

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION REVIEWS FOR RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND CLINICAL RANKS AT INDIANA UNIVERSITY-BLOOMINGTON

OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY & ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

June 1, 2021

PREAMBLE

Promotion reviews stand at a vital intersection, where the professional careers of individual scholars, scientists, artists, teachers, and librarians meet the ambition of Indiana University Bloomington to remain a world-class research and teaching university. No decision we make is more consequential for the future of the institution than providing career advancement of our faculty.

It is essential that we ground these reviews on the enduring principles and collegial values of the academy: procedures and expectations must be consistently applied and transparent to candidates, to faculty involved in the process, and to external referees; decisions must be fair and well justified by the merits of each case. This document follows the principle from university policy that reviews of instructional and research faculty generally use the same procedures as are used for promotion and tenure of tenure-track/tenure-line faculty.

SCOPE

The following ranks are promoted based on performance in these areas (relevant University or Bloomington policies in parentheses):

- Research Scientists/Scholars: Evaluated on Research/Creative Activity (ACA-20, BL-ACA-A1, BL-ACA-A5)
- Lecturers: Evaluated on Teaching (ACA-18, BL-ACA-A1, BL-ACA-A3)
- Clinical Faculty: Evaluated on Teaching and Service (ACA-18, BL-ACA-A1, BL-ACA-A3)

This document covers processes used for promotion within these ranks/appointments which does not necessarily coincide with a decision to extend or renew a long-term contract.

PROCEDURES

Sequential Stages of Review

Decisions about promotion are reached through the comprehensive and rigorous peer review of achievements, contributions, impact and promise. The review process begins in the candidate's home unit (i.e. department, center, institute) or school (for non-departmentalized units). Each case moves through a sequence of reviews: from the department to the school/college and then the campus. At each stage, a faculty review committee votes for a recommendation and writes a substantive report evaluating the candidate's performance in the applicable performance area(s) for their rank: Research/Creative Activity, Teaching and/or Service/Engagement (using the

evaluative categories listed below). Then the appropriate administrator (chair, dean, vice provost) provides a separate substantive evaluation and recommendation. The Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs (VPFAA) prepares the final substantive evaluation and recommendation for the Executive level (i.e. Provost, President) who in turn make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. If a candidate has appointments in multiple units, one unit is designated the “home” for promotion reviews (this is usually identified in a memorandum of understanding). The home unit will identify consistent and appropriate avenues of participation for units that share the appointment. These units will share reports with the chair/dean following consistent practices.

Faculty Review Committees

The faculty review of a dossier begins at the department (or institute or center) or school level and includes the votes of the chair and dean. It ends with a recommendation by the campus Promotion Advisory Committee (PAC) to the VPFAA and Executive level. At the initial level of review, all rank-eligible faculty (as defined by each school or college) participate, although only a subset of them may be charged with writing the evaluative report. At subsequent levels, a small but broadly representative committee of eligible faculty writes the report and votes on a recommendation. When possible, internal review committees will include faculty of the same appointment category as the candidate.

The campus PAC operates under the same principles as the Tenure Advisory Committee (see BL-ACA-E20 and BL-ACA-A5). Procedurally the campus Promotion Advisory Committee operates with one independent subcommittee of rank-appropriate Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) and Tenure-Track (TT) faculty reviewing research rank (senior scientist/scholar) and tenure-line promotions, and a second independent subcommittee of rank-appropriate TT and NTT faculty reviewing instructional (lecturer and clinical) faculty promotions. The subcommittee reviewing research rank promotions is augmented with two persons holding the rank of senior scientist/scholar. Likewise, the subcommittee reviewing instructional promotions will include at least two Teaching Professors and at least two Clinical Professors, and at least 60% total membership by tenure-line faculty (all members will have demonstrated expertise and commitment to teaching).

Committee reports should capture the range of opinions expressed during the deliberations (minority reports are not allowed), while providing an evidence-based rationale for the chosen recommendation. Independent evaluations by individual faculty members in the home unit who are eligible to vote must not be included in promotion dossiers (except as comments on collaborative projects, co-leadership of programs or peer assessments of teaching). All internal reviewers must have access to all dossier materials added at prior levels,, including promotion criteria, external review letters, and recommendations from prior levels. All oral deliberations by review committees are strictly confidential.

