

All tenure and promotions dossiers should be divided into the following five sections:

- I. General summary
- II. External letters
- III. Substantiation of teaching contributions
- IV. Substantiation of contributions to research/creative activity
- V. Substantiation of service contributions

I. General Summary

The initiating unit should ascertain that the dossier contains the following:

- 1) Signature Sheet (See Appendix A).
- 2) A copy of the unit and School criteria used to evaluate the candidate.
- 3) The chairperson's evaluation and personal recommendation concerning the candidate's teaching, research/creative activities, and service. **The basis for the case should be carefully considered at this level and communicated to the unit head prior to the solicitation of external reviews to assure that referees address the area(s) of excellence specifically. The candidate and the department must be in agreement concerning the area(s) of excellence.**
- 4) The departmental evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research/creative activities, and service, and the departmental recommendation to include a tally of the specific votes and any individual statements submitted by members of the personnel committee.
- 5) The candidate's CV.
- 6) The candidate's own statements about teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The candidate's statement may include excerpts from progress or final reports submitted to funding agencies as supplemental descriptions of the candidate's current and future research endeavors.
- 7) A list of all publications **noting, in the left-hand margin, whether the publication was evaluated as evidence of teaching, research/creative activities, or service.** For promotions from Associate Professor to Professor, all items on this list which were used in the previous promotion review process should be clearly identified.
- 8) An assessment by the department or school of the extent of candidate's contribution to works with more than one author.
- 9) Tenure and Promotion Dossier Checklist (See Appendix B).

The Dean of the School or College is responsible for *adding* the following to the dossier:

- 1) The School or College Committee's recommendation (including a report of exact votes) and the Committee's evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research/creative activities, and service.
- 2) The Dean's personal recommendation and a summary evaluation of the candidate's teaching, research/creative activities, and service.

A signature sheet should be placed in the front of the dossier to be signed by each level, recording specific votes to include absences and abstentions and identifying whether or not the candidate is recommended for promotion and/or tenure (See Appendix A).

A copy of the unit and School criteria used to evaluate the candidate should appear in the general section of the dossier so that there is no misunderstanding concerning the criteria used by the evaluators at each level.

The promotion and tenure checklist should be completed by the person who prepares the dossier with the original being placed in the dossier and a copy given to the candidate.

All statements from individuals and from committees must identify the area judged to be excellent. A general assessment of the criteria (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, very good, excellent) should be included and the rationale or the basis for the assessment by referring to the evidence presented in the other sections of the dossier. University policy requires that each candidate should normally excel in at least one area and be at least satisfactory in each of the other two. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present

evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university over time. In all cases the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. Tenure, while based on evidence of accomplishments to date, is also based on the candidate's promise of future accomplishments.

Annual Reviews should not be included in the dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate. These reviews represent private communications between the individual faculty member and the closest supervisor, and should remain private.

II. External Letters

- 1) A list of external referees supplied by the candidate with statements **describing why each individual was proposed as a referee and the relationship of that person to the candidate.**
- 2) A list of external referees compiled independently by the chairperson or department/school committee with statements **describing why each individual was proposed as a referee and the relationship of that person to the candidate.**
- 3) A list of external referees to whom the Dean or Unit Head sent letters soliciting outside evaluations and a sample copy of the letter. An explanation should be provided for any referee who declined to write and a list of those solicited who did not respond to the request to evaluate the candidate.

Each School Dean or Unit Head will request the letters from the external referees, selecting names from each of the lists submitted. Because the quality of the candidate's scholarly contribution is evaluated, most of the external referees should have university affiliations. Those who are not affiliated with a university should be selected because their position qualifies them to provide a perspective that is relevant to the candidate's work, and their qualifications as a referee should be explained. All letters requesting outside evaluations should be accompanied by a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, a copy of the unit and School criteria, and an adequate and appropriate selection of publications or other materials relevant to area(s) of excellence agreed to by the chair and candidate to be evaluated by the referees. Letters of evaluation provide an important external perspective on the candidate's reputation and impact on his/her discipline. External referees must be asked to comment specifically on the area(s) identified as the primary basis for tenure and/or promotion. They should also be asked to comment on the overall impact of the candidate's work in the discipline or profession.

