

GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS
AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY BLOOMINGTON
OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY & ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
March 19, 2015

Tenure and promotion reviews stand at a vital intersection, where the professional careers of individual scholars, scientists, artists and librarians meet the ambition of Indiana University Bloomington to remain a world-class research university. No decision we make is more consequential for the future of the institution than the granting of tenure to early-career faculty members or their eventual promotion to full professor. It is essential that we ground these reviews on the enduring principles and collegial values of the academy: procedures and expectations must be transparent to candidates and reviewers, and consistently applied; decisions must be fair and well justified by the merits of each case.

PROCEDURES

Sequential Stages of Review. Decisions about tenure and promotion are reached through the comprehensive and rigorous peer review of achievements and promise. The review process begins in the candidate's home department or school (for non-departmentalized units). Each case moves through a sequence of reviews, from the department, to the school and then the campus. At each stage, a faculty review committee writes a substantive report evaluating the candidate's performance in Research/Creative Activity, Teaching and Service/Engagement (using the evaluative categories listed below) and votes for a recommendation, and then the appropriate administrator (chair, dean, vice provost) provides a separate substantive evaluation and recommendation. The Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs (VPFAA) prepares the final substantive evaluation and recommendation for the "executive level" (Provost and President), who in turn make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. If a candidate has appointments in multiple units, one unit is designated "home" for tenure and promotion reviews (usually, this is identified in a memorandum of understanding); other units send their review reports and recommendations to the chair/dean of the home unit, who includes them in the dossier for consideration by the home unit.

Review Committees. At the initial level of review (department or school), the review committee consists of all rank-eligible faculty, although only a subset of them may be charged with writing the evaluative report. At subsequent levels, a small but broadly representative committee of eligible faculty writes the report and votes on a recommendation. Committee reports should capture the range of opinions expressed during the deliberations (minority reports are not allowed), while providing an evidence-based rationale for the chosen recommendation. Independent evaluations by individual faculty members in the home unit who are eligible to vote must not be included in tenure or promotion dossiers (except as comments on collaborative projects or peer assessments of teaching). All reviewers must have access to all dossier materials assembled by the chair/dean and candidate, including external letters and recommendations from prior levels. All oral deliberations by review committees are strictly confidential.

Eligibility and Voting. Eligibility is guided by the principle of rank-appropriateness: only tenured faculty within a unit may vote on tenure cases; only full professors may vote on candidates seeking promotion to full. Faculty are eligible to vote only if they have been “materially engaged” in the review process, as evidenced (for example) by their familiarity with the dossier or attendance at meetings where the case is discussed. No proxy voting is allowed. Retired faculty members may not vote. Departments and schools may have their own requirements for minimum FTE in the unit necessary for voting eligibility. Eligible faculty may vote only once per case (members of school and campus review committees should vote with the initial home unit – e.g., the department – and then recuse themselves from subsequent considerations of the case). At all stages of review, all eligible faculty must vote on all performance areas using the evaluative ratings listed below, and also for the overall recommendation for tenure or promotion. Votes by all eligible faculty members must be reported in the dossier; all absences, abstentions and negative votes (if possible) must be accounted for by the chair/dean. Voting is by secret ballot. Ballots should not make space available for substantive written comments by individual voters.

Notification of Decisions. Candidates will be notified by the chair as soon as the departmental faculty reach a decision, and by the dean after the school reaches a decision. Campus-level recommendations (by the review committee and by the Vice Provost) are shared with candidates only after the “executive level” completes its deliberations (typically, in the first week of April). The grounds and justifications for negative recommendations must be made clear to the candidate. Later committees and administrators need not restate the substance of earlier judgments and recommendations.

Rebuttals and Requests for Reconsideration. Upon receiving a negative tenure or promotion decision from the executive level, candidates may request a reconsideration of that decision if they believe that there were unjustifiable judgments of professional competence or judgments based on erroneous information. That request entails the preparation of a written rebuttal and the addition of new material germane to the deliberations. If the candidate chooses to request additional external letters, they must be obtained following the same procedures used to obtain the initial batch (described below). When the rebuttal materials are completely prepared, they are included in the dossier, which is sent in its entirety back to the first level of review making a negative recommendation (and then it is reviewed again by all subsequent levels). The reconsideration process will not add time to the candidate’s tenure probationary period, even if those deliberations extend into the seventh probationary year. Rebuttal materials must be submitted by the candidate for review within two months following notification of the negative decision.

