



# PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

*Approved by the IUN Faculty Organization on April 15, 2011*

**Indiana University  
Northwest**



**FACULTY ORGANIZATION**

Charles P. Gallmeier, President

*Faculty Affairs Committee*

Alan Barr, College of Arts and Sciences, Chair

George Bodmer, College of Arts and Sciences

Frank Caucci, College of Health and Human Services

Janice A. Grskovic, School of Education

Lou Ann Karabel, College of Arts and Sciences

Ranjan B. Kini, School of Business and Economics

Michael S. LaPointe, College of Arts and Sciences

Barbara J. Peat, College of Health and Human Services

**CAMPUS ADMINISTRATION**

William J. Lowe, Chancellor

David J. Malik, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Cynthia D. O'Dell, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor

*Cover photo:* Students at IUN Commencement at the Genesis Center, Gary

**TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR *PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES***

<p><b>Introduction</b> 4</p> <p><b>Terms</b> 4</p> <p><b>Review Process and Dossier</b> 4 Peer Review Process</p> <p><b>Demonstration of Excellence</b> 5 Balanced Cases Librarians Negative Recommendations</p> <p><b>Composition of Promotion and Tenure Committees</b> 6</p> <p><b>Unit and Department Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure</b> 6</p> <p><b>Third Year Review</b> 7</p> <p><b>Dossier Components</b> 7 Principal Dossier Supplemental Dossier Responsibility for Dossier Preparation</p> <p><b>Dossier Preparation</b> 7 Responsibilities of the Chair, Dean, or Director Candidate's Narratives on Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service</p>		<p><b>Principal Dossier</b> 9</p> <p><b>Supplemental Dossier</b> 10</p> <p><b>Factors in the Documentation of Excellence</b> 11 Teaching Research and Creative Activity Service</p> <p><b>External Reviews</b> 13</p> <p><b>Internal Recommendations</b> 13 Primary Committee Chair, Dean, or Director</p> <p><b>Lecturers and Clinical Faculty</b> 14 Senior Lecturer Clinical Ranks Review Letters for Non-tenure Track Faculty</p> <p><b>Appendices</b> 15 A: Template Letter Soliciting External Reviews B: Academic Calendar for the Promotion, Tenure, and Sabbatical Leave Processes</p>
---	--	---

## INTRODUCTION

Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important decisions that a university makes, determining the quality and character of the faculty and of the institution itself. It is essential that the process be as equitable, clear, and objective as possible. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure should be counseled from the time of arrival about the process and mentored through it. A perusal of this document and of their unit's more specific promotion and tenure guidelines should provide guidance and assistance for preparing dossiers and indicate the types of documentation that will be helpful. In addition, the Office of Academic Affairs can provide information on the process, timelines, and procedures for the promotion and tenure process. The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* also describes some aspects of the procedure, and, should they become necessary, faculty rights and responsibilities in any request for reconsideration.

## TERMS

The *unit committee* is ordinarily the school or college promotion and tenure committee. For those schools or colleges with departments, the department committee is the *primary committee*. In colleges containing schools or divisions, the school or division promotion and tenure committee is the *primary committee*. Chair shall here refer to the candidate's immediate administrative supervisor, whether chair, dean, or director.

## REVIEW PROCESS AND DOSSIER

The *Indiana University Northwest Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* indicate various kinds of supporting evidence and their relative merits. They also assist a candidate

in preparing and organizing the dossier. While guidelines can indicate expectations and provide assistance in organizing a dossier, the importance of actively seeking advice from senior faculty in the creation, selection, and organization of dossier contents cannot be overstressed. Candidates are urged to seek input, formally and informally, from colleagues both within and beyond their units. In general, each candidate should contribute demonstrably to the University's mission, through teaching, research and creative activities, and service. It is the candidate's responsibility, with the assistance and advice of his or her academic unit, to understand the process and the standards of performance expected. Each dossier should reflect an appreciation of these standards and present a clear and concise argument of achievement, with supporting evidence. It should also identify whether teaching, research and creative activities, or service is the declared area of excellence.

The promotion and tenure process is a dynamic one, involving recommendations from a variety of faculty groups and administrators. It is difficult to generalize how assessments of such factors as significance or impact or substance collectively contribute to an overall recommendation. Candidates are well advised to make optimal use of routine evaluations of feedback and of pertinent experiences and to seek the counsel of peers on the most effective strategies in developing a strong case toward promotion and tenure. Clearly, it is best when the accumulated accomplishments present a compelling case. Dossiers with ambiguities or that invite a "close" decision are most vulnerable to the vagaries of a process that cannot be described with exactness.