Eligibility and Voting

Voting eligibility is guided by the principle of rank-appropriateness and is determined by each school or the College. Faculty are eligible to vote only if they have been “materially engaged” in the review process, as evidenced (for example) by their familiarity with the

dossier and/or attendance at meetings where the case is discussed. No proxy voting is allowed. Retired faculty members may not vote. Departments and schools may have their own requirements for minimum FTE in the unit necessary for voting eligibility. Eligible faculty may vote only once per case (members of school and campus review committees should vote with the initial home unit – e.g., the department (or school, if departments do not exist) – and then recuse themselves from subsequent considerations of the case).

At all stages of review, all eligible faculty must vote separately on all appropriate performance areas using the evaluative ratings listed below. Faculty also cast a vote for the overall promotion recommendation.

All eligible faculty members' votes must be reported in the eDossier. To the extent possible, the department chair's (or dean's) memorandum must explain the basis for absences, abstentions, and negative votes, if any. To the extent that concerns about the dossier were voiced in a faculty meeting, those concerns and discussion should be summarized in the department chair/dean's letter. Voting is by secret ballot. Ballots should not include space for individual voters' substantive written comments. Instead, any opinions should be voiced and discussed in the faculty meeting and summarized in the chair's (or dean's) memorandum.

Vote options for promotion are "yes," "no", or "abstain." "Abstentions" reflect an eligible voter's decision not to select a "yes/no" option. In addition, "absences" (those faculty unable to attend, not materially engaged, or recused) are reported in the eDossier.

Notification of Decisions

The chair will notify candidates as soon as the departmental faculty and chair reach a decision, and the dean will notify candidates after the school reaches a decision. Campus-level recommendations (by the Promotion Advisory Committee and by the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs) are shared with candidates only after the Executive level completes their review (typically, in the first week of April). The grounds and justifications for negative recommendations must be made clear to the candidate. Later committees and administrators need not restate the substance of earlier judgments and recommendations. Candidates may request a copy of internal reviews at any point in the process.

Rebuttals and Requests for Reconsideration

Upon receiving a negative promotion decision from the Executive level, candidates may request a reconsideration of that decision if they believe that there were unjustifiable judgments of performance or judgments based on erroneous information. The VPFAA supervises the request for reconsideration process. To make a request, the candidate prepares and sends a written rebuttal describing what they see as unjustifiable judgments of professional competence or judgments based on erroneous information to the VPFAA. If grounds are found for a new review, the candidate may add new materials germane to the deliberations in a new eDossier folder created for this purpose. If the candidate requests additional external review letters, and this request is approved, they must be obtained following the same procedures used to obtain the initial set (described below). The updated eDossier is sent back to the first level of review that

made a negative recommendation, and then it is reviewed again by all subsequent levels. The reconsideration process will not add time to a candidate's probationary period. The candidate must submit rebuttal materials for review within two months following notification from the VPFAA that grounds are found for a new review.

Appeal/Grievance in Lieu of or Following Reconsideration

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

Timing of Reviews

Promotion from First Rank (Assistant to Associate Scientist/Scholar, Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Lecturer)

Research ranks do not face an up-or-out promotion decision, and promotion to Associate Research Scientist is normally considered after a minimum of three years (BL-ACA-A1). Generally, the time for promotion in the research ranks follows the tenure-line faculty promotion timeframe.

The timeline for reappointment reviews of research rank faculty varies and should be specified in their appointment or reappointment letter. The director/chair/dean or a faculty committee conducts these reappointment reviews, which culminate in a written assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and prospects for eventual promotion.

Within the research ranks, qualified Research Associates and Postdoctoral Fellows may be eligible for appointment to the rank of Assistant Scientist. Per BL-ACA-A5, Postdoctoral Fellows could be considered eligible to apply for a position in one of the research ranks under certain conditions upon satisfactory completion of the post-doctorate term. Qualified Research Associates could be eligible to apply for openings in the three-rank system but would not be automatically eligible for promotion to the beginning rank. However, these appointment reviews follow the same campus process for promotion reviews, so the procedures in this guidelines document generally apply.

As with tenure-line faculty, Lecturers and Clinical Assistant faculty start with a probationary period culminating in an up-or-out promotion decision during the sixth year (BL-ACA-A1 and BL-ACA-A3). Some faculty may be hired in at higher ranks but on probationary status. After an initial three-year appointment, most faculty are reviewed by the home unit each year starting in Year 2 for possible reappointment for Year 4, in Year 3 for Year 5, and so on. The chair/dean or

a faculty committee conducts these reappointment reviews, which culminate in a written assessment of the candidate's accomplishments and prospects for eventual promotion. These home unit reappointment reviews should provide candidates the feedback necessary to understand what will be expected for promotion at the campus level.

