use the same format and general content to contact all persons asked to provide evaluations. Pay special attention that the letter asks the reviewers to comment on the appropriate area of excellence being sought by each specific candidate.)

Dear __________________________:

Professor ________________ is being considered for (promotion and/or tenure) at the rank of ________________ in the Department of ________________ within the School of ________________ at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). We would be particularly grateful for your comments on the depth and significance of Professor ________________’s work and its impact in your field. To assist in this evaluation, we are providing a packet of relevant materials, including (his/her) curriculum vitae; a copy of (his/her) personal statement; copies of selected recent publications and teaching materials; and our criteria for (promotion and/or tenure).

Professor ________________ has identified (research/creative activity, teaching, service) as (his/her) area of excellence and therefore this is the area where evaluation by peers is most important. [OR: Professor ________________ has indicated a balanced case, which should be supported by evidence of highly satisfactory performance in all three areas, research, teaching and service, in keeping with Indiana University’s policy on balanced cases.]

Please comment on Professor ________________’s research as well as other scholarly work in ________________ (the area of excellence). We welcome your evaluation of the quality of the publications and journals that have been listed, as well as comments on any creative work or exhibition media. IUPUI is dedicated to multidisciplinary research. Please keep this in mind as you review this candidate’s scholarship. Comments on teaching might include your evaluations of course syllabi, examinations, other teaching materials, and publications on teaching, as well as any personal experience you may have of (his/her) teaching. For excellence in service, please comment on both service activities and the candidate’s scholarship of service. We would also appreciate any comments you might care to make concerning Professor ________________’s contributions to professional organizations or to (his/her) discipline through professional service activities or publications.

Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate’s work. We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion or tenure, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive promotion or tenure at your institution.

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vitae or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments.

We hope you understand how much we appreciate your assistance as we consider Professor ________________’s candidacy. It is important for us to understand (his/her) contributions from a perspective beyond our campus. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes, and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. (This paragraph is mandatory language for all letters requesting external peer evaluation for promotion and/or tenure and may not be altered.)

In order to complete Professor ________________’s dossier for review, we would appreciate receiving your comments by _______________________. I do hope you will be able to assist us.

Sincerely,

[2018-19] Chief Academic Officer’s Promotion and/or Tenure

-57-
SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR LIBRARIANS

(Schools may develop their own letters, but they should use the same format and general content to contact all persons asked to provide evaluations. Pay special attention that the letter asks the reviewers to comment on the appropriate area of excellence being sought by each specific candidate.)

Dear [Name]:

[Name] is being considered for promotion to the rank of Librarian at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI). We would be particularly grateful for your evaluation of [Name]’s contribution to and standing in the profession. To assist in this evaluation, we are providing a packet of relevant materials, including [Name]’s curriculum vitae; a copy of [Name]’s personal statement; other pertinent materials; and our criteria for (promotion and/or tenure).

For promotion to the rank of Librarian from Associate Librarian at IUPUI, the candidate must meet established university criteria.

Primarily: Superior performance – the candidate must show evidence of performance that is achieved by few others at IUPUI.

Secondarily: Either – Excellence in professional development – the candidate must show a continued significant contribution at the state, regional, national, or international level.

Or – Excellence in service – the candidate must show a continued significant contribution at the community, state, regional, national, or international level.

Tertiary: For either area not chosen as secondary, performance must be at least satisfactory.

In order to evaluate objectively the criterion of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession, we depend heavily upon the opinions of prominent colleagues outside IUPUI who are knowledgeable in the field of specialization of the candidate. Your frank appraisal of the candidate’s contributions to the profession is very important. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes, and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vitae or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments.

Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. (This paragraph is mandatory language for all letters requesting external peer evaluation for promotion and/or tenure and may not be altered.)

In order to complete [Candidate’s Name]’s dossier for review, we would appreciate receiving your comments by [Due Date]. I do hope you will be able to assist us.

Sincerely,
SAMPLE LETTER TO REQUEST AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION FOR CLINICAL FACULTY

(Schools may develop their own letters, but they should use the same format and general content to contact all persons asked to provide evaluations. Pay special attention that the letter asks the reviewers to comment on the appropriate area of excellence [or highly satisfactory performance in teaching and service for a balanced case] being sought by each specific candidate.)

Dear ____________:

Professor ____________ is being considered for promotion at the rank of ____________ in the Department of ____________ within the School of ____________ at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI).

We would be particularly grateful for your comments on the depth and significance of Professor ____________’s work and its impact in your field. To assist in this evaluation, we are providing a packet of relevant materials, including (his/her) curriculum vitae; a copy of (his/her) personal statement; copies of selected recent publications and teaching and service materials; and our criteria for promotion.

Professor ____________ has identified (teaching, service) as (his/her) area of excellence and therefore this is the area where evaluation by peers is most important. [OR: Professor ____________ has indicated a balanced case, which should be supported by evidence of highly satisfactory performance in both areas, teaching and service, in keeping with Indiana University’s policy on balanced cases.]