According to the *IU Academic Handbook*, "the dossier is constructed in consultation

with the candidate,” usually with a chair assisting to ensure that guidelines are followed. The reviews and recommendations added at each level are the responsibility of the relevant administrator or committee chair.

### Peer Review Process

---

The University has a unique peer evaluation process to judge a candidate’s academic record and achievement. Dossiers will be evaluated by a series of committees and administrators, and it should be clear to each successive level of review what the expectations, limitations, and special opportunities are that pertain to each candidate’s discipline for achieving success. Each recommendation should not simply be for or against tenure or promotion, but should make clear its rationale; it should convey an awareness of the expectations and criteria, and its conclusion should be based on the evidence. The candidate will be provided with a copy of the recommendations made at each level—whether positive or negative.

### DEMONSTRATION OF EXCELLENCE

The candidate and all reviewers should be provided with the unit, department, or division criteria for tenure and promotion. Because these vary in specifics among academic units, it is important that the reviews closest to the candidate’s discipline make clear the reasons for their recommendations—based on their expectations and criteria. The dossier should convincingly substantiate a case in accordance both with the criteria in the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* and with any approved unit promotion and tenure guidelines.

These *Guidelines* address in general the different levels of advancement. While no specific distinctions are made between

being promoted to associate professor, to professor, or to senior lecturer, higher levels of promotion will expect greater demonstrated achievement—in merit and in impact. While the candidate’s entire record is reviewed, any promotion will be based primarily on contributions made in rank (since the candidate’s previous promotion or hire). **The paramount requirement is simply to demonstrate excellence in one area and a satisfactory record in the others**, as shown by progress since the last promotion.

However, what indicates excellence—for example, in research for a person seeking promotion to associate professor—is quantitatively and qualitatively different from what is expected of a person seeking promotion to professor. “Excellence” in research for the higher rank implies having an established, ongoing, nationally recognized body of scholarship; there should be clear evidence of substantial contributions, typically reflected in publications in high-quality, national-level peer-reviewed journals. There should be clear evidence of substantial contributions (as described later in this document). Parallel evidences apply to teaching and service for demonstrating an “excellent” or “satisfactory” level of achievement in the three areas. These *Guidelines* give examples (in *Suggested Documentation*) of different contributions and suggest their weight for establishing excellence. Each academic unit, in its own guidelines, should indicate what it expects for advancement at each level.

### Balanced Cases

---

In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University. In all cases, the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is recognition of past achievement and a sign

of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments, and a successful balanced case, like more customary dossiers, must indicate this.

### Librarians

In its discussion of tenure and promotion, the *Academic Handbook* includes librarians along with faculty: “Full-time librarians are appointed in ranks analogous to and modeled on faculty ranks.” The Indiana University Libraries *Library Faculty Handbook* describes the criteria (which differ from teaching faculty criteria), dossier preparation guidelines, and other P&T information pertinent to librarians. In the specific routing of dossiers for librarians, after being evaluated by the Library P&T Committee and the Director of Library Services, they will be reviewed by the IU Librarians’ Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Ruth Lilly Dean of University Libraries, and then returned to IU Northwest’s campus P&T Committee.

### Negative Recommendations

The IU *Academic Handbook* stipulates: “The faculty member or librarian who believes that a recommendation or decision that he or she not be reappointed has resulted from inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information may offer corrections and request reconsideration at the level at which the decision not to recommend reappointment was first made.” On this campus, a candidate will be allowed to request two reconsiderations of negative reviews, one at the first level of the negative recommendation. The relevant committees or administrators will evaluate whether to reconsider its recommendation. If reconsideration is declined, the original recommendation stands. If reconsideration occurs, both the initial review and recommendation and the revised recommendation will be included in the dossier. Although the *Academic Handbook*

only stipulates that reconsideration is available for probationary faculty, at IU Northwest it will be available for all candidates for promotion or tenure. Candidates, then, will have the opportunity to request up to two reconsiderations, one at the first level of a negative recommendation and one additional reconsideration request for a subsequent negative recommendation.