III. Substantiation of Teaching Contributions

This section of the dossier should contain evidence of the impact of the candidate's teaching and teaching related activities. This section should include:

- 1) A list of all the specific courses taught, enrollments and grade distributions listed by semester and academic year.
- 2) The numbers of Ph.D., M.A., and other research committees chaired or served on, names of student advisees and the titles of any dissertations directed, listed by academic year.
- 3) Copies of pedagogical books, articles, chapters, and reviews as evidence of national exposure as a scholar of teaching and learning.
- 4) Evidence of the quantity and quality of classroom teaching, (e.g., syllabi of selected courses to illustrate the variety of courses taught, as well as efforts as course development and improvement; summaries of standardized quantitative student course evaluations (such as prepared by BEST) and transcribed student comments; course portfolios; evidence of student learning outcomes).
- 5) Evidence of the quantity and quality of peer instruction (e.g., workshops, lectures, curricula disseminated, including peer evaluations of presentations and materials).
- 6) Evidence of teaching leadership and recognition (e.g., competitive grants, awards, invited presentations).
- 7) Solicited and unsolicited letters and e-mail from students, colleagues, and professional groups that reveal the influence of the candidates teaching.
- 8) (For tenure) Written evidence of pedagogical work-in-progress.

Developmental work on programs and curricula is sometimes difficult to classify as evidence of teaching or as evidence of research. Generally, pedagogical publications are considered as research only where the work has a conceptual/theoretical orientation and there is evidence that the efficacy of the pedagogy has been systematically studied and evaluated. Course outlines or program plans and similar material, which may represent many hours of creative work, may be included as evidence of teaching quality. These efforts, and other activities in class preparation, bear upon the candidate's teaching performance and its assessment. However, this kind of information must be organized in ways that allow committee members to see how these data support assertions that there are unique skills demonstrated by the candidate, and the ultimate effectiveness or impact of the pedagogical efforts.

Innovative efforts, which may sometimes include unsuccessful approaches, should also be described. It is imperative that all data are presented in an organized way. Note that raw data, (e.g., scanned sheets from BEST) should not be included in the dossier but should be retained by the academic unit and **must** be available upon request. Summaries of quantitative and qualitative evaluations should provide evidence of accomplishments at varied levels of teaching. Graphs are a particularly effective way to illustrate trends across semesters. Examples of other evidence include write-ups of student exit interviews and letters or notes from present or former students solicited by and/or written to someone other than the candidate. Other supporting materials may include textbooks, monographs, articles on teaching, CD ROMs, and videos. However, it is important to remember that committee members outside a candidate's own unit will not necessarily have access to the equipment needed to review digital or A/V materials. Therefore, it is important to represent critical evidence in a paper format within the dossier.

Evaluations by colleagues based on first-hand observations and any and all evidence that the candidate has a reputation beyond this campus are of particular significance. These are particularly effective when repeated classroom observations allow colleagues to comment on an instructor's growth and improvement through time. A reputation beyond the campus is especially important in cases where teaching is defined as the area of excellence, and external referees must be asked to evaluate teaching in addition to research/creative activities and service. Any other available and relevant evidence on the *quality* of teaching should be included.

It should be kept in mind that the primary purpose of the evidence presented in this portion of the dossier is to document the breadth and especially the quality of the teaching.

III. Substantiation of Contributions to Research/Creative Activities

- 1) A list of the candidate's research/creative publications. For promotions from Associate Professor to Professor, this list should identify which items were used in the previous promotion review process.
- 2) Reprints of all published and in-press journal articles, research book chapters, books published, manuscripts in press, and manuscripts in draft.
- 3) Reviews of books at any stage; commentary on journal articles.
- 4) Reviews of creative works (include level of distribution, as in local, regional, national, international publications). Number of citations and the significance may also be included, if considered appropriate for the discipline.
- 5) Departmental or school evaluations of the reputation of the journals in which the publications appear, the stature of the museums showing creative work, and so forth.
- 6) List of current grants, (funded and unfunded) including cover pages and abstract, and copies of interim reports to funding agencies.
- 7) Evidence of research leadership and recognition, such as awards and honors, and invitations from prestigious organizations for research lectures/activity.