For Lecturers and Clinical Assistant Professors, the promotion review and decision ordinarily occur during Year 6 of the probationary period (solicitation of external review letters begins at the very end of Year 5). Various leaves and other interruptions of work may add additional time to the probationary period. Candidates may choose to be reviewed for promotion prior to the sixth year and may withdraw such "early" candidacies at any point before a case advances to the Executive level for a final decision. These decisions are best made in consultation with the chair. The probationary period length does not change the promotion criteria/expectations, and chairs should inform external referees of this fact. Upon a negative decision by the Provost, the candidate may not be considered for promotion again. For Lecturer and Clinical ranks, the granting of promotion to a Senior Lecturer or Clinical Associate Professor is automatically associated with extension of a long-term appointment, unless that contract is already in place.

Promotion from Second Rank (Associate to Senior Scientist, Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor, Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor or Clinical Lecturer)

Faculty may be reviewed for promotion at any time, at the faculty member's request or by invitation of faculty of rank in the unit (department or school). If promotion is denied, the candidate may request another review in a later year, and as many times as necessary. Home units should evaluate all faculty who have been in rank for seven years or more for possible promotion to upper ranks each year, during an annual meeting between the faculty member and the chair or dean.

Access to Dossier

All dossier materials must be shared with the candidate upon request at all stages of the review process, including internal and external review letters.

CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS

School and Department Expectations

Criteria for promotion must respect the diversity of missions among academic units on the Bloomington campus. All departments and schools must prepare documents that define with reasonable specificity the criteria/expectations for Excellence (and all other evaluative categories) in Research, Teaching, and Service/Engagement (where applicable), and make them available to all promotion candidates. These criteria must be sufficiently precise to allow candidates to gain a clear understanding of what accomplishments are expected, but sufficiently elastic to allow diverse means to satisfy those expectations and also to enable reviewers to make judgments about work quality that are irreducibly subjective. If the unit's promotion criteria change during the candidacy period, faculty who are in a probationary period may choose to be evaluated under the criteria in force when they were hired; non-probationary promotion reviews

are grounded in current expectations. Schools, departments, centers, or institutes must periodically review and revise promotion expectations and make them available to both faculty and the VPFAA for web posting.

Campus Expectations

Evaluative Categories

For the Research Scientist/Scholar ranks, Research/Creative activity is the only category considered in evaluation for promotion. If Service in support of Research is included as part of the evidence for Research Excellence, the Service subfolders in the eDossier can be used to provide that evidence. The four evaluative options are Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory.

For Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors, Teaching is the only category considered in evaluation for promotion. Service or Research in support of Teaching consistent with appointments may be included as part of the teaching dossier. Four evaluative options are used to rate the candidate's performance in Teaching: Excellent, Very Good, Effective, and Ineffective.

For the Clinical (Assistant, Associate, Full) Professors, both Teaching and Service are evaluated and both sections of the eDossier are employed. Teaching is evaluated as Excellent, Very Good, Effective, and Ineffective. Service/Engagement is evaluated as Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory. Promotion is determined on a finding of Excellent in one of these areas, or in Balanced Cases, on a finding of at least Very Good in both areas.

Area(s) of Performance/Basis for Promotion.

Like promotion to tenured status, promotion from the first rank of Research, Lecturer, and Clinical classifications should principally be a judgment about prospects for future contributions, while promotion to senior ranks is principally based on achievement in rank.

Please note that the criteria for Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Service may be unique to each rank and appointment.

Scientist/Scholar Ranks

The qualifications for each of the three research ranks should be roughly equivalent to Research qualifications for tenure-line faculty.

Typically, a candidate for Assistant Scientist/Scholar would have to have completed the terminal degree in his or her discipline and, in some fields, have at least one year of successful postdoctoral research experience. A person at this rank would be fully capable of original, independent research, but typically would work under the direction of a senior faculty member or an Associate Scientist/Scholar or a Senior Scientist/Scholar (BL-ACA-A5).

For promotion from Assistant Scientist/Scholar to Associate Scientist/Scholar, candidates must demonstrate Excellence in Research/Creative Activities. Per BL-ACA-A5, they would have begun to establish a national reputation through published work and would typically have responsibility for carrying out independently, as principal investigator, their own original projects. The terms of appointment should determine evaluation. For scientists with appointed service responsibilities, documented evidence for Excellence in Research may include service in support of successful research, grants, collaborative projects, and/or scholarship. Normally a person should have achieved a minimum of three years, and more typically five or six years, of successful research as reflected in work published in refereed sources before attaining or being appointed to Associate Scientist.