### COMPOSITION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEES

Every promotion and tenure committee, to the extent feasible, should be comprised of at least three senior faculty. If sufficient faculty members are not available, consultation between the dean and chair (or existing senior faculty) can add tenured faculty from another department or unit to the Committee. It must be stressed that no untenured faculty may participate at any level of the process, with the exception of senior lecturers who may participate in departmental reviews of lecturers. No faculty member may participate or vote in more than one level of the promotion and tenure process for any candidate. Every member of a promotion and tenure committee is expected to participate in every meeting and in all votes. Faculty will only be able to vote if they have participated in the discussion, deliberations, and review of the candidate; absentee or proxy votes are not allowed.

### UNIT AND DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Department, division, and unit guidelines for promotion and tenure must be vetted and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. This vetting process ensures that adequate compliance with University-wide expectations is met in the context of the *Academic Handbook* and with the prevailing expectations of the IU Northwest *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*.

## THIRD YEAR REVIEW

In the Spring Semester of the third year of a probationary faculty member's appointment, the candidate prepares a file for review. In this third-year file, he or she will assemble narratives on accomplishments in teaching, research or creative activities, and service to establish a pattern of developing scholarship and achievements. The purpose of this review step is to encourage an organization and structure that helps the candidate better understand the challenges of effective documentation and to provide input from the unit and department on his or her progress. Feedback should address weaknesses and recognize strengths in the candidate's performance.

## DOSSIER COMPONENTS

Dossiers should be divided into two components, the principal and supplemental dossiers.

### Principal Dossier

This dossier must be submitted in a pressboard report binding. It must contain:

- All reviews and recommendations (internal and external)
- Brief professional biographies of external reviewers
- Candidate narratives of teaching, research and creative activities, and service
- Candidate's curriculum vitae
- Approved department or unit promotion and tenure Guidelines.

The Table of Contents of essential material in this principal dossier follows in these Guidelines.

## Supplemental Dossier

This second dossier must be submitted either in a pressboard report binding or a three-ring binder. The supplementary binder should include all of the supporting material most appropriate for primary and/or unit committee review, such as:

- Copies of publications
- Proposals for external funding
- Other relevant supporting documentation of teaching.
- Other relevant supporting documentation of service

Recommendations from primary and/or unit levels should reflect consideration of the evidence cited in the supplemental dossier and serve as an assessment of the merits of contributions.

## Responsibility for Dossier Preparation

Both the chair and the candidate have responsibilities in preparing the dossier: the chair to assist in assembling it, to advise as necessary, and to ensure that guidelines are followed, the candidate to provide its contents. The administrator may assist the candidate with suggestions on the content and its organization. These Guidelines outline a schedule indicating when to assemble supporting evidence and when the dossier is due. They suggest the type of evidence that can indicate accomplishment in the three areas and include the process by which faculty, both within and outside the candidate's discipline, can evaluate his or her record. The Chair and the candidate should be attentive to the particular guidelines of their unit.

## DOSSIER PREPARATION

Candidates for promotion and tenure should be advised concerning the upcoming reviews and consult the Academic Calendar for Promotion and Tenure in the Appendix.

Candidates will need to supply the information that will be important to this evaluation process in the Spring Semester preceding the year of review for tenure and/or promotion. In order to have the necessary documentation, all units should begin to accumulate information about the candidate's teaching, research and creative activities, and service contributions as soon as the candidate becomes a faculty member.

The chair should routinely gather the information that will be appropriate for a tenure dossier. The compilers of a dossier should keep in mind that the objective evidence in the dossier should confirm the case for promotion or tenure. It is not sufficient for evaluators simply to state that the candidate is excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each area; they should elaborate how well they feel the candidate has made his or her case. Normally, the dossier should contain information that convincingly, objectively supports the contention that the candidate is excellent in one area and at least satisfactory in the others. All relevant evidence, both positive and negative, must be included in the dossier. A chair may not exclude material because of negative content. Review committees should be able to assume there is no pertinent evidence for or against the candidate beyond the documents in the dossier.

Candidates are responsible for presenting in an organized and effective way the evidence in their part of the dossier, the chairs likewise in their part. Candidates and all committees reviewing cases should be provided with the approved department or division criteria for promotion and tenure. Since these vary in some particulars from one academic unit to another, it is important that the reviewing committee know clearly the grounds upon which the case is being made and judged. The dossier should contain evidence for substantiating a case based on criteria in the Indiana University

*Academic Handbook* and in any specific division and/or department promotion and tenure guidelines.