Tenure dossiers should present an assessment of the impact of the dissertation research and all post-terminal degree research and creative activities; promotion dossiers should contain an assessment of work done in rank at Indiana University and elsewhere.

The current status of each publication should be noted. For example, 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 also be labeled appropriately. Normally work in preparation will be of little relevance in the promotion process, but may be relevant to the tenure decision which involves promise of future accomplishments.

V. Substantiation of Service Contributions

This portion of the dossier should contain:

- 1) A list of the candidate’s service activities at each level: department, school, campus, community, discipline/profession. Include workshops, clinics, presentations and panels, conferences organized and coordinated, editorial work, public policy assignments, committees, offices held and other significant activities.
- 2) A list of the candidate’s service-related publications.
- 3) Evaluation of the quality of the candidate’s service activities by the chairperson and by professional colleagues at IU, or by associates in the service activity, e.g., conference participant’s evaluations of activities.
- 4) Copies of service-related committee reports and other relevant documents to illustrate the quality and impact of the service contributions or professional leadership provided by the candidate.

Service activities may be rendered to the department, to the University, to professional organizations, to community or governmental bodies, or to other similar institutions. Service may occur at local, state, or national levels. Where service is presented as the area of excellence, evaluations from colleagues and associates in the service activity are of particular importance. These evaluations or other assessments must indicate the contributions and responsibilities of the individual candidate to the service activity, and demonstrate either a breadth of significant contributions or exceptional quality in specific areas of endeavor.

Appendix A

**BLOOMINGTON FACULTY AND LIBRARIANS
ROUTING AND ACTION FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW**

RECOMMENDATIONS (If not applicable, write N/A in the appropriate section):

Name: _____ Department: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Absent _____ Abstentions _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Absent _____ Abstentions _____ Basis

Chairperson: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis

School/COAS Committee: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Absent _____ Abstentions _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Absent _____ Abstentions _____ Basis

Dean: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis

Campus Advisory Committee: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Absent _____ Abstentions _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Absent _____ Abstentions _____ Basis

Vice Provost: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis

Provost: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis

Executive: _____ Date: _____

Promotion: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis
Tenure: _____ Yes _____ No _____ Basis

* School and unit recommendations must include a written evaluation of the candidates teaching, research/creative activities, and service.

Appendix B

Promotion and Tenure Dossier Checklist (for Initiating Unit)

3/09

Candidate _____ Department _____

General:

- Signature Sheet.
- Copy of unit and School criteria used to evaluate the candidate.
- Chairperson's personal recommendation and a summary evaluation of teaching, research/creative activities, and service.
- Departmental recommendation (report of exact votes or separate memos from colleagues). Departmental evaluation of teaching, research or creative activities, and service.
- Candidate's CV
- Candidate's own statement on teaching, research or creative activities, and service. (Optional for promotion dossiers, but strongly recommended.)
- A minimum of six outside evaluations to be secured by Dean or Chairperson.
- Copy of list of referees supplied by candidate.
- Copy of list of referees supplied by chairperson or Department/School committee.
- Copy of referees selected to write and those who did not respond.

Teaching:

- Courses taught each semester, number enrolled. Number of Ph.D./M.A. committees chaired or served on.
- Titles (and abstracts where relevant) of any dissertations directed.
- Copies of any textbooks written.
- Evidence of any curricula development.
- Evidence of quality of teaching.
- Evaluation by students.
- Summary of student evaluation forms and transcription of comments from forms.
- Write-ups of student interviews done by unit.
- Letters from former students (solicited by and written to someone other than the candidate).
- Evaluation by colleagues, preferably first-hand (e.g., team teaching, symposia, visitation by colleagues).

Research:

- IU colleague evaluation of research or creative activities.
- Departmental evaluation of stature of (1) journals in which publications appear or (2) museums in which showings have been presented, performances, and so forth.
- Departmental assessment of the contribution made by candidate to co-authored or collaborative work.
- Copies of pedagogically relevant publications.
- Copies of professionally relevant publications
and/or
- Copies of creative work, reviews of creative performances and exhibitions
and/or
- Copies of research papers and development projects.
- Documentation of grants obtained and applied for.

Service:

- Summary of activities (Departmental or other University service; local, state, or national service; professional or other).
- Evaluation by chairperson of the quality as well as the quantity of service.
- Evaluation by professional colleagues (or other knowledgeable individuals) of the quality and impact of the service activities.

I have given a completed copy of this checklist to the candidate and included a copy in the dossier.

(Signature of Preparer)

(Date)

SAMPLE ONLY

Professor H.G. Hart
Department of Kiswahili
New York University
Washington Square
New York, New York 10003

Dear Professor Hart:

Professor Tracy Smith is being considered for tenure (and/or promotion to Associate Professor/Professor) as a member of the faculty of the Department of Kiswahili at Indiana University. As part of our review procedures, we customarily write to a selected group of experts in the candidate's field to ask them for an independent judgment of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Additionally, we seek your opinion of his contributions in his area(s) of excellence and the overall impact of his work in his discipline.

Because you are an expert in your field, your frank appraisal of the significance of Professor Smith's (insert scholarly contributions, teaching, research/creative, and/or record of service, depending on the area(s) that must be reviewed to support the case) would be greatly appreciated.

A list of Professor Smith's publications is enclosed for your consideration. Do you rate the contributions as below average, average, above average, or excellent in quality? In quantity? How do you assess the promise for the future of Professor Smith's work? Are you personally acquainted with the candidate? Would Professor Smith be granted tenure (and/or promotion) at your university?

Tenure (and/or promotion) decisions at Indiana University also consider the candidate's record in teaching and in areas of service to the University, the State, the Nation, and the profession. I invite your evaluations of Professor Smith's performance in these areas if you have knowledge of them, although we realize the judgments in these areas must rely heavily upon local assessment.

In most cases your letter will be seen only by a small group of faculty members serving in a tenure (and/or promotion) advisory capacity. Although letters of recommendation are normally not disclosed to candidates, the candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier.

I appreciate your time and aid in allowing us to compile as thorough a dossier as possible for Professor Smith. Since our review is currently under way, it would be helpful if you could respond by (date). Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Carrell N. Jones
Dean, School of International Languages

SAMPLE LETTER FOR BALANCED CASE

Professor H.G. Hart
Department of Kiswahili
New York University
Washington Square
New York, New York 10003

Dear Professor Hart:

Professor Tracy Smith is being considered for tenure (and/or promotion to Associate Professor/Professor) as a member of the faculty of the Department of Kiswahili at Indiana University. As part of our review procedures, we customarily write to a selected group of experts in the candidate's field to ask them for an independent judgment of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Additionally, we seek your opinion of his contributions in his area(s) of excellence and the overall impact of his work in his discipline. Ordinarily a candidate for tenure (or promotion) should excel in a least one of the categories of research/creative activity, teaching, or service and be at least satisfactory in the other two areas. In exceptional cases, however, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university. In such cases, we expect near-excellence in all three categories and evidence of integration between them. Professor Smith is being considered for tenure (promotion) on the basis of a balanced case.

Because you are an expert in your field, your frank appraisal of the significance of Professor Smith's research/creative, teaching, and service would be greatly appreciated.

A list of Professor Smith's publications is enclosed for your consideration. Do you rate the contributions below average, average, above average, near excellence, or excellent in quality? In quantity? How do you assess the promise for the future of Professor Smith's work? Are you personally acquainted with the candidate? Would Professor Smith be granted tenure (and/or promotion) at your university?

The C.V. enclosed for your consideration includes courses taught (and perhaps other information about teaching) as well as information about the candidate's service to the University, State, the Nation, and to the profession. Because Professor Smith is being considered for promotion/tenure on the basis of a balanced case, your impression of his performance in these areas are also invited. We realize that the judgments in these areas must rely heavily upon local assessment, but would like your comments as well.

In most cases your letter will be seen only by a small group of faculty serving in a tenure (and/or promotion) advisory capacity. Although letters of recommendation are normally not disclosed to candidates, the candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier.

I appreciate your time and aid in allowing us to compile as thorough a dossier as possible for Professor Smith. Since our review is currently under way, it would be helpful if you could respond by (date).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Carrel N. Jones
Dean, School of International Languages