GUIDELINES AND PROCESSES FOR PROMOTION & TENURE

Revised by the IUSSW Promotion & Tenure Committee
and approved by the IUSSW Faculty Senate
May 2010
Beginning of Fall Semester:
Faculty member submits dossier to chair (or dean of units without departments, such as SLIS, SPEA).
The faculty member has the right to review all material in the dossier and add new materials to it at any point in the process.
The faculty member has the right to be informed of any negative recommendation and appeal before consideration of the case at the next level.

End of the Fall Semester:
Academic dean informs candidate of outcome of unit's evaluation and recommendation.

Mid-term Spring Semester:
Dean of the Faculties informs candidate of outcome of Campus recommendations (and advises candidate of their rights to appeal if outcome is negative).

End of Spring Semester:
Candidates are informed of positive tenure decisions.
SOURCES OF PROMOTION AND TENURE INFORMATION

Information about promotion and tenure can be found in the following documents:

- The Indiana University Handbook
  - http://www.indiana333na.edu/~deanfac/acadhbk/
- Policy on Three-Year Formative Review
  - http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/3-year-review.htm
- Documenting Excellence in Teaching
  - http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/documenting.doc
- Assessing Research Impact
  - http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/AssessingResearch.doc
- Building a Teaching Dossier for Tenure and Promotion
  - http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/Teaching_Dossier.doc
- Post Tenure Review
  - http://www.opd.iupui.edu/ftre/documentation.html#one
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The principle of peer review mandates a process of evaluation that assures that all candidates for promotion and tenure be judged in a fair and relevant manner. This would seem to suggest that such judgments can only be made equitably within the context of the realities that give form and substance to an individual's particular profession or academic discipline. In accordance with the recommendations of the *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*, the School of Social Work defines "scholarship" to include a range of activities that goes well beyond the traditional view of empirical research. Scholarship encompasses four separate but overlapping functions: "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching" (Boyer, 1990). This inclusive concept of scholarship is based on the assumption that all four of these functions are essential components of viable social work education, and as such, should be regarded with equal status. The intent is to affirm the distinctive contributions and talents of each faculty member in a manner that is uniquely suited to the mission of the School of Social Work.

The "scholarship of discovery" comes the closest to the traditional notion of research. It involves the production of new knowledge through a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods. It represents the process by which the body of knowledge that informs our professional practice is expanded and enriched.

The "scholarship of integration" provides the means by which knowledge is synthesized within and across professional and academic boundaries. It not only helps to overcome what some critics consider to be the reductionist tendency of theory driven research, but also provides a context within which new insights and meanings can be discovered via meta-analytical principles. Integration implies a multilateral approach to knowledge building which connects research to practice, practice to theory, and theory and practice to further research. It is reciprocal, convergent and synergistic in nature and provides the scaffolding to bridge the artificial boundaries created by specialization.

The "scholarship of application" is at the heart of professional social work practice. It operationalizes the driving imperative "to serve," rather than merely "to know." It goes beyond interpretation to implication. It requires the scholar to recast knowledge in functional or heuristic terms. Practice provides the crucible within which to test the efficacy of professional knowledge and connect theory to real-world problems. In addition, it provides a bottomless reservoir of experience to be investigated and synthesized through further discovery and integration.

---

Application of knowledge is the essence of professional education, and as such, is recognized as a legitimate form of scholarship.

All faculty are familiar with the "scholarship of teaching." For many, it represents the principal form of scholarship in which they engage on a regular basis. If the scholarship of application, or practice, represents the "heart" of the professional social work enterprise, then the scholarship of teaching provides the "life's blood" of the professional process. It constitutes the means by which the fruits of discovery, integration and application efforts are transmitted to a new generation of scholarly practitioners. As Boyer notes, "In the end, inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive. Almost all successful academics give credit to creative teachers - those mentors who defined their work so compellingly that it became, for them, a lifetime challenge."

Teaching is certainly not only the vehicle through which existing knowledge is transmitted to students, but it does provide the context within which critical thinking generates new ideas to be explored and debated in terms of their efficacy and implications for application to real world issues. As such, the spirit of inquiry that characterizes inspired research seems to originate from the same sense of wonderment and healthy skepticism that represents the hallmark of effective teaching.

While most academic institutions identify the general nature of the documentation that is to be considered as supporting evidence of an individual's application for promotion and/or tenure, rarely do they specify how the various forms of documentation are to be interpreted and applied in relation to any given unit, such as social work. Since the nature of academic units vary widely, it is reasonable to assume that the relative importance of different forms of supporting documentation should vary accordingly. For that reason, the School of Social Work has identified the specific kinds of documentation that it considers appropriate when qualitative judgments are being made regarding the relative merits of an individual's scholarly contributions (see Section VI, VII, and VIII in these Guidelines). It is also recognized that the nature of scholarship as manifested within professional schools (e.g., social work) should be judged somewhat differently than it is within the academic disciplines.

While the University community mandates that promotion and tenure be tied directly to a faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, research and service, it is assumed that each school or academic unit is free to define (within limits) how these areas can best be evaluated and/or weighted within the context of the specific culture and mission of the school or unit in question. While the criteria for judging the quality of scholarship are by no means entirely unique to each profession or discipline, there exist sufficient differences to justify the position that each school retains the right to identify and define whatever distinctions do in fact exist. This requires that the faculty within the School of Social Work identify the kinds of documentation it considers to be the most compelling evidence in support of the various forms of scholarship. In the final analysis, if scholarship is to be adequately assessed by peers, it must be presented in some tangible form capable of independent review.

The Academic Handbook requires that a candidate for promotion normally excel in at least one of the three traditional areas of teaching, research, or service, and be at least satisfactory in each of the other two, or “present a balance of highly satisfactory performance in all three areas sufficient to demonstrate comparable long-term benefits to the University.” It is incumbent upon
the candidate for promotion and/or tenure to identify the specific area(s) of scholarship in which she or he is claiming “excellence,” and to provide tangible evidence in support of the claims being made. The level of documentation varies in relation to the rank being sought. Normally, candidates applying for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they are well on the way to establishing an emerging national reputation. Candidates for Full Professor are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they have attained a national reputation.

In the School of Social Work, the faculty do not adhere to the a priori assumption that research conducted by an individual faculty member is in some way inherently superior to research endeavors of a collaborative nature. While individual efforts are highly valued, in some instances, collaborative research initiatives may well provide a context for the production of more substantive scholarly products. The intent is to encourage and reward the forms of scholarship that contribute most to the body of knowledge that informs professional practice, and in so doing, enable faculty to draw upon their strengths, while at the same time learn from the strengths of their colleagues.

The School concurs with Derek Bok (1990)\(^2\) who cautions that the political realities of a post-cold war global economy dictate that "faculty need to engage in new kinds of research and professional outreach ... All this implies new faculty roles ... working in teams, working on real-world problems, writing for publics beyond one's peers. As a corollary to this premise, Bok argues that universities would do well to pay special attention to the potential contributions of the "applied fields" such as social work. In this regard, it is the position of the School of Social Work that "applied or practice-sensitive research" be viewed of equal intellectual importance and rigor as its "basic research" counterpart.