### **Responsibilities of the Chair, Dean, or Director**

---

The chair, dean or director is responsible for:

1. Notifying the faculty member of the due dates for the dossier.
2. Providing clerical assistance and reproduction facilities.
3. Ascertaining that the faculty member has copies of the current *Academic Handbook* and of the unit guidelines, and informing him or her that these are the relevant documents to consider when building a case for promotion and tenure.
4. Soliciting names of potential external reviewers to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and their impact. The candidate (as well as other faculty) can suggest potential reviewers; the chair will select a list of those from whom reviews will be solicited. The chair can also add additional names to the list of prospective reviewers. Typically, a chair will inquire if a person is willing to evaluate the dossier prior to sending a formal written request. The chair then invites evaluations from those agreeing to review the dossier, using the letter included in the Appendix. Each candidate should be apprised of those chosen to make an evaluation. Ordinarily, sufficient external reviewers should be identified so that six letters are received. Reviewers will receive the bulk of the principal dossier: the CV; Teaching, Research and Creative Activities, and Service Narratives; samples of accomplishments; and the promotion and tenure guidelines of the candidate's unit. External reviewers are

asked to comment on the quality and impact of the candidate's accomplishments, whether the area of excellence claimed is teaching, research and creative activities, or service. If not provided by the reviewer, the chair should create a brief professional biography from the reviewer's CV or other biographical material.

5. Arranging for the selection and functioning of department or division promotion and tenure committees.
6. Writing a letter to the next highest administrator, evaluating the candidate and recommending action.

Materials gathered by the chair and included in the dossier for purposes of promotion and tenure become the property of the Office of Academic Affairs for the permanent record following the completion of the promotion and tenure process. This includes confidential evaluations from various administrators, committees, outside referees, colleagues and the candidate's statements and list of activities. Other non-confidential materials supplied by the candidates will be returned to the faculty member.

### **Candidate's Narratives on Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service**

Candidates should provide thoughtful narratives about their teaching, research and creative activities, and service. Each narrative should be three to five pages and should convey both the candidate's views of these areas and his or her accomplishments. The teaching narrative should reflect not only a pedagogical attitude, but should also discuss student and any relevant peer evaluations and how they have been integrated into subsequent practice, particular kinds of successes and even instructive missteps. A series of courses or a

program successfully designed is useful. Noteworthy advising or mentoring could well figure into a person's philosophy of teaching.

The narrative on Research and Creative Activity should not simply recount what is already in the candidate's bibliography, but rather highlight particular achievements and ongoing projects or programs or funding, and endeavors that have been especially fruitful and where they might lead. The narrative about Service would ideally reflect the candidate's understanding that (and how) service to the University, the profession, and the region is an important part of a faculty member's commitment. The emphasis should be on significant undertakings and the breadth of their effect—not a list of token memberships. If pertinent, it is appropriate and useful to indicate how these areas may have overlapped and reinforced each other.

## **PRINCIPAL DOSSIER**

The University will soon be moving to electronic dossiers that can be circulated in a stable, pdf-like format. Only one original, paper copy will then be required. Until that time, there should be one original and two copies of the principal dossier, and one copy of the supplementary dossier.

Only the principal dossier is forwarded beyond the campus to the Vice President's office. This press-board bound dossier will contain the documents listed below, **arranged in the following order:**

1. P&T Routing and Action Summary Form (this form is provided by the Office of Academic Affairs)
2. Recommendation from the Executive Vice Chancellor

3. Recommendation of Campus P&T Committee, including vote and rationale (This report should reflect the committee's discussion and concerns, including disagreements.)
4. Recommendation from Dean<sup>1</sup>
5. Recommendation from unit P&T Committee, including vote and rationale
6. Recommendation from the Chair<sup>2</sup>
7. Recommendation of the primary Committee, including vote and rationale.<sup>3</sup>
8. Summary list of External Reviewers. (Required information for each review received includes name, rank, institution, and relationship to candidate. Credential information of the reviewers is required. A copy of the letter sent to reviewers must be included.)
9. Letters from External Reviewers
10. Supplemental letters from external reviewers who have mentored or collaborated with the candidate, commenting on their roles in the research, or internal letters from faculty who have peer-reviewed his or her teaching or have direct knowledge of service activities

---

<sup>1</sup> For Librarians, the recommendations of the statewide Librarian reviews would precede the IUN Library Director.

<sup>2</sup> For Social Work, the Director and the IUSSW Dean's recommendations would be added here.