Please comment on Professor ____________’s scholarly work in ____________ (the area of excellence). [OR: Please comment on Professor ____________’s scholarly work in teaching as well as service]. We welcome your evaluation of the quality of the publications and journals that have been listed, as well as comments on any creative work or other media. Comments on teaching might include your evaluations of course syllabi, examinations, other teaching materials, and publications on teaching, as well as any personal experience you may have of (his/her) teaching. Comments on service might include your evaluations of service activities and service materials as well as the candidate’s scholarship of service. We would also appreciate any comments you might care to make concerning Professor ____________’s contributions to professional organizations or to (his/her) discipline through professional service activities or publications.

Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate’s work. We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive promotion at your institution.

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vitae or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with a context for your comments.

We hope you understand how much we appreciate your assistance as we consider Professor ____________’s candidacy. It is important for us to understand (his/her) contributions from a perspective beyond our campus. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes, and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. (This paragraph is mandatory language for all letters requesting external peer evaluation for promotion and/or tenure and may not be altered.)

In order to complete Professor ____________’s dossier for review, we would appreciate receiving your comments by _______________. I do hope you will be able to assist us.

Sincerely,

[2018-19 2019-20] Chief Academic Officer’s Promotion and/or Tenure
**CANDIDATE REVIEW FORM**

Please review the "Candidate Profile" below, review the dossier, and complete the "Review Form" section.

**CANDIDATE PROFILE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name:</th>
<th>Primary Reviewer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Secondary Reviewer:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
<td>Highest Degree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial IUPUI Appointment Yr:</td>
<td>Year Highest Degree Achieved:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Rank:</td>
<td>Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Current Rank Achieved:</td>
<td>Rank Sought:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Candidate for Promotion: | Candidate for Tenure: |

| Area of Excellence Declared by Candidate: |

**Prior Actions for Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary:</th>
<th>Dean:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit:</td>
<td>Department Chair:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prior Actions for Promotion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary:</th>
<th>Dean:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit:</td>
<td>Department Chair:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVIEW SECTION**

Please indicate your overall rating of the candidate for each area of service and make your recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. **Note:** Areas of service differ for librarians. "Performance," for librarians, is the equivalent of "Teaching," and "Professional Development" is the equivalent of "Research or Creative Activity." For "All Read" cases, please omit this rating.

**Summary Global Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching:</th>
<th>Research or Creative Activity:</th>
<th>Professional Service:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer's Recommendations</th>
<th>For Tenure:</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Is this a model dossier?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Promotion:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Is this an exemplary case?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2018-19-2019-20** Chief Academic Officer’s Promotion and/or Tenure -60-
**REVIEWER’S SUMMARY EVALUATION**

Check the corresponding boxes below to indicate the aspects of teaching/performance, research and creative activity/professional development, and service about which the dossier did not contain sufficient documentation.

**Summary Evaluation of Achievement:** Provide a summary statement that addresses the principal accomplishment in the areas and evaluates strengths and weaknesses, commenting as appropriate on: clarity of goals, preparation, methodology, and self-reflection. Then, indicate whether the dossier contained adequate documentation regarding each area.

### I. TEACHING: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reviewer’s Comments on Teaching:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Peer Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Class visits by peers</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peer review of materials</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scholarly Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scholarly Products</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National/international presentations</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course/curriculum/procedure development</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Evidence over several terms</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Normed for dept/school</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mentee/alumni comments</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Effective and Appropriate Methods</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student outcomes/results</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clear course goals</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Teaching Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. State/national</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University/campus</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School/department</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Plan for Increasing Future Teaching Effectiveness</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Teaching Load</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate for dept/school</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate for emphasis</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation?</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reviewer’s Comments on Research/Creative Activity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. External Peer Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scholarly Products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stature of journals/works/galleries</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Refereed</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rate of productivity</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Grants Received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number in rank</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total amount in rank</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Source of grants
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

E. Research Focus Goals
1. Progress towards goals
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
2. Future plans
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

F. Research Load
1. Appropriate for dept/school
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]
2. Appropriate for emphasis
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

G. Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

III. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE: SUMMARY EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Adequate Information in Dossier? (Check one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Reviewer’s Comments on Professional Service:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Contributions/Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Service to patients/clients/others</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative: Hospitals/clinics/courts/others</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scholarly Products</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Professional Service to Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Peer reviewed</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other evidence</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Regional/National/International Professional Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Offices held</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other professional service</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Professional Service Load</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriate for dept/school</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate for emphasis</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Was overall documentation adequate for forming a recommendation?</td>
<td>Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

A. Reviewer’s Comments on University Service:

B. Is there sufficient evidence of satisfactory University service?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

C. Is there sufficient evidence of high standards of professional conduct across teaching, research and creative activity, and service?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

V. DOSSIER OVERALL

A. Do you have any comments to go back to the chair or dean about issues raised in reviewing this dossier?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ]

B. Comments to chair or dean:

C. Overall Comments on Dossier Overall:
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