For promotion to Senior Scientist/Scholar, candidates must demonstrate Excellence in Research/Creative Activities in the previous rank. This includes continued growth in scholarship, making substantial disciplinary contributions, and the acquisition of a national and international reputation. This may be demonstrated through publication record, invited lectures, leadership in research organizations, grantsmanship, research collaborations, service to the profession, documented service in support of successful research, and/or other evidence of disciplinary impact. Some forms of research (e.g., creative and/or developmental activities) may not necessarily result in publications in scholarly journals, but nonetheless may impact future inquiry and should be included in the dossier as research contributions. For example, certain scientific or scholarly findings and technological developments might be disseminated through presentations to professional organizations and through consultations with persons engaged in similar work at other institutions. Terms of appointment should determine evaluation, which should account for appointed service responsibilities.

Lecturer Ranks

Lecturers (including Clinical Lecturers) who seek promotion to Senior Lecturer must have demonstrated Excellence in Teaching, based on performance in the classroom. Lecturers may be assigned service or research in support of teaching. If so, those accomplishments contribute to the evaluating of their teaching. Those promoted to Senior Lecturer should have also demonstrated a commitment to continued professional growth and currency with pedagogical developments in their fields. Per BL-ACA-A3, Service and/or Research/Creative Activity in support of teaching may be included as part of the teaching dossier. Other research may be considered as evidence of intellectual engagement in the professional field that generally indicates long-term intellectual contributions valuable in classroom/teaching settings and to the campus. Per BL-ACA-A1, the faculty of each unit using Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Teaching Professor appointments are responsible for adopting promotion criteria that are appropriate to the duties that may be assigned to Lecturer/Teaching Professor appointees.

Excellence in Teaching for candidates for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor includes a sustained record of excellence in teaching as a Senior Lecturer (or the equivalent) and pedagogical leadership (demonstrated by activities such as curriculum development; innovation and mentoring at the school, college, campus, or university level; and recognition and impact at the regional or national level). The pedagogical leadership is expected to extend beyond the department level, and to include evidence of impact and quality.

Review committees and administrators (at all levels) should remember that the dossier materials (including external review letters) are gathered and presented to justify promotion on the basis of Excellence in Teaching, including classroom teaching and pedagogical leadership.

Clinical Ranks

Clinical appointments can include a range of responsibilities as specified in the initial appointment, which must be considered in the evaluation. Clinical Professors are evaluated on the basis of both Teaching and Service. For a case based on one performance area, candidates must be rated as Excellent in one category and at least Satisfactory/Effective in the other. For a Balanced Case, candidates must be at least “Very Good” in both Teaching and Service.

Promotion must be based on standards of performance in Teaching and Service in a clinical setting.

Clinical faculty are not expected to do individual research but may contribute to a unit’s research efforts through their clinical work. Any Research/Creative Activity in support of Teaching and Service in a clinical setting may be included as evidence of teaching and service effectiveness. Other research may be considered as evidence of intellectual engagement in the professional field that is generally indicative of long-term intellectual contributions valuable in classroom settings and to the campus in general.

Promotion of Clinical Assistant to Associate Professor, like promotion to tenured status, should principally be a judgment about prospects for future contributions in these areas.

Candidates for promotion from Clinical Associate to Full Professor on the basis of Excellence in Teaching or Service shall be evaluated on the basis of existing standards and criteria at the school level.

Depending on their appointment terms and other considerations, candidates also may be evaluated on the basis of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance; in this “balanced case” dossier, performance in both areas must be Very Good. Except for the “balanced case”, candidates must base their case for promotion on only one performance area (although that choice does not preclude the possibility that performance in the other area will be judged Excellent). Review committees and administrators at all levels should remember that dossier materials, including external letters, were gathered and presented in order to justify promotion on the basis of Excellence in the relevant performance area.

DOSSIER PREPARATION

Timing and Custody: The chair or dean (in non-departmentalized schools) and the candidate share the responsibility for assembling the full promotion packet. This occurs generally in the spring/summer before a candidate’s promotion review year. While candidates have discretion over most submitted material, custody of the dossier rests with administrators at each level of

review, thus ensuring the integrity of its contents. The performance area for promotion must be decided prior to assembling the dossier, and clearly indicated in the candidate's statement and in communications soliciting external review letters.

Assembling the Promotion Materials (Steps 1 through 8).