<sup>3</sup> For Social Work, the IUSSW Committee's recommendation, with vote and rationale, would be added here.

11. Candidate's Narratives—of teaching, research and creative activities, and service
12. Curriculum Vitae
13. Department and Unit Promotion and Tenure policy documents

### SUPPLEMENTAL DOSSIER

The contents of this folder provide the evidence and documentation that will enable the departmental committee, chair, dean, and the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee to make informed, persuasive recommendations. It should be as well-organized, clear, and concise as possible. This information will not generally be transmitted beyond the campus review levels.

This dossier may include the following items for the years in rank:

- Student evaluations—both the numerical and the prose comments (under *Teaching*)
- Student letters, indicating how they were chosen (under *Teaching*)
- Grade Point Distributions (under *Teaching*)
- A copy of all published scholarship or other evidence of creative activities (under *Research and Creative Activity*)
- Description and documentation of any notable service to the unit, University, profession, or region (under *Service*)
- Annual reports and (signed) evaluations
- CVs of external reviewers, if provided (brief biographies of them appear in the Principal Dossier)

## FACTORS IN THE DOCUMENTATION OF EXCELLENCE

Types of documentation that would help to prove that the case for promotion and tenure is justified are indicated below. For the area of excellence, the evidence should include more compelling and extensive documentation, and should clearly and convincingly demonstrate superior performance. The areas that are deemed satisfactory should also be well documented, but fewer types of evidence need to be included; the relative level of performance expected is less than that for excellence.

### Teaching

It is up to the candidate's academic unit to elaborate in its guidelines what its expectations for promotion and tenure are. Not all accomplishments are equally meritorious. While the list that follows is neither exhaustive nor fully inclusive, among the kinds of evidence that might show accomplishments in teaching are:

**Substantive accomplishments** (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Awards (local, University-wide, regional, or national)
- Consistently favorable student responses on evaluations, on both the prose comments and numerical results
- Pedagogically-oriented publications in peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly publications
- Funded external proposals for pedagogical innovation or systemic change in teaching
- Presentations on teaching innovation in professional meetings
- Peer-reviewed textbooks published
- Peer reviews (external and internal) attesting to impact and value of the candidate's work

- Major curricular innovations or new degree programs that are developed, approved and offered

**Significant accomplishments** (those that might further support the candidate's case):

- Student letters (solicited or unsolicited) commenting on or analyzing the value and effectiveness of the teaching. If the letter is solicited, include a copy of the letter sent to students and indicate how the students were chosen.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Electronic formats developed for courses and used in teaching
- Course and program design or supervision
- Evidence of student learning or teacher effectiveness (results can be summarized in the Teaching Narrative)
- A list of courses taught reflecting impact on program
- Share of department's teaching responsibilities
- Other indications of teaching creativity or innovation
- Mentoring of students or other faculty, with feedback if available from affected individuals
- Effective student advising
- Innovative course materials developed and implemented, pedagogical presentations on campus
- Contributions on teaching committees

### Research and Creative Activity

It is up to the candidate's academic unit to elaborate in its guidelines on what its expectations for promotion and tenure are. Again, items should be described on the basis of their substantive and significant contributions to their discipline, to make clear the merits of the contribution. While the list that follows is neither exhaustive nor

fully inclusive, among the kinds of evidence that might show accomplishments in research and creative activities are:

**Substantive accomplishments** (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Peer-reviewed Publications: Books, monographs, scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, accepted manuscripts. Book contracts do not normally constitute substantial evidence until a manuscript is delivered and accepted by a publisher. The candidate should include a list of journals with a description of their status and rank (circulation, prestige, impact factor, acceptance rate, or other attributes that reflect the prestige of the journal). Publications in national level, peer-reviewed journals offer the strongest indication of publication quality. Co-authored work should be accompanied by a clear statement of the candidate's contribution.
- Creative activities: Shows, exhibits, notable acquisitions, performances, literary publications. The quality and extent of shows, performances, etc. should be specified, including whether or not they are juried.
- Conference presentations in disciplines where this is highly regarded, indicating whether or not submissions are peer-reviewed
- Honors or awards for scholarly or creative activities
- Evidence of substantial, promising ongoing projects or programs
- Efforts to attract external funding to support students, scholars, and expenses of research if appropriate to the discipline
- Invited lectures at other colleges or universities on the candidate's research or creative activity