Appeal/Grievance. If the above reconsideration results in a negative decision or if the candidate foregoes the reconsideration opportunity, the candidate may appeal the decision (after the executive level decision) to the BFC Faculty Board of Review on procedural grounds only. The Board will decide whether evidence supports the conclusion that procedural irregularities had consequences for the legitimacy of the outcome, and if so, they make suggestions for remediation to the Provost (who decides whether the review needs to be redone, all or in part). A grievance will not in itself extend the tenure probationary period (unless so requested by the Provost). The candidate must submit materials to the FBOR within two months following

notification of the negative decision by the executive level, or within one month following completion of the reconsideration process.

Timing of Reviews. *Tenure.* The tenure probationary period (“clock”) typically does not exceed seven years. After an initial three-year appointment, tenure-track faculty are reviewed by the home unit each year starting in Year 2 for possible reappointment for Year 4, in Year 3 for Year 5, &c. These reappointment reviews may be conducted by the chair/dean or a faculty committee, and culminate in a written assessment of the candidate’s accomplishments and prospects for eventual tenure. The tenure review and decision is ordinarily made during Year 6 of the tenure probationary period (solicitation of external letters begins at the very end of Year 5). Various leaves and other interruptions of work may add years to the probationary period. Candidates may choose to be reviewed for tenure prior to the sixth year, and may withdraw their “early” candidacy prior to a final decision by the executive level (if a negative decision is reached by the executive committee, the candidate may not be considered for tenure again). Length of the probationary period does not affect the criteria/expectations for tenure/promotion, and external referees should be informed of this. The granting of tenure is automatically associated with promotion to associate professor, except for those who have previously attained this rank.

Promotion to Full Professor. Associate professors may be reviewed for promotion at any time, at the request of the faculty member or by a decision of full professors in the unit (department or school). Those associate professors who have been at rank for seven years or more should be considered for possible promotion to full each year, during an annual meeting between the faculty member and the chair or dean. If promotion is denied, the candidate may request another review in a later year, and as many times as necessary.

Access to Dossier. All dossier materials must be shared with the candidate upon request at any moment in the review process, including external reference letters.

CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS

Evaluative Categories. In evaluating Research/Creative Activity, and Service/Engagement, four categories are used to rate the candidate’s performance: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. In evaluating Teaching, the categories are: Excellent, Very Good, Effective and Ineffective.

Area(s) of Performance/Basis for Tenure/Promotion. Candidates for tenure and promotion must be Excellent in one performance area and at least Satisfactory/Effective in the other two. In exceptional circumstances, candidates may be put forward on the basis of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university – their performance in all three areas must be Very Good (“balanced case”). Except for the “balanced case,” candidates must choose one and only one performance area on which to base their case for tenure or promotion (although that choice does not preclude the possibility that performance in one or both other areas will be judged Excellent). Review committees and administrators (at all levels) should remember that the dossier materials (including external letters) were gathered and presented in order to justify tenure or promotion on the basis of Excellence in the one performance area chosen by the candidate.

Campus-Level Expectations. Tenure decisions are forward-looking: candidates are expected to provide evidence that they have the potential to become an intellectual (scientific, artistic) leader in their chosen field. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to provide evidence that they have, in fact, achieved a position of intellectual leadership in a field. Granting tenure and/or promotion is a recognition that the faculty member will continue to achieve truly significant professional work in future years – original, innovative, influential, and consequential.

School and Department Expectations. Criteria for tenure and promotion must respect the diversity of missions among academic units on the Bloomington campus. All departments and schools must prepare documents that define with reasonable specificity criteria/expectations for Excellence (and all other evaluative categories) in Research/Creative Activity, Teaching and Service/Engagement, and make them available to all candidates for tenure and promotion. These criteria must be sufficiently precise to allow candidates to gain a clear understanding of what accomplishments are expected, but sufficiently elastic to allow a diversity of means to satisfy those expectations and also to enable reviewers to make judgments about the quality of work that are irreducibly subjective. If the unit's criteria for tenure change during the period of candidacy, the faculty member may choose to be evaluated for tenure under the criteria in force at the time of hiring; promotion reviews are grounded in current expectations. School/department expectations must be reviewed and revised periodically, and made available for web-posting by the VPFAA.