Finally, it is recognized that there is no one model of a successful scholar. The faculty in the School of Social Work concur with the position articulated by Boyer who envisioned faculty differentially engaged in various forms of scholarship throughout the course of their academic careers. Boyer argued that most faculty members pursue their scholarly interests in a cyclical manner, typically engaging in the various forms of scholarship for varying lengths of time, emphasizing one form for a few years, and then moving on to another. Accordingly, decisions regarding promotion and tenure are considered within the context of a faculty member’s total professional career which recognizes that the nature and extent of any given type of scholarship is likely to vary depending upon the unique course of each individual’s professional development.

---

I. SYSTEM SCHOOL POLICY (This section under review)

When Promotion and Tenure is sought from a faculty member on a campus other than Indianapolis, the role, relationships, and responsibilities of the IUSSW P&T Committee is to be negotiated and resolved by the IUSSW Dean and the appropriate decision-making bodies on the relevant campus. Explicit agreement on the contents and format of the candidate’s dossier, and on all processes and timetables, must be specifically articulated in advance. Agreements for Third Year Reviews must be similarly articulated. While we encourage IUSSW faculty on all campuses to use these guidelines, they should also adhere to the P&T guidelines specific to their campus. If there is an existing Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between IUSSW and a campus other than Indianapolis, that MoU must be followed.

II. THIRD YEAR REVIEW

The purpose of the Third Year Review is for the candidate to present and evaluate their materials and for the Promotion and Tenure Committee to review the materials and identify what actions will help the candidate build a solid case for tenure and/or promotion. Based on the standards set by the school for promotion and tenure, the committee makes recommendations to the candidate about steps the candidate could take to improve his/her case. In order to help candidates be clear about expectations both at the School and at the All-Campus level, the Promotion and Tenure Committee uses an evaluation form that is comparable to the form used by the All-Campus committee. The evaluations of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or excellent in each area are based on what the committee believes is necessary to reach these standards at the time of tenure or promotion.

Documentation needed for the Third Year Review includes:

1. an updated and signed vitae using the IU format (see Section IX)
2. a five page personal statement addressing your accomplishments, your teaching philosophy, and your future goals
3. copies of publications and/or letters from journals acknowledging submission or acceptance
4. syllabi of all courses taught
5. a table showing your course evaluation scores
6. any unsolicited letters or emails from students or colleagues expressing appreciation
7. evidence of professional development to enhance teaching and research (this might be listed in the vitae or mentioned in the personal statement)
8. plans to enhance teaching and research over the next few years

See Section X for the Process and Responsibilities Related to Third Year Review (p. 25).
III. ACCEPTANCE OF NOMINATION & NOTIFICATION OF CANDIDACY

A. Promotion

Faculty members may be nominated for promotion in rank by one or more faculty colleagues, or they may nominate themselves. Whatever the form of nomination, however, as soon as possible after a faculty member has decided to pursue candidacy for promotion she or he should notify the Chair of the Indiana University School of Social Work Promotion and Tenure Committee of the candidacy. Notification of candidacy must be in writing and should be received no later than 5:00 P.M. on March 1 for the review to occur during the following year. Of course, nominations may be submitted at any time prior to that time.

The letter of candidacy should contain a statement indicating that he or she is a candidate for promotion. An area of excellence (i.e., teaching, service, or research/scholarship) should also be clearly indicated. Further details regarding the timing of various steps in the review process may be found in the Process and Responsibilities document (see Section X below). The candidate is reviewed at several levels: IUSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, campus specific Promotion and Tenure Committee, Campus and University administration, and IU Board of Trustees. Review at each level is based on the dossier submitted by the candidate, as described more fully in the rest of this document, supplemented by external letters of review (see Section V below) and by the cumulative reports of any prior review stages.

B. Tenure

Faculty members may become candidates for tenure through various routes. She or he may have reached the point for tenure evaluation as contracted during the hiring process. (Commonly, this would occur during the sixth academic year of employment.) Alternately, a faculty member may seek early tenure. Whatever the form of nomination, however, as soon as possible after a faculty member has decided to pursue candidacy for tenure she or he should notify the Chair of the Indiana University School of Social Work Promotion and Tenure Committee of the candidacy. Notification of candidacy must be in writing and should be received no later than 5:00 P.M. on March 1 for the review to occur during the following year. Of course, nominations may be submitted at any time prior to that time.

The letter of candidacy should contain a statement that she or he is a candidate for tenure. The area of excellence should also be clearly indicated. Further details regarding the timing of various steps in the review process may be found in the Process and Responsibilities Document appended to these Guidelines. The candidate is reviewed at several levels: IUSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee, Dean, local campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, Campus and University administration, and IU Board of Trustees.

3In 1993, the Faculty Council of Indiana University approved, as an alternate to this normal process, a “balanced case” approach to promotion. In the event of a "balanced case," the faculty member should specify that and go on to support “better than satisfactory performance” in each of the three areas (teaching, service, and research/scholarship).
Review at each level is based on the dossier submitted by the candidate, as described more fully in the rest of this document, supplemented by external letters of review (see Section V below) and by the cumulative reports of any prior review stages.

IV. PROMOTION AND TENURE DOSSIERS

A. Responsibility and Due Date

The preparation of promotion and tenure dossiers is the responsibility of the candidate. However, the Dean, Indiana University School of Social Work, provides newly employed faculty with copies of those documents that address applicable policies and procedures. The Promotion and Tenure Committee also disseminates information regarding current promotion and tenure policies and procedures, including guidelines and timetables. Candidates will find additional information about dossier preparation in the current IUPUI Guidelines prepared by the Dean of Faculties.

Because every university setting is unique in its approach to promotion and tenure, candidates may wish to consult senior members of the faculty for advice regarding the presentation of their materials. Because the function of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Indiana University School of Social Work is evaluation, the Committee Members are prohibited from giving advice concerning how best "to make one's case." The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, however, is charged with providing faculty with information concerning the format in which materials are to be presented, the process through which the evaluation occurs, and the criteria upon which it is based.

The P&T Committee provides an informational forum, ideally during the fall semester. Attendance of non-tenured faculty or faculty seeking promotion is strongly encouraged for optimizing the dossier and strengthening one’s case for tenure and promotion. The completed dossier should be submitted to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than 5:00 P.M. on the first day of classes for the Fall semester. This is necessary in order that the Promotion and Tenure Committee may carefully review the materials presented, prepare a recommendation report, and forward the candidate's portion of the dossier along with Committee's report to the Dean by mid-October.
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B. Organization of Materials

The candidate's promotion or tenure dossier should be organized as follows:

1. Section I: General Summary of Dossier Content. This section includes some material created by others, such as outside letters, reviews by relevant committees and administrators, a checklist and routing forms. The following materials should be prepared by the candidate for inclusion in this section:
   
i. A Table of Contents for the dossier.
   
   ii. A Curriculum Vitae that summarizes the professional experiences of the candidate with dates and a brief description of each position or activity that may not be apparent from the title. The Curriculum Vitae should be arranged in accordance with the Curriculum Vitae Format for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers as suggested by the IUPUI Dean of Faculties (this format is shown in Section IX of this document). The candidate should sign and date the Curriculum Vitae to attest that the material presented is an accurate summary of her or his professional life to date.
   
   iii. A brief (two or three sentence) statement of the expertise of each external letter writer (see Section V of these Guidelines below).