**Significant accomplishments** (those that might further support the candidate's case):

- Involving students in research or creative activity
- Student presentations of the candidate's research or creative activity
- Non-peer reviewed articles or presentations in local, non-juried shows

### **Service**

---

Service generally addresses service to the units or campus, professional service to the discipline, and public service to the community or region. All of these areas can have impact and be recognized as elements of a dossier for promotion and tenure. It is up to the candidate's academic unit to elaborate in its guidelines its expectations for promotion and tenure as to the extent and depth of these contributions. Among the kinds of evidence that might show accomplishments in service are (the list is neither exhaustive nor fully inclusive):

**Substantive accomplishments** (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Service to the profession: on academic boards, disciplinary and inter-disciplinary committees, editing, reviewing, evaluating, invited lectures
- Roles in reviewing departments or units in other colleges or universities
- Roles in national professional organizations, such as elected positions on boards
- Grants for service projects
- Peer-reviewed publications or presentations on service to the institution, unit, or discipline
- Organizing major, visible campus events impacting the discipline, unit or campus

**Significant accomplishments** (those that might further support the candidate's case):

- Service to unit: on committees, designing programs, mentoring colleagues
- Administrative contributions that exceed the ordinary expectations of an administrative role
- Major roles in representing the discipline or unit to other forums or in the community
- Service to campus: on committees, as a representative or liaison
- Service to the community: public lectures and presentations, discipline-related community activities
- Local awards and honors for service
- Outreach and event organization
- Consulting in the discipline

## EXTERNAL REVIEWS

A brief professional biography and possibly a CV of each external reviewer will be included in the dossier. It is helpful when the fields of the reviewers enable them to address the impact and importance of the candidate's contributions.

Indiana University broadly expects that six external reviews are desirable in the assessment of the candidate's work. Note that the external review letters cannot be from the candidate's home campus, from previous mentors, thesis directors, former colleagues in prior institutions, significant collaborators, classmates, or from people with whom the candidate has a personal relationship. The candidate should list all reviewers and indicate his or her connection with them. It is University policy that all external reviewers receive the same packet of materials.

## INTERNAL RECOMMENDATIONS

### Primary Committee

The department (or school within a college) committee's evaluation of the candidate's research and creative activities, teaching, and service should include factual and judgmental statements about each, assessing the area(s) to be judged excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. This letter should address the candidate's research and creative activities, teaching, and service attainments and anticipated contributions to the future development of the department, and it should summarize the confirming evidence. The written recommendations of the primary committee and of every subsequent level of review should be made available to the candidate at the conclusion of the committee's or the administrator's work. If the vote is not unanimous, both the majority and the minority positions must be explained in the committee's report.

### Chair, Dean or Director

If this recommendation is positive, it should contain an assessment of the candidate's contributions to the department (or unit). It should demonstrate that he or she will serve the needs of the department and has established a pattern of scholarly or artistic productivity, teaching, and service — a pattern that will benefit the University community in future years. If the recommendation is neutral or negative, this also should be justified. The recommendation of the chair will be provided to the candidate at the conclusion of the review.

## LECTURERS AND CLINICAL FACULTY

Indiana University has additional ranks of Lecturer and Senior Lecturer and clinical ranks with professorial designations. While these positions are not tenure-track, they provide substantial value to our mission in teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

### Senior Lecturer

---

Promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching or service, with at least satisfactory performance in the remaining area. Research or creative activity would be recognized when it strengthens the area of excellence. Candidates are ordinarily expected to provide leadership in teaching and to contribute to course and curriculum development. They may have organizational and oversight responsibilities for a course or program, participate in course and curriculum development, and, where appropriate, provide workshops for colleagues. They may oversee and provide mentoring for full and part-time non-tenure track faculty. Candidates may also make school and campus contributions beyond the classroom, such as campus service or other professional activities.

If a lecturer is hired with specific responsibilities beyond the normal teaching and service expectations, the accomplishments and contributions in those areas should be assessed.

### Clinical Ranks

---

Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor or from Clinical Associate Professor to a higher rank is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching, research, or service. The candidate must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in the remaining

area. Service can be identified as a primary focus for a clinical faculty member if considered a significant part of the faculty member's major responsibilities. Candidates are ordinarily expected to provide leadership in their primary area, but not to the extent and impact expected of tenure-track candidates for promotion. Clinical faculty may have organizational and oversight responsibilities for a course or program, participate in course and curriculum development, and, where appropriate, provide workshops for colleagues. They may oversee and provide mentoring for other non-tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty are encouraged to make school and campus contributions and to pursue external professional activities.