DOSSIER PREPARATION

Assembling the Dossier. Responsibility for assembling the dossier belongs to the department chair or dean (in non-departmentalized schools), who works closely with the candidate to ensure that all pertinent materials are loaded in eDossier. When the dossier is fully assembled, both the candidate and the chair/dean must acknowledge that eDossier is complete. Custody of the dossier rests with administrators at each level of review, thus ensuring the integrity of its contents. The dossier must be assembled before the end of the summer prior to the review year (materials to be sent to external reviews need to be available late in the prior spring semester). The performance area to be considered as the basis for tenure/promotion must be decided prior to assembling the dossier, and clearly indicated in the candidate's statement and in the solicitation of external letters.

Mandatory Items. All materials listed in the "General" section of eDossier must be included. All other materials in eDossier may be included at the discretion of the candidate. Annual review and merit review reports should not be included in eDossier, unless specifically requested by the candidate.

Timing of Work Included in Dossier. For tenure candidates, all work since reception of the highest degree should be included, even if the candidate spent time as a postdoc or at another university before coming to IUB. Pre-PhD work (e.g., scholarly or scientific publications) may be included to give additional evidence of pace, future trajectories, and continuity or change in research interests. Work produced since the tenure candidate's first appointment at IUB is

assumed to be a better predictor of future productivity than earlier work. Candidates for promotion to full professor should include only work completed in rank (i.e. since promotion to associate professor or the tenure decision, if that came later).

Adding New Materials to the Dossier. Candidates may add new material to the dossier at any time during the review process by uploading material into the “supplemental” folder in eDossier. Notice of newly added materials will be distributed to all prior levels of review. Faculty committees and administrators have the opportunity to revise earlier evaluations and recommendations – as a response to newly-added materials – although they are not obligated to do so. No materials may be added to the dossier during the review process without the candidate’s permission, other than recommendations from review committees and administrators. Addition of new materials to the dossier will not delay the review process. Only accomplishments completed prior to the decision by the Executive level may be included in the dossier, even if a reconsideration request or appeal/grievance has been initiated

External Letters. The campus requires a minimum of six letters from external referees, three from a list prepared by the candidate and three from a list prepared by the department (or school). Referees should be leaders in the candidate’s field, ideally at the rank of full professor or above, who hold an academic appointment at a variety of peer institutions or better, and who have no compromising relationships with the candidate (mentor, student, collaborator, co-author, former colleague, familial attachments, commercial ties). There may be exceptions to these rules, but they should be justified in the chair’s (or dean’s) letter. External letters must be requested and received by the chair or dean, using the suggested solicitation template (below); deans must approve referees proposed by chairs. External referees must be sent the candidate’s c.v., at least a subset of publications (chosen by the candidate) and the unit’s criteria/expectations for tenure/promotion. All solicited letters received must be included in the dossier. Anonymous contributions to the dossier may not be considered in tenure and promotion reviews. Unsolicited letters of recommendation are of little value.

DOCUMENTATION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Materials for review and their arrangement are specified in eDossier. Not all categories of documentation will apply to all candidates. As candidates plan their careers and as faculty and administrators assess their achievements, the following considerations should be remembered:

Research/Creative Activity

Considerations

Candidate’s Statement. This is not a restatement of the curriculum vitae, but rather a narrative overview of the candidate’s career -- highlighting major themes, new directions (beyond the dissertation) and future plans in research/creative activity. The prose should be understandable to a non-specialist without sacrificing the sense of what makes this work distinctive, innovative and influential. Discussion of the appropriateness and stature of publication outlets and artistic venues should be included.

Interdisciplinarity. With the growth of interdisciplinary research and with the emergence of exciting new fields, not all research/creative activity will fit comfortably into traditional “disciplinary” expectations or understandings. Candidates for tenure and promotion are encouraged to pursue innovation wherever it seems promising, even at the edges of disciplinary boundaries or in between them. Reviewers at all levels should be open to the possibility that work “on the edges” or straddling two fields may eventually transform research agendas in fundamental ways not always easily recognized by the home unit. A candidate’s interdisciplinarity may require that home units adapt their expectations/criteria and procedures. For example, practices for assembling review committees and soliciting external referees may need to be altered in order to insure that all aspects of research/creative activity get assessed by properly knowledgeable judges.

New Scholarly Communications. The world of scholarly and scientific publishing is undergoing revolutionary change. New forms of digital scholarly communication (e-journals, moderated websites, blogs) continue to emerge and grow. New journals emerge in interdisciplinary fields. Reviewers at all levels should consider that the best new research/creative activity may not necessarily appear in the traditional disciplinary top journals or in books published by the historically most prestigious publishing houses. Peer reviewed publications are given greater weight than those that are not. Candidates assume responsibility for providing evidence of the value of their publication outlets.

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

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

Defining Quality. Evaluations of research can never be reduced to a simple metric: judgments about the quality of work, and its influence, impact, utility and creativity cannot be fully captured by the count of publications and citations or by a journal impact factor. Faculty members and administrators must fully engage the candidate’s work, and reach their own judgments about its worth. Greater weight will be given to peer-reviewed publications/creative activities. Tenure and promotion decisions are not only about “quantity” (e.g., number of grants or publications), although successful candidates will typically show a sustained or accelerating rate of output during the period under review.

Status of Publications. It should be explicitly clear from the candidate's curriculum vitae and statement whether a manuscript is: published (in a journal or as a book), accepted for publication (irreversible decision), under review or in preparation. Published books and articles, and those accepted for publication, are given the greatest weight. A book manuscript "under contract" will be given most weight if it is complete and if an irreversible decision to publish has been made. Published professional reviews are of great value in assessing the impact of a book or artistic event.

Teaching

Candidates may consult with the Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning for assistance with pedagogy and its documentation: <http://citl.indiana.edu/>

Considerations

Candidate's Statement. This is an opportunity to reflect on one's pedagogical philosophy and accomplishments. The candidate should identify specific challenges or problems faced when teaching, and then describe efforts to improve and indicators of improvement. Discussion should center on strategies for stimulating the intellectual interests of students and for incorporating into courses new developments in the field. The statement should consider engagement with individual undergraduate and graduate students (if applicable), including sponsorship of their research/creative activity.

Assessment of Learning Outcomes. In the teaching statement and through course materials (syllabi, exercises, exams), candidates should make clear what students are expected to learn in their classes. Candidates should identify their empirical strategies for determining how well those learning outcomes have been achieved, and describe how the results of such assessments have been used to improve teaching and learning.

Student Course Evaluations. Judgments about teaching effectiveness cannot be reduced to a single indicator or measure. Quantitative data from student course evaluations should be interpreted in the context of other materials assembled to document pedagogical achievements – and should not be given greater weight. Student course evaluations may be most useful for tracking improvements over time and especially for identifying teaching problems and measuring the impact of efforts to solve them. Statistical data must be presented in a summary spreadsheet or graph (showing course, semester/year, and results on campus-wide survey items), enabling trends and comparisons to reference groups to be easily discerned.

Peer Assessments of Teaching. The chair or dean may appoint rank-appropriate faculty colleagues to review a candidate's teaching performance and to observe classroom activities. Peer review of teaching should be ongoing (annually for tenure-track faculty, periodically for associate professors with tenure). Departments and schools should develop instructions for peer assessors to distinguish "formative reviews" that provide suggestions for improvement and "summative reviews" that evaluate teaching performance against department, school and campus

standards. These instructions should promote transparency and consistency in the review process.

Excellence in Teaching. Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion on the basis of Excellence in Teaching must provide evidence for national/international visibility and stature in the area of pedagogy (effective teaching in the classroom is necessary but not sufficient). Indicators include: development of instructional/curricular materials, pedagogical publications (e.g., textbooks) and presentations; active engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning (papers/books about teaching); participation in national conferences on teaching. External letters should focus on the candidate's contributions to the improvement of pedagogy, locally and beyond.

Service/Engagement

Considerations

How Much Service/Engagement? The amount of time spent on service is expected to increase throughout the academic career. Candidates for tenure and promotion to associate professor should not be burdened with onerous service responsibilities, and chairs/deans must make certain that these responsibilities are distributed fairly among all probationary faculty members. Candidates for promotion to professor are expected to assume greater service responsibilities by taking on tasks that are vital for the sustenance of the academic community, including mentoring of younger colleagues.

Community Outreach and Partnerships. Technical competence and professional skills are indispensable for coping with the complexities of contemporary society. Faculty members are encouraged to make service contributions to diverse communities outside of the academy, from local neighborhood groups to national and international advisory panels.

Excellence in Service/Engagement. Candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion on the basis of Excellence in Service/Engagement must provide evidence for national/international visibility and stature resulting from service activities (even abundant local committee work is insufficient). The key is to demonstrate that the candidate's efforts have been sustained and transformative, for a professional association, government agency, or non-academic community.

Note: These guidelines are grounded in University and campus academic policies – and consistent with them -- but they do not supplant those policies.

DOSSIER CHECKLIST

General

- Department and School Criteria/Expectations for Tenure/Promotion
- Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (indicate peer reviewed publications; list separately publications to be considered research, teaching or service; for promotion to full, indicate work done since appointment as associate professor)
- Candidate's Statements on Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, Service/Engagement
- List of Referees Selected (indicating those who did/did not respond and reason for non-response)
- Department (School) List of Prospective Referees (including brief summary of credentials and relationships with candidate)
- Candidate's List of Prospective Referees (including credentials and relationships with candidate)

Research/Creative Activity

- Copies of Publications and/or Evidence of Creative Work
- Reviews of Candidate's Books, Creative Performances and Exhibitions
- List of Grants Applied for/Received
- Copies of Manuscripts or Creative Works in Progress
- Evidence for the Impact/Influence of Publications or Creative Works
- Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues
- Awards and Honors for Research/Creative Activity
- Candidate's Contributions to Collaborative Projects

Teaching

- List of Courses Taught
- Sample of Course Materials
- Graduate Training
- Student Awards, Honors, Collaborative Publications, Achievements
- Undergraduate Research Experiences and Mentoring
- Student Course Evaluations
- Solicited/Unsolicited Letters from Former Students
- Evidence of Learning Outcomes
- Peer Evaluations
- Curricular Development
- Professional Pedagogical Development
- Teaching Publications
- Teaching Awards, Honors, Grants, Fellowships

Service/Engagement

- Evidence of Service to the University, School and Department
- Evidence of Service to the Profession
- Evidence of Engagement with Non-Academic Communities and Agencies

SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REFEREES (initial contact)

Professor X is being considered for tenure [and/or promotion to associate professor/professor] in the Department of Y at Indiana University Bloomington. As part of our review procedures, we customarily write to experts in the candidate's field to ask them for an independent judgment of the candidate's scholarly contributions.

[Research] Your frank appraisal of the productivity, quality and impact of Professor X's research/creative activity would be greatly appreciated. If you have knowledge of his/her contributions to teaching and service/engagement, we would also value your evaluation of those activities.

[Teaching: Your frank appraisal of the quality and impact of Professor X's contributions to teaching would be greatly appreciated. If you have knowledge of his/her contributions to research/creative activity and service/engagement, we would also value your evaluation of those activities.] *[Service/Engagement:* Your frank appraisal of the quality and impact of Professor X's professional service to academic and non-academic communities would be greatly appreciated. If you have knowledge of his/her contributions to research/creative activity and teaching, we would also value your evaluation of those activities.] *[Balanced Case:* Professor X is being considered for tenure/promotion on the basis of balanced strengths in research/creative activity, teaching and service/engagement, and we would appreciate your evaluation of the quality and impact of his/her performance in all three areas.]

Professor X's curriculum vitae is enclosed for your consideration. *[For tenure cases:]* Does the candidate's research/creative activity [or other performance area(s)] represent the work of a person who has the potential to achieve a position of leadership in a substantial field of scholarly endeavor? Would Professor X be granted tenure at your university?

[For promotion to full:] Does the candidate's research/creative activity [or other performance area(s)] represent the work of a person who has achieved a position of leadership in a substantial field of scholarly endeavor? Would Professor X be promoted to full professor at your university?

We would also like to know if you are personally acquainted with the candidate in ways that might compromise the objectivity of your assessment.

[This paragraph is obligatory!] Your letter will be seen by faculty members serving in a tenure [and/or promotion] advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to the entire dossier at any time, and the University is legally compelled to comply.

We value highly your frank and detailed judgments. If you agree to prepare an evaluation of Professor X, we shall send you his/her materials and our criteria and expectations for tenure [and/or promotion]. Please let us know by DATE if you will be able to take on this task. Your letter would be due by DATE. Many thanks for considering this request.