External Review. Step (1): In late winter/early spring, the chair/dean will solicit names for external review from the candidate. (2) The chair/dean will solicit letters from referees (more details below). (3) The candidate prepares a representative packet of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity and/or Service/Engagement materials for external review. (4) The chair/dean send this packet to referees and manage the process of uploading external review letters.

Internal (Department/School/Campus/University) Review. In the spring, the campus will also notify the candidate when eDossier is open for uploading materials for internal (department/school/campus/university) review. (5) The candidate is fully responsible for selecting, assembling, and uploading all content to the relevant Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and/or Service/Engagement folders. (6) It is recommended that the candidate regularly consult with the chair or dean's representative during this process, and for the chair/dean to meet with the candidate to review these contents before final submission to ensure that all pertinent materials are included. (7) The "General" folder is a shared responsibility: the candidate will upload a curriculum vitae and personal statements. Schools will upload promotion criteria (but may need to consult with a candidate to determine the criteria under which they choose to be evaluated should the criteria have changed during a probationary period). The chair/dean's representative will also upload the Department and Candidate's Lists of Prospective Referees. (8) When the dossier is fully assembled, both the candidate and the chair/dean must electronically confirm that eDossier is complete. (9) All other eDossier materials are the responsibility of the chair/dean (Internal Review Letters, External Review Letters, List of Referees Contacted, Solicited Letters, and Vote Record through the Dean's level).

Mandatory Items. All materials listed in the "General" section of eDossier must be included. Departments/schools may require that other specific evidence or documentation be included in eDossier. All other materials in eDossier may be included at the candidate's discretion. Annual review and merit review reports should not be included in eDossier unless the candidate specifically requests them to be included.

Timing of Work Included in Dossier. While a curriculum vitae covering relevant details from a candidate's full career is expected, promotion will be evaluated on the basis of work in rank. For candidates with prior academic or professional careers, the work accomplished since their most recent appointment at IUB is assumed to be a better reflection of productivity or impact than earlier work. Therefore, in both the CV and eDossier, candidates should distinguish Research, Teaching, and Service work carried out in their current rank and/or at IUB from earlier work.

Candidates for promotion from Postdoctoral Fellow to Assistant Scientist and from Assistant to Associate Scientist should include all work since reception of the highest degree, even if the candidate spent time as a postdoc or at another university before coming to IUB. Pre-PhD work (e.g., scholarly or scientific publications) may be included to give additional evidence of pace, future trajectories, and continuity or change in research interests. For all other ranks and

promotion levels, faculty may include any background or pre-IUB career details that they consider relevant, but again should distinguish work accomplished in rank from other work.

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

External Review Letters.

General guidance:

The purpose of the external review is to provide an objective, peer review of a candidate's claim to Excellence. Whether the reviews come from inside or outside IU, faculty serving as external referees are expected to provide a full review of the promotion packet they received, and their letters should not be confused with “colleague” or “promotion support” letters.

Letters used in the promotion process for instructional and research faculty will generally follow the same procedures used for promotion reviews for tenure-line faculty.

The chair or dean must request and receive external review letters using the suggested solicitation template (see below); deans must approve referees that chairs propose. External referees must be sent the candidate’s CV, at least a subset of materials that will be included in the eDossier documenting the candidate's performance in rank or other documents demonstrating the candidate’s prominence in their field (that the candidate has chosen) and the unit’s promotion criteria/expectations. All external referees receive the same materials, and schools should have standard expectations across each rank for the external review packet. All solicited letters received must be included in the dossier. Anonymous contributions to the dossier may not be considered in promotion reviews. Unsolicited letters of recommendation are of little value.

Rank-specific guidance:

Research Scientists/Scholars

Candidates for promotion to Assistant Scientist require three letters from rank-appropriate referees, internal or external. At least two of these letters should come from external referees.

For promotion from Assistant Scientist to Associate Scientist and Associate Scientist to Senior Scientist, dossiers must include a minimum of six letters from external referees, at least three

from a list prepared by the candidate and at least three from a list prepared by the department (or school, center, or institute). Referees should be leaders in the candidate's field, ideally at the rank of Research Professor or Scientist, Full Professor or above, who hold an academic appointment at a peer institution or higher, and who have no compromising relationships with the candidate (e.g., mentor, student, collaborator, co-author, former colleague, familial attachments, commercial ties). Some, but not all, of the external letters may be solicited from referees holding non-academic positions if they are leaders in their fields or organizations at a level comparable to senior faculty members. There may be exceptions to these rules, but any exceptions should be justified in the chair's (or dean's) letter.