2. Section II: Personal Statement. The personal statement should begin with an introductory statement describing the candidacy (promotion to what rank and/or tenure, as appropriate), containing a clear indication of the candidate's chosen area(s) of excellence. The personal statement is where the candidate demonstrates how she or he meets school and university criteria for promotion and/or tenure. This very important part of the dossier is where the candidate “states her or his case” and refers to the evidence in the rest of the dossier that supports that case. The candidate is encouraged to write a well organized, concise narrative statement of no more than five single-spaced pages, with a minimum font of 10pt. Exceeding this limit requires appeal to and approval of the Committee.

   The personal statement should contain five sections: an introductory section; sections entitled evaluation of teaching, evaluation of research and scholarly activities, and evaluation of service; and a summary section. The introduction may contain a discussion about the candidate's professional philosophy or perhaps an elaboration about the candidate's area of excellence. The candidate should also mention any extenuating circumstances that may pertain to his or her candidacy. (For example, a candidate may have received some years toward tenure at Indiana University due to previous teaching experience as negotiated with the Dean at the time of employment.)

   The sections of the personal statement related to the areas of teaching, service, and research and scholarly activities should be as concise, specific, and pointed as possible in demonstrating how the candidate meets or exceeds school and university criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate should avoid meaningless or insignificant items that do not add to the case. She or he should,
however, mention everything that is necessary to show excellence in the area selected for excellence, and satisfactory performance in the other areas. The candidate should indicate where in the rest of the dossier the relevant evidence may be found.

In the summary section, candidates may wish to address their compatibility with the needs and mission of the school and university. The personal statement should be signed and dated by the candidate.

3. Core Evidence. Objective documentation of the candidate's activities and accomplishments is extremely important. Sections III, IV, and V of the dossier contain core evidence to support claims made in the personal statement regarding teaching, research and service, respectively. These sections are an integral part of the dossier and move forward through all levels of review. Any additional supporting materials should be placed in Appendices (discussed further in 4, below).

Each section of core evidence should be carefully organized. The candidate may include an introductory statement of no more than 2 pages in each section briefly describing the items of evidence included and explaining any contextual information necessary for the reader to interpret the evidence. Wherever feasible, the candidate should include self-evaluations of performance and incorporate the results of evaluation efforts by others. For example, within the evaluation of teaching section, statistical analyses of ratings on student evaluations during the period under review should be presented. As part of the process of preparing summary analyses of raw evaluation data, it is often helpful to ask a colleague to review the data and its analysis to ensure accuracy. Clearly presenting results of statistical analyses in numerical terms or in the form of graphical representations may help committee members better understand the relevance of evaluation statements made in the personal statement.

Section III: Evaluation of Teaching and Scholarship. Refer to the Guidelines, section VI regarding the criteria and sources of evidence to document teaching.

Section IV: Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, or Creative Activities. Refer to the Guidelines, section VII regarding the criteria and sources of evidence to document research and scholarship.

Section V: Evaluation of Service. Refer to the Guidelines, section VIII regarding the criteria and sources of evidence to document service.

4. Appendices contain additional material supporting the core evidence. Appendices are retained at the School level and do not go forward beyond that level (although these materials are available upon request to other levels). As with all other aspects of the dossier, the candidate is urged to limit appendix materials to those related to the criteria the candidate addresses in making her or his case for excellent or satisfactory performance.

A few examples may help clarify the distinction between core evidence and other materials. Consider a candidate whose claim to excellence rests in part on a few major publications discussed in the personal statement. Copies of select publications should be included as core evidence in Section III, IV, and V (depending upon whether the publications are relevant for teaching, research or
service claims, respectively) as described below. Copies of the candidate’s other publications should be included in an appendix. As another example, the candidate may include as core evidence selected letters from colleagues or others supporting a particular claim made in the personal statement; additional relevant letters may be placed in an appendix. As a final example, the candidate should present as core evidence a summary table or chart highlighting relevant aspects of student course/instructor evaluations; the appendix should contain the evaluation summary sheets from all courses taught. (Note that the candidate should not submit all raw evaluation forms, even in the appendix).

V. LETTERS OF EVALUATION

A. External Review Letters

An important aspect of the promotion or tenure processes is the evaluation of a candidate by credible, external reviewers. Because promotion or tenure requires at least a beginning national or international reputation, letters of evaluation should be sought, whenever possible, from professionals other than those at institutions where the faculty member has taught, where she or he received graduate education, or from coauthors. External reviewers are not to be former colleagues, co-workers, professors, or collaborators on research projects, books, book chapters, articles, or presentations. Letters of evaluation should be obtained from credible, objective external reviewers who are able to comment knowledgably upon the candidate’s designated area(s) of excellence. Any exceptions to this policy must be requested of and approved by the Committee.

By March 15, the candidate should supply names of ten persons who might be asked for letters of evaluation, along with a brief description of why these persons should be considered as reviewers. Other names may be suggested by members of the Promotion and Tenure committee or by other members of the faculty. When persons who have not been suggested by the candidate are solicited for evaluation letters the candidate will be notified by the Chair. The candidate may exclude specific nominees with reason. As described more fully in the Processes and Responsibilities document (appended to these Guidelines), the Promotion and Tenure Committee will select six persons to serve as external reviewers. Please note that the candidate does not directly solicit the evaluation letters. Rather, the Dean’s Office personally contacts referees.

By April 15, the candidate will prepare six packets of materials to be sent to the external reviewers. Packets of information generally include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, personal statement and core evidence (see these Guidelines, throughout, for definition and examples of core evidence), as available at that time.

As part of the dossier, the candidate must provide a brief summary description of the persons nominated to write external letters of evaluation in order to identify their area of expertise, status, and reputation in the professional community. The candidate will be provided copies of the reviewers’ curriculum vitae prior to the due date (see Section X). The external reviewers’ vitae cannot be substituted for the summary description.
All evaluation letters received as well as the letter used by the Dean to solicit them will be included in the completed promotion or tenure file when forwarded to the Dean. The candidate may have access to external reviewers’ letters by June 30th (see Section X).

B. Solicited Letters

1. In all cases where the candidate has declared teaching as an area of excellence, and optionally otherwise, a random sample of students will be selected to provide comments, as outlined further in Section X. To protect the confidentiality of the students and the integrity of the process, the candidate will not have access to these comments at any time.

2. The candidate may provide a list of other colleagues and professionals who are familiar with the candidate’s work and might be willing to write a letter of support. For candidates whose area of excellence is service, obtaining these letters is particularly important to document the candidate’s service achievements. The Dean will solicit these letters and include them in the candidate’s file. The candidate may have access to these solicited letters at any time.

VI. TEACHING

A. Description

Teaching is a scholarly function that is vital to this school. The candidate should make a special attempt to identify quantitative and qualitative teaching contributions. The collection of data on teaching as a scholarly endeavor and service requires considerable attention. The collection of such data should be ongoing. Areas of important information related to teaching include: teaching load; quality of teaching and courses; curriculum development efforts; participation in educational projects and programs; and advising and field liaison activities. In order to document teaching performance, the faculty member should keep detailed records of teaching activities. Those quantitative and qualitative aspects of teaching which the file reflects will serve to distinguish among excellent, satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance levels. Faculty members should therefore regularly update their teaching activities files in order to maintain a complete and current data base. The file, then, can serve as a basis for each tenure track faculty member's preparation of the annual reports for the dean and the promotion and tenure committee. The file also, of course, serves as an aid in the preparation of promotion and/or tenure dossiers.

B. Criteria

Since teaching is both a technology and an art, its excellence is not totally quantifiable nor can it be narrowly defined. The following broad guidelines are provided to assist faculty members in determining their readiness for promotion and tenure. The items below should guide faculty as examples of useful ways to document positive work in teaching, but should not be used as a checklist for which every item should be checked:

Satisfactory Performance (Required if teaching is not designated as the area of excellence.)
• Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes
• Teaching load (e.g., classroom, online, service-learning, field) is clearly documented and contextualized
• Evidence of development as a teacher (e.g., improvement in educational materials, approach, or effectiveness over time)
• Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness
• Mentoring or advising load is clearly documented and contextualized
• Evidence of student satisfaction (including but not limited to end-of-semester student learning/course evaluation surveys)
• Evidence of a satisfactory impact on student learning and achievement
• Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL
• Record of seeking development as a teacher, such as conference or workshop attendance, teaching experimentation, or reading on teaching
• Reflective commentary on candidate’s own teaching
• Peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth in teaching

**Highly Satisfactory Performance**

• Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction
• Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes
• Important impact and student achievement documented
• Evidence of regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and recognition of high quality of teaching
• Grants or awards at the department or campus level (For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence)
• High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers
• Positive peer assessment of the teaching experiments in the above category (For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence)
• Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues through mentoring, committee work, or other work

**Excellent Performance** (Required if teaching is designated as the area of excellence.)

As noted in the preamble, the level of documentation varies in relation to the rank being sought. Normally, candidates applying for tenure or for promotion to Associate Professor with teaching as an area of excellence are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they are well on the way to establishing an emerging national reputation for excellence in teaching. Candidates for Full Professor are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they have established such a national reputation. Typically, such a reputation is evidenced by publications related to teaching in highly regarded national journals, success in generating external funding related to teaching activities, participation in national conferences, hearings or review committees and by major invited presentations at a national level.

The following are required if teaching is designated as the area of excellence.
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- 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
- Evidence of the production of effective course and curricular products
- Evidence of dissemination of ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation or other means.
- Evidence of impact (that is, the work has been adopted by others locally, nationally or internationally)
- Evidence of a scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising
- Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of students, advisees, and mentees
- 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
- 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 awards for teaching or dissemination of scholarly teaching, or significant funding for teaching projects
- Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning
- Membership in communities of practice at the campus, national, or international level
- Evidence of contribution to, leadership in, and impact upon curriculum development and improvement
- Participation in dissemination of good practice
- Peer reviews of teaching and its impact (including but not limited to two or more peer reviews of teaching, at least one in advance of third-year reviews, if applicable, and another in advance of the submission of promotion or tenure dossiers; at least one of which must reflect excellence)

C. Evidence/Supporting Materials

Candidates’ dossiers must include documentary evidence to support claims of satisfactory or excellence in the area of teaching. Evidence may be submitted directly by the candidate or indirectly through, for example, peer evaluations and external reviews. In regard to teaching, evidence such as the following is included and organized in a coherent fashion such as presented in Table VI.A.1 below (see the most current IUPUI Dean of the Faculties Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for the most up-to-date placement recommendations).

D. Unusual Circumstances

If applicable, the candidate should communicate information regarding unusual circumstances (including illness, special workload assignments, problematic situations, etc.) affecting workload and performance.
## Table VI.C.1 DOCUMENTING TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Teaching Performance</th>
<th>Potential Placement in the Dossier</th>
<th>Section I: CV</th>
<th>Section II: Candidate's Statement</th>
<th>Section III: Statement contained in Evaluation of Teaching</th>
<th>Peer Review (may be part of Sections I-Dean, Chair Comment or III-internal and external peers)</th>
<th>Appendices or Supplemental Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching load</strong></td>
<td>List of courses, and nature (e.g., classroom, field, service learning, online) - Identify specific course titles and numbers, and the required or elective nature of courses - Provide numbers of students, advisees, mentees, interns, students in field or service learning, etc.</td>
<td>Details on students mentored, advised, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on relative size of load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching goals</strong></td>
<td>Goals and/or Teaching Philosophy</td>
<td>Expansion of explanation in statement, if desired</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on fit with university, campus, school, and program missions and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing professional development</strong></td>
<td>List of formal activities</td>
<td>Description of activities and their significance - Identify special activities that have contributed to teaching effectiveness. - Document attendance and participation in institutes, workshops, courses and programs. - Provide details of study, reading, or consultations and their significance to professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on efforts undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of exemplary teaching methods</strong></td>
<td>Description of methods</td>
<td>Details, on specific methods such as teaching with technology, use of PBL, service learning, or other innovative methods, inclusive teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of teaching</strong></td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
<td>Student rating summaries, peer reviews of teaching performance, and other evidence of quality include summaries and discuss the educational/instructional implications of the quantitative evaluative data presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
<td>- Include syllabi, bibliographies, exams, handouts, and other pertinent course or educational materials as appendices arranged by course number and semester in chronological order. - Provide student evaluations of the candidates teaching arranged by course and semester in chronological order for at least the past five years or time in rank, whichever is less. - Present tables summarizing and comparing at least three years of data from formalized teaching evaluations - Evidence of student satisfaction with advising, mentoring, service learning, internship, or field practicum experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of student learning</strong></td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
<td>Results of nationally normed tests, pre-post evaluations of course knowledge gains, analysis of student work, student/alumni reports, approach toward PUL's (for UG courses) or educational program goals, objectives, or competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Student report in letters</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local administrative and peer comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship of teaching and national leadership</strong></td>
<td>Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline</td>
<td>Descriptions of scholarly approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local or external peer review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course and curriculum development</strong></td>
<td>List of committees, etc.</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Details, commentary on CV entries</td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
<td>- Include documents or materials produced. - Show contributions to course development including innovations in and/or the improvement of instructional materials (textbooks, laboratory manuals, handouts used for guiding learning, audiovisual materials, etc.) and experimentation with different teaching methods and techniques. - Show contributions to curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition (grants, awards)</strong></td>
<td>List of recognitions</td>
<td>Can be mentioned</td>
<td>Details, commentary on CV entries, if needed to elaborate on the nature, relevance, and significance of various forms of recognition</td>
<td>Commentary on stature of awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

A. Description

As discussed in the Preamble to the Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure, “scholarship” may be thought of as falling into four general categories that are at once distinct, yet interdependent in nature: 1) the scholarship of discovery; 2) the scholarship of integration; 3) the scholarship of application; and 4) the scholarship of dissemination (teaching). The following section refers to all forms of scholarship and assumes that faculty will submit tangible documents in support of the various forms of scholarship cited in their promotion and tenure materials. It is essential that claims of “excellent” and “satisfactory” performance in the areas of teaching, research or service be accompanied by documentation that allows for peer review.

Social Work and Labor Studies are applied disciplines. Therefore, in the Indiana University School of Social Work, scholarly activity necessarily covers the gamut of knowledge building from recognition and definition of a condition or a problem through assessment of need, development and evaluation of interventions, to formal theory development, testing and application of theory. The development and testing of basic theory for the profession has high priority but valid and effective scholarship leading to demonstration and evaluation of a practice innovation or new data on the differential needs of specific groups or communities is also recognized as of great importance to the profession.

As indicated above, at the time the candidate formally notifies the promotion and tenure committee of her or his candidacy, all scholarly products prepared during the period upon which the case for promotion or tenure is based should be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Given the wide range of media available, candidates may submit copies of books, published or unpublished papers, grant proposals, audio-visual productions, computer programs, etc. However, evidence of scholarship must be submitted in a form which allows members of the review committees an opportunity to evaluate or to arrange for evaluation of the scholarly products.

B. Criteria

As is the case with teaching and service, research and scholarly production are not totally quantifiable. In social work and labor studies, research and scholarship cannot be narrowly defined. However, because the scholarly products themselves are available for review there exists a greater opportunity for objective evaluation. The following guidelines are provided to assist faculty members in determining their readiness for promotion and tenure in relation to research and scholarly activities. The items below should guide faculty as examples of useful ways to document positive work in teaching, but should not be used as a checklist for which every item should be checked:

**Satisfactory Performance** (required if research and scholarly activities is not designated as the area of excellence)

- Candidate has performed research that is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice or candidate has performed research as part of a
cross-disciplinary effort that highlights the contributions of the professional discipline in addressing challenging social problems

- Candidate has disseminated the results of research in scholarly journals and other appropriate venues; all scholarly products are readily accessible for review
- Research program is clearly articulated
- Evidence and results of attempts to secure internal grants and/or external support; proposals reflect scholarship and show potential for future success
- Evidence of the peer review of scholarly products
- Peer review of the nature and stature of journals and the significance of the candidate’s research publications
- Evidence of the candidate’s plans for continued research
- Evidence of at least local dissemination of scholarly production and research findings
- Evidence of recognized good practice in the area of research and scholarship
- In the School of Social Work, during the period of time under review, the candidate should average at least:
  - One publication of a peer reviewed journal article or acquisition of funded support every other year, and
  - A conference presentation of a peer reviewed paper or poster, a written report on unfunded research, submission of a grant proposal, or publication of a book chapter, monograph, etc. every other year.

Highly Satisfactory Performance

- Candidate’s research and scholarly production has attracted favorable peer reviews and comments that refer to quality and reflect strong evidence of potential for future productivity
- Candidate has secured internal grants and/or external support and provides evidence of continuing efforts to secure more
- Evidence of regular local and external peer review of research and scholarly production
- Evidence of regular and significant dissemination of scholarly production and research findings
- In the School of Social Work, during the period of time under review, the candidate should average at least:
  - One publication of a peer reviewed journal article or acquisition of funded support every other year, and
  - A conference presentation of a peer reviewed paper or poster, a written report on unfunded research, submission of a grant proposal, or publication of a book chapter, monograph, etc. every other year.

Excellent Performance

As noted in the preamble, the level of documentation varies in relation to the rank being sought. Normally, candidates applying for promotion to Associate Professor with research as an area of excellence are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they are well on the way to establishing an emerging national reputation for excellence in research. Candidates for Full Professor are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they have established such a national reputation. Typically, such a reputation is evidenced by publication in highly regarded national journals, membership on the
editorial boards of scholarly journals, success in generating external funding for one’s area of scholarship, participation in national conferences, hearings or review committees and by major invited presentations at a national level. The following are required if research is designated as the area of excellence.

- Evidence of significant research contributions to the knowledge in and impact upon 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 and scholarship
- Candidate has secured external support and makes significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support, including the degree to which evaluation processes were competitive
- Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations, grants, and publications
- Evidence of national and/or international recognition of and an emerging reputation for the high quality of work (for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor)
- Evidence of a national and/or international recognition of and an established reputation for the high quality of work (for promotion to the rank of Professor)
- Evidence of a program of scholarly activities that have contributed to the discipline’s knowledge base and improved the work of others
- Internal and external recognition of the stature and impact of the research and scholarly work
- In the School of Social Work, during the period of time under review, the candidate should average at least:
  - One publication of a peer reviewed journal article or acquisition of funded support every year; and
  - A conference presentation of a peer reviewed paper or poster, a written report on internally funded or unfunded research, submission of a grant proposal, or publication of a book chapter, monograph, etc. every year.

C. Evidence/Supporting Material

Candidates’ dossiers must include documentary evidence to support claims of satisfactory or excellence in the area of research. Evidence may be submitted directly by the candidate or indirectly through, for example, peer evaluations and external reviews. In regard to research and scholarly productivity, evidence such as the following is included and organized in a coherent fashion such as presented in Table VII.C.1 below (see the most current IUPUI Dean of the Faculties Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for the most up-to-date placement recommendations).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Section I: Chair’s Letter, Dean’s Letter, Primary and Unit Committee Reports</th>
<th>Section I: CV</th>
<th>Section II: Candidate’s Statement</th>
<th>Section III: Statement contained in Evaluation of Research</th>
<th>Peer Review (may be part of Sections I, Dean, Chair or III, internal and Appendices or Supplemental Materials)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three to five most significant publications or creative activities which reflect major research accomplishments</td>
<td>List all published works or scholarly products (e.g., grant proposals, software programs, DVDs, etc.) and indicate whether in rank and whether refereed</td>
<td>Description in personal statement may also note the most significant publications or creative activities</td>
<td>May contain a more thorough discussion of the most significant published research or creative activities and the status of the journals, other publications, or venues for creative activities</td>
<td>-Include professional texts or other books, or book chapters published by reputable publishers. -Include papers accepted by a refereed journal but not yet published together with evidence of their acceptance for publication. -Self-published works (e.g., monographs, manuals, etc.) may be included but should clearly be identified as such -If available in tangible form (e.g., print or other media), papers delivered at respected professional conferences or meetings may be included (indicate invited or refereed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Evaluation of stature of journals in which articles appear | Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature | May be an indication in CV (refereed v. non-refereed, name of publisher, age of journal title) | Candidate may also comment on a journal’s quality in the Candidate’s Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident | As above | External letters may also provide guidance on the stature of journals and other publications |

| Evaluation of stature of galleries where works appear or stature of performance venues | Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature | May be an indication in CV (stature of gallery or performing venue, city, potential size of audience) | Candidate may also comment on galleries in the Candidate’s Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident | As above | External letters may also provide guidance on the stature of galleries and performance venues |

| Research Expectations | As above: a letter often points out unusual circumstances related to work load | This may also be commented on in the personal statement (but seek confirmation from other documents in the dossier) | May be more detailed comments on this, particularly where load is considered heavy in school or department | Comment on fit with IUPUI and departments/school goals and quantity of effort |

| Research goals/program of research or creative activities | Letters from Chair and Dean may comment, as may committee reports (important for tenure, as the University is projecting candidate’s future contributions) | List of goals and candidate’s description of continuing program of research, scholarship or creative activities | May include a more thorough discussion of the research projects in progress and/or future research plans; may include listing of manuscripts or creative activities submitted for | Interpretation of candidate’s research or creative activities progress and future potential in external letters |

| Quality of research or creative activities | Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | CV | Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate’s Statement | Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate’s Statement | Experts in candidate’s field through letters solicited by chairs or deans |

| Assessment of contributions when more than one author or collaborator or performer | Departmental evaluation, committee reports | Listed in CV using citing conventions appropriate to the school/unit or discipline -When joint papers are referenced, the bibliographic references should include the authors’ names in the same order as in the original paper | An annotated bibliography in the CV can be helpful, with interpretive comments in the personal statement | Candidates may provide additional detail as to their own individual contributions to the effort (important to cross check against other documentation) | External and internal letters can indicate the stature of collaborators |

| Contributions to interdisciplinary research or creative activities | Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | CV may indicate which items are interdisciplinary | Candidate’s Statement may comment on how interdisciplinary work may have contributed to the candidate’s career and research goals | Candidate should highlight this as appropriate, since interdisciplinary research and creative activities are major goals of the campus | Evaluations by peers in research centers or other departments/schools may identify achievements in interdisciplinary research and creative activities. |

| Grants and awards | Committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | List of grants and awards (Accuracy in amounts and dates is very important.) | Explanation of most significant grants and awards is crucial. | May include a more thorough description of grants and awards, as well as information on grant applications in process where appropriate | External letters may reference grants and awards received |

| Stature of grants and other awards | Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Dean and Chair | May appear on CV (reputation of granting agency, national v. state or local reach of grant, constituents to be served) | Candidate's own assessment of the stature of grants and awards | Candidate's assessment of the significance of grants and awards and how they fit in an overall research plan may be more fully documented here | Experts in candidate’s field through letters solicited through school procedures |

| Continuing efforts to enhance research, scholarship and creative activities | Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean | CV | Reflective comments by candidate | Reflective comments by candidate | Experts in candidate’s field through letters solicited through school |

Guidelines and Processes for Promotion & Tenure
VIII. SERVICE

A. Description

In higher education three broad categories of activities have come to be labeled service. These include university service (committee or other governance activities internal to the school or university related to program development and institutional policy), professional or disciplinary service (committee, editorial, or other work for local, regional, national, or international professional or disciplinary associations), and community service (activities other than basic research and teaching involving direct relationships with groups external to the academic and professional communities).

The Indiana University School of Social Work is uniquely positioned, as a result of having a mission and philosophy which not only supports but expects its social work and labor studies faculty to be engaged in professional service, to provide leadership to the University. In an era where there is widespread public support for the University to contribute to the well-being of the broader community, the contributions made by the faculty in the area of service take on added significance in the overall assessment process.

B. Criteria

Service is not totally quantifiable nor can it be narrowly defined. Therefore, the following broad guidelines are provided to assist faculty members in determining their readiness for promotion and tenure. The items below should guide faculty as examples of useful ways to document positive work in teaching, but should not be used as a checklist for which every item should be checked:

Satisfactory Performance (required if service is not designated as the area of excellence) Minimal service expectations include acceptable service in at least one of the areas below.

- University Service (includes service to campus, school, and educational program)
  - Evidence that candidate fulfills routine, required, and expected school and program service functions in a satisfactory manner (e.g., active participation in faculty senate, school or educational program committees)

- Service to Profession or Discipline
  - Evidence that candidate fulfills routine, required, and expected service functions associated with the profession or discipline; and does so in a satisfactory manner

- Service to Community
  - Evidence that the candidate engages in professional or discipline related service in the community

Highly Satisfactory Performance

Minimal service expectations include acceptable service in at least two of the areas below.

- University Service (includes service to campus, school, and educational program)
  - Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance by Faculty Council; “wrote a policy that was approved by committee”) that is above and beyond what is “required or expected”

- Service to Profession or Discipline
  - Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants; “organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered”)
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• Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to discipline’s goals or organization’s mission, with independent evidence of significance, impact, role, and effective communication to others

• Service to Community
  o Accompanied by independent evidence of impact (e.g., “chaired a subcommittee of the board that accomplished X, Y, & Z”; “played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization”)
  o 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

Excellent Performance

Minimal service expectations include excellent performance in two of the areas below and highly satisfactory performance in one.

As noted in the preamble, the level of documentation varies in relation to the rank being sought. Normally, candidates applying for promotion to Associate Professor with service as an area of excellence are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they are well on the way to establishing an emerging national reputation for excellence in service. Candidates for Full Professor are expected to provide evidence to support a claim that they have established such a national reputation. Typically, such a reputation is evidenced by publications related to service in highly regarded national journals, service leadership beyond the local level, participation in national conferences, hearings or review committees and by major invited presentations at a national level. The following are required if service is designated as the area of excellence. University Service may include service to the university, campus, school, and educational program.

• Service to the University
  o Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work
  o Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received
  o Evidence of the impact of one’s university service (e.g., adoption of a policy, revision of a program, procedure, or process, etc.)

• Service to Profession or Discipline
  o Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work
  o Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received
  o Evidence of the impact of one’s professional or disciplinary service (e.g., adoption of a policy, revision of a program, procedure, or process, etc.)

• Service to Community
  o Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work
  o Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received
  o Evidence of the impact of one’s community service (e.g., adoption of a policy, revision of a program, procedure, or process, etc.)

C. Evidence/Supporting Materials

Candidates’ dossiers must include documentary evidence to support claims of satisfactory or excellence in the area of service. Evidence may be submitted directly by the candidate or indirectly through, for example, peer evaluations and external reviews. In regard to service, evidence such as the following is
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included and organized in a coherent fashion such as presented in Table VIII. C.1 below (see the most current IUPUI Dean of the Faculties Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure for the most up-to-date placement recommendations)
### TABLE VIII.C.1 DOCUMENTING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Section I: CV</th>
<th>Section I: Internal Supporting Letters &amp; Reports</th>
<th>Section II: Candidate’s Statement</th>
<th>Section III: Evaluation of Professional Service</th>
<th>External Peer Review</th>
<th>Appendices or Supplemental Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory University Service*</td>
<td>List of university service</td>
<td>Evidence (e.g., assigned responsibilities context, role, growth, impact) and basis for judging it satisfactory</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals as well as evidence of impact</td>
<td>Annotation of roles, contributions, and impact</td>
<td>External letters evaluate the achievement evident in the products of service.</td>
<td>-Letters of recommendation from committee chairs, deans, or other administrators in the University. -Letters of acknowledgment or recommendation from groups, offices, or agencies in the private or public sector. -Letters of acknowledgment or recommendation from alumni or students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance and impact of professional service</td>
<td>List of community, disciplinary/professional, and university service</td>
<td>Assessment of significance and impact to the context of the unit or campus mission</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals and evidence of impact</td>
<td>Evidence of impact on constituencies and intellectual contribution from and to the discipline or profession</td>
<td>External letters evaluate the adequacy of the evidence</td>
<td>-Announcements of honors or awards received for service. -Announcements of grants received for the development or implementation of service activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of activity and individual’s responsibility</td>
<td>List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer)</td>
<td>Evidence of candidate’s contribution</td>
<td>Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and contributions</td>
<td>Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and intellectual contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Logs of student recruiting, counseling and advising. -Records of advising student organizations. -Programs or announcements of organized colloquia, seminars, continuing education programs, conferences, workshops or special events. -Records of public relations activities with accrediting agencies, trustees, news media, legislative bodies or representatives. -Records of consultations with various organizations and the benefits to the University which accrued from such activity. -Documents indicating leadership in professional societies. -Documents indicating editorship of professional journals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and leadership</td>
<td>List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer)</td>
<td>Evidence of leadership</td>
<td>Self-assessment of growth and leadership</td>
<td>Annotation of specific roles, responsibilities, intellectual contributions</td>
<td>Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications related to service</td>
<td>List of refereed publications and non-refereed publications</td>
<td>Assessment of significance to the discipline, constituencies, and mission</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals</td>
<td>Annotation on significance as intellectual work</td>
<td>Comments on this criterion within letters from external reviewers</td>
<td>-Documents indicating service as a reviewer or editor for a manuscript, newsletter, or textbook. -Copies of reports of school or university committees. -Records of activities and accomplishments as a result of administrative assignments, such as chair or coordinator. -Copies of publications produced as a result of one’s service (describe nature and extent of contribution) including school or university bulletins, brochures, as well as grant proposals. -Copies of public statements or testimonies given in areas of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of results of service</td>
<td>List of presentations, workshops, and reports</td>
<td>Assessment of significance to the discipline or profession</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals</td>
<td>Annotation of nature of dissemination as appropriate and effective</td>
<td>Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The IUPUI Dean of the Faculties’ Guidelines states that “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.”
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IX. CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

FOR TENURE, APPOINTMENT CONTRACT, AND PROMOTION DOSSIERS

NAME: ________________________________________________________________
(Last) (First) (Initial)

EDUCATION (include institution, degree, and year):
UNDERGRADUATE: _____________________________________________
GRADUATE: _______________________________________________________
POST DOCTORAL: ________________________________________________

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (inclusive dates):

OTHER APPOINTMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTSHIPS (including other remunerated employment):

LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION:

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (including offices held and committee memberships):

HONORS AND AWARDS (teaching, service, and research recognitions should be included here, but not grants and fellowships):

TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS:
List the course number, short title, term, and enrollment for each course taught since appointment or last advancement. Indicate your role in team-taught courses, postgraduate and continuing education courses, clinical teaching, senior electives, and other courses. Include hours, enrollment, and exact type of student contact, i.e., lecture, laboratory, conference, supervision, etc. Indicate number of months spent as an attending, on the consulting service, in outpatient clinics, etc. Estimate time spent training fellows.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE:
Distinguish carefully between University and professional service and record professional service activities that advance the discipline or interdisciplinary field of inquiry as intellectual work.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE:
List committee, administrative, and other University service since appointment or last advancement.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:
Record professional activities in current rank that you consider significant that are directly related to your work as a faculty member, and which are not covered elsewhere in curriculum vitae, including international activities not listed elsewhere. This section can be used to detail presentations that are not
listed in other categories. They should be annotated to include information on audience and place of presentation, as well as date and title, co-presenters, if any, and whether the presentation was invited or made following a peer review process. Please do not include voluntary service in this section, no matter how significant or important to the civic community.

GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS:
Indicate the name of the granting agency, title of the project, amount, and duration of all grants and fellowships received. Your role in grants must be clearly indicated (principal investigator, research associate, part of program project or center, etc.).

PRINT AND ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS:
Divide publications or creative works into one of three areas: (I) teaching, (II) research or creative activity, or (III) professional service. When work involves integration of two or more aspects of faculty work, it should be placed in one area, with a notation such as (T), (R), or (S) preceding it to indicate that it belongs in multiple categories. List publications only once, even if a publication might be applicable to more than one area. Authors should be listed as they appear in the publication. Refereed and non-refereed works should be noted by separating works into distinct categories within each of the three areas. Publications should be numbered sequentially within each of the three sections. If available, please include the Pub Med citation number assigned by the publisher.

Entries should be listed chronologically with the most recent listed last. The exact status of each publication should be noted if the status is ambiguous. For example, unpublished articles that have been officially accepted by an editor or publisher should be identified as "in press." Articles that have been submitted for editorial review, but have not been accepted or have been accepted subject to revision, should be identified as "submitted" or "under editorial review." Work in preparation should not be listed in the vitae. Projected work or work in preparation should be reported in the candidate’s statement.

Software, multimedia presentations, films or videos, and other scholarly or creative works designed for electronic technologies should be similarly listed in one of the three categories and be designated as refereed or not. If additional explanatory information would be helpful to reviewers, this information should be provided in an appendix to the dossier. IUPUI recognizes and encourages electronic publication, but care must be taken to identify and explain the venue and to explain what procedures for peer review are in place. Electronic publication should reflect the same quality and standards as print publication.

Similarly, interdisciplinary work that appears in journals or other publication forms that may not be traditional should be listed in one of the three categories and designated as refereed or not. Additional explanatory information may be provided in an appendix to the dossier. Such work is encouraged by IUPUI, and it should be fully described to ensure that it is appreciated as peer reviewed and valuable.

NOTE: As a part of the dossier preparation, department chairs (deans where applicable) should provide an assessment of each journal, press, or other medium of publication. This requirement applies to electronic media and to interdisciplinary media. See the statement of chair’s responsibilities.

(Date) ____________________________________________ (Signature of Candidate)
X. PROCESS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. PROCESS AND RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO THIRD YEAR REVIEW

1. In September of the candidates’ third year, the Dean will tell the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee who will be doing a third year review during the spring semester. The chair will give each candidate the third year review schedule.

2. Faculty whose promotion and tenure decisions are made on campuses other than IUPUI can request that the IU School of Social Work and Tenure Committee do a third year review. This review is strongly recommended. Any faculty member wishing such a review should notify the chair of the IUSSW Promotion and Tenure Committee by no later than December 1 of their third year.

3. The third year dossier is due on March 1, during the spring semester of the candidate’s third year. The dossier should be turned into the Office of the Dean. The third year dossier should include the following four things: a curriculum vita prepared using the standard Curriculum Vita format as it appears in the Red Book, a narrative discussing teaching, service and research and identifying the area of excellence, a copy of all publications, and plans related to teaching, service, and professional development for the next two years. It is recommended that all materials be organized and indexed in one two inch binder and that the narrative be no longer than five pages. Products referenced in the narrative such as peer review summaries, reports of creative teaching practices, etc. should be included. The emphasis should be on work done since coming to the School. Besides the binder, candidates should include four copies of their vita and narrative.

4. The third year dossier will be turned into the Office of the Dean who will stamp the time and date on the materials and then file the material. The dossier will be reviewed to assure that the following materials are in the notebook: a curriculum vita, a statement on teaching, research, and service, copies of all publications, and plans for the next two years. The Office of the Dean will arrange for appropriate, secure, confidential storage of the dossiers during the review process.

5. The promotion and tenure committee report will be completed by no later than April 15. It will be given to the Office of the Dean where it will be held in a secure location until all promotion and tenure committee members have signed it. A copy of the signed report will be given to the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, to the Dean, and to the candidate.

6. The Dean will also provide a written assessment of the candidate’s third year review dossier.

7. The candidate will be invited to meet with the promotion and tenure committee to discuss the report. Ideally, this meeting will take place by the end of the spring semester.

8. All deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be confidential.

9. Observing this schedule assures that the Promotion and Tenure Committee will have adequate time to review each dossier and the candidate will have time to complete the work necessary to be successful at the time of promotion and/or tenure. Any variation to this schedule must be requested in writing at least one week before the deadline. These written requests should be sent to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
B. PROCESS AND RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO PROMOTION AND TENURE

1. The Eligible Candidate Reports from the Faculty Records Office will be forwarded from the Dean to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee by January 15. If any of these dates falls on a weekend, the materials will be due at 5:00 pm on the following Monday.

2. By no later than February 1, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will inform the candidates of the promotion and tenure schedule.

3. Candidates will send written notification of their intention to stand for promotion and/or tenure to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee by no later than March 1 in the year when the dossier will be turned in. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will give the Dean a list of people who intend to stand for promotion and/or tenure by no later than March 7.

4. Each candidate will develop a list of ten possible external reviewers. For each possible external reviewer the candidate will identify why this person would be qualified to review the materials, what relationship the candidate has to the external reviewer, and the name, address, phone number, and e-mail address of the possible reviewer. This list will be turned in to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than March 15. Although the Promotion and Tenure Committee will consider the names suggested by the candidate as external reviewers, the committee reserves the right to select other people.

5. By April 1, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will give each candidate a list of the five external reviewers who will be evaluating their materials.

6. All Promotion and Tenure materials will be turned in to the Office of the Dean who will stamp the time and date on the materials and then file the material. Office of the Dean refers to the person or persons designated by the dean to manage certain aspects of the promotion and tenure process.

7. Each candidate will prepare six packets of materials to be sent to the external reviewers. Packets of information generally include the candidate’s curriculum vitae, personal statement and core evidence (see Guidelines, throughout, for definition and examples of core evidence), as available at that time. These packets will be turned in to the Office of the Dean no later than April 15.
8. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will contact external reviewers to confirm their willingness to do a letter of evaluation. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will give the Dean a list of external reviewers for each candidate. The Dean will write a letter that will accompany each packet of information. This letter will explain our promotion and tenure guidelines, identify the candidate’s area of excellence, request a letter evaluating the candidate, ask for a copy of the external reviewer’s resume or curriculum vita, and remind the external reviewer that their letter must be sent back by June 1. Letters and packets of material will be sent out by the Office of the Dean by May 1. When the evaluation letters are returned, the original and four copies will be filed in the appropriate candidate’s file by the Office of the Dean. The Office of the Dean will notify the Dean of any letters that have not been received by June 10. By June 30, either a reminder letter or telephone call will be made by the Dean to any external reviewers who have not sent an evaluation letter and resume or curriculum vita.

9. One copy of each resume or curriculum vita from the external reviewers will be made by the Office of the Dean. The original curriculum vita will be filed with the rest of the candidate’s material in a separate file identified as curriculum vitae related to (name of the candidate). The copies of the curriculum vitae for external reviewers related to each candidate will be sent to the appropriate candidate by the Office of the Dean no later than August 1.

10. Each candidate will use the curriculum vita of their external reviewers to write a paragraph description of each external reviewer. In this paragraph it will be important for the candidate to describe and document the external reviewer’s area of expertise. An original and three copies of this summary will be turned in to the Office of the Dean by September 15. These summaries will be filed by the Office of the Dean in each of the candidate’s general summary files. The summary should be placed immediately in front of the letters from the external reviewers.

11. By May 1, each candidate whose area of excellence is teaching will give the Office of the Dean a copy of class rosters from the last five years. For candidates whose area of excellence is research or service or who are presenting a balanced case, submitting class rosters is optional. By June 1, the Dean will write a letter to students soliciting either letters of support or completion of an evaluation form. This evaluation form will be developed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Some system of random selection will be used to decide which fifty students should be asked for letters. When the letters are sent in, they will be filed by the Office of the Dean along with other material related to the candidate in a file titled letters of support from students for (name of the candidate). Note: to protect the confidentiality of the students and the integrity of the process, candidates will not have access to these individual letters or surveys.

12. By May 15, each candidate will give the Office of the Dean a list of colleagues and professionals who are familiar with the candidate’s work and might be willing to write a letter of support. For candidates whose area of excellence is service, obtaining these letters is particularly important to document the candidate’s service achievements. By May 30, the Dean will write a letter asking these people for letters of support to be returned by July 15. When the letters are sent in, they will be filed by the Office of the
Dean along with other material related to the candidate in a file titled solicited letters of support for (name of the candidate). Note: candidates may have access to these solicited letters of support at any time upon request.

13. The full dossier is due the **first day of classes for the fall semester**. The dossier should be turned in to the Office of the Dean. The dossier material will include four general summary files organized in the following order: Tenure and Promotion Checklist (complete top four lines only), Routing and Action Sheet, curriculum vita, statement on teaching, research, and service, and a description of each journal in which his/her publications appear. This description should include such information as a general statement of the purpose of the journal, its total circulation, and its intended audience. One copy of all the supportive material is adequate. Supportive material should be organized in file folders or notebooks which will fit in a file cabinet.

14. The **Office of the Dean** will arrange for appropriate, secure, confidential storage of the dossiers during the review process. The full dossier will be placed in a locked file cabinet by the Office of the Dean. Until October 15, members of the promotion and tenure committee will have priority access to the dossier material.

15. When the full dossier is turned in to the Office of the Dean, it will be reviewed to assure that four copies of the following materials are in the file: Tenure and Promotion Checklist (complete top four lines only), Routing and Action Sheet, curriculum vita, statement on teaching, research, and service, and a description of each journal in which his/her publications appear. **By one week after the first day of fall classes**, a checklist letter will be sent by the Office of the Dean indicating which materials have been received. A copy of this letter will be sent to the candidate and to the Chair of the Committee.

16. By **September 15**, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will tell each candidate about any materials added or deleted from the dossier that will be sent forward to the campus committee and ask the candidate to sign off on the routing sheets. By no later than **October 15**, the Chair will give the Dean four copies of the candidate’s routing sheet. The **Office of the Dean** will put a copy of the routing sheet at the front of each candidate’s general file immediately following the Tenure and Promotion Checklist.

17. The **promotion and tenure committee report** will be completed by no later than **October 15**. It will be given to the **Dean** where it will be held in a secure location until all promotion and tenure committee members have signed it. Five copies of the report will be made by the **Office of the Dean**. The original and three copies will be placed in the beginning of the appropriate candidate’s file immediately following the routing sheet. A copy of the signed report will be given to the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair. A copy of the Promotion and Tenure report will be given to the candidate no later than **October 15**.
18. When the Dean’s report is completed, five copies of the report will be made. The original and three copies will be placed in the candidate’s files by the Office of the Dean. This report goes in front of the Promotion and Tenure report. The Dean will inform the Promotion and Tenure Chair that the files are complete. The Promotion and Tenure Chair will give the Dean the completed Promotion and Tenure checklists. These will be placed in each appropriate file. The checklist is the first item in the file followed by the routing sheet. One copy of the Dean’s report will be given to the candidate before it is submitted to Faculty Records.

19. The Office of the Dean will send three completed general files on each candidate to the Faculty Records Office for the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee. The fourth copy of the file will be kept with other promotion and tenure reports in a locked file cabinet. All other materials from each candidate will also be kept in a locked file cabinet until the all-campus promotion and tenure review is completed; at that time the supporting materials will be returned to each candidate.

20. All deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be confidential.

21. Observing this schedule assures that the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean will have adequate time to process each application. In the case of extenuating circumstances, a candidate may request in writing an extension of a deadline. These written requests should be sent to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

22. If deadlines are not met by the candidate, the Promotion and Tenure Committee has the authority to not act on the candidate’s application.