### Review Letters for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

---

It would normally be expected that candidates for promotion in non-tenured positions would have four review letters from outside their unit of appointment, allowing recommendations from faculty in other schools or colleges of IUN, as well as from other IU campuses or universities.

## APPENDICES

### A: TEMPLATE LETTER SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS

---

*Instructions: Replace bracketed data with appropriate information applicable to the candidate.*

[Date]

[External reviewer's address]

Dear [External reviewer]:

[Candidate name] is under consideration for promotion to the rank of [proposed rank] in the Department of [name] within the [School/college name] at Indiana University Northwest. Indiana University Northwest continues to develop its academic excellence in scholarship in teaching, research and creative activities, and service. A critical step in advancing the mission of our campus is recognizing meritorious faculty in rank. Your input in a review of our candidate is important in assessing the impact and value of our candidate's work.

The primary area in which [candidate name] seeks advancement is in [teaching, research and creative activity, or service; in the unusual instance of a "balanced case," this must be explained], with [the two areas claimed "satisfactory"] as the secondary areas. Within this context, we would appreciate your candid evaluation of [candidate's] academic work. We are particularly interested in your evaluation of the quality, significance and impact of [his/her] work, and the quality of the journals, publications, or other vehicles used for dissemination. To assist you in your evaluation we are enclosing Professor [candidate name]'s curriculum vitae, a summary dossier, and some representative contributions of the candidate. We would, of course, appreciate any other comments you would like to make regarding [candidate]'s teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service, and their overlap.

Since we are obligated to provide a short biographical sketch of you to promotion committee members, we would appreciate a brief biographical sketch, or your curriculum vitae, if more convenient. Please also clarify whether you have any personal or professional relationship with the candidate, and if so, the nature of that relationship.

We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and appreciate your assistance in this matter. Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in the campus's promotion and tenure process. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. If this in any way influences your ability to write a candid evaluation, please let us know as soon as possible.

To complete Professor [candidate name]'s dossier, we would appreciate receiving your comments by early to mid-August of this year.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely yours,

[Department Chair or designated administrator]

Enclosure(s)

## **B: ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR THE PROMOTION, TENURE, AND SABBATICAL LEAVES PROCESSES**

---

April	1st Monday	Office of Academic Affairs notifies units of candidates that must be considered for a promotion and tenure recommendation in following year. Units contemporaneously notify candidates.
May	1st Monday	Candidates notify chair, director, or dean of intent to pursue promotion and/or tenure or sabbatical leave. P&T candidates submit names of suggested external reviewers to responsible administrator.
May – June		Candidate dossiers are sent to external reviewers by chair, director, or dean as appropriate.
August		Promotion and Tenure Committees constituted.
September	2nd Monday	Both principal and supplemental dossiers for promotion and/or tenure candidates due in department or unit office  Sabbatical leave applications are also due. All external reviews should be received prior to this date. Reviews of dossiers progress from primary area (department or school) to unit committees and dean.
October	2nd Friday	Reappointment recommendations due in Office of Academic Affairs, for tenure track faculty in the second year of their appointment (for third year appointment only), and for lecturers in the first year of their appointment (for second year appointment only).
October	3rd Monday	Dossiers have been reviewed completely in schools and colleges, and are due in the Office of Academic Affairs.
October - December		Dossiers reviewed by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, and sabbatical applications reviewed.
January	2nd Monday	Reviews of the Campus P&T Committee are transmitted to the EVC.
February	mid-month	Recommendations of the EVC to the Chancellor.
February	end	Complete campus recommendations/principal dossiers are transmitted to the Office of the Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning, and Policy. Supplemental dossier may be requested.
March	mid-month	Candidates notified by EVC that their dossiers are undergoing Executive Review. If applicable, candidates may withdraw their applications at this time.
March – April		Executive Review in consultation with Chancellor.
April	early	President recommendation communicated to campus, followed by Chancellor or EVC notification to candidate whether a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees.
April	mid-month	Board of Trustees action, followed by candidate notification from the President.
April	3rd Friday	Reappointment recommendations due in Office of Academic Affairs, for tenure track faculty in second year and later, lecturers, and some senior lecturers.

Office of Academic Affairs, May, 2011. Dates may change from time to time. Current dates are available from the Office.