Lecturer Faculty

For promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, dossiers must include a minimum of six letters. The letters are all solicited by the chair or dean, who selects at least three letters from a list prepared by the candidate and at least three from a list prepared by the department (or school). The unit decides whether those letters will be solicited from IUB colleagues or a combination of IUB and non-IUB colleagues. All of the solicited IUB letters should come from outside the candidate's home unit. The practice must be consistent for all candidates within the school or college.

For promotion from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor, the campus requires that dossiers should include at least six letters that the chair or dean solicits, at least three each from lists prepared by the candidate and the department. Referees should be leaders in the candidate's field, ideally at the rank of Teaching, Clinical or Full Professor or above, and have no compromising relationships with the candidate (e.g., mentor, student, collaborator, co-author, former colleague, familial attachments, commercial ties). At least four of these letters must be from non-IUB referees who hold academic appointments at peer institutions or better, and up to two letters can be from IUB referees from outside the candidate's home unit. Deans will have discretion to set parameters for soliciting internal letters that meet the above criteria. Solicitation of external letters should generally follow the same processes used for other promotion reviews. The practice must be consistent for all candidates in the school or college.

For promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor, some but not all external letters may be solicited from referees holding non-academic positions who are leaders in their fields or organizations at a level comparable to senior faculty members. There may be exceptions to these rules, but any exceptions should be justified in the chair's (or dean's) letter.

Clinical Faculty

For Clinical Professors (Assistant to Associate and Associate to Full), dossiers should include at least six letters from non-IUB external referees, at least three from a list prepared by the candidate and at least three from a list prepared by the department (or school). Solicitation of external review letters should generally follow the same processes used for other promotion reviews. Referees should be leaders in the candidate's field, ideally at the rank of Clinical Professor, Full Professor or above, who hold academic appointments at peer institutions or

better, and who have no compromising relationships with the candidate (e.g., mentor, student, collaborator, co-author, former colleague, familial attachments, commercial ties). Some but not all external review letters may be solicited from referees holding non-academic positions who are leaders in their fields or organizations at a level comparable to senior faculty members.

DOCUMENTATION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Materials for review and their arrangement are specified in eDossier. Not all categories of documentation will apply to all candidates. The following are intended as suggestions to help faculty strengthen these areas of their dossier as appropriate. Candidates planning their careers and faculty and administrators assessing their achievements should consider the following:

Research/Creative Activity: *Considerations*

Candidate's Statement. A candidate's statement is not a restatement of their curriculum vitae, but rather a narrative overview of their research career—highlighting finished projects, current work, and future plans. Candidates should also discuss their research/creative collaborations and co-authorships, identify their specific role(s) within projects, and their contributions to grant activities. The candidate's prose should be accessible, striking a balance between communicating with experts in the field and faculty members who may not be familiar with their area of Research/Creative activity (e.g., candidates should clarify technical terms, spell out acronyms, and explain disciplinary conventions).

New Scholarly Communications. Reviewers at all levels should consider that important Research/Creative Activity may not necessarily appear in traditional disciplinary formats. Furthermore, new forms of digital scholarly communication (e-journals, moderated websites, blogs) continue to emerge. Peer reviewed publications are given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed materials, although efforts in translational and public scholarship are also valued. Candidates assume responsibility for providing evidence of their publication outlets' value.

Impact on Diverse Communities. In assessing the impact of Research/Creative Activity, reviewers may also want to consider the variety of diverse communities both within and beyond the academy, noting that “public scholarship” can expand the range of audiences to whom a scholar/artist may direct their research/creative activity. Candidates may want to describe how their Research/Creative Activity intersects with both scholarly and non-academic communities. Evidence of Research/Creative Activity should be targeted towards peer professional communities. However, evidence of “public scholarship” can supplement a candidate's work. Examples of “public scholarship” include panel/commission and other technical reports, policy white papers, and strategic plans for community/civic groups.

Collaborative Work. Candidates are expected to establish independent roles within their overall research program or creative activity and must describe this role in their promotion statements. The chair/dean/program director must solicit letters from collaborators and co-authors, attesting to the candidate's autonomous contributions.

Defining Quality. Evaluations of research/creative activity can never be reduced to a simple metric; judgments about the quality of work, and its utility, impact and influence cannot be fully captured by the count of publications and citations or by a journal impact factor. Furthermore, important research and creative work that support the university's mission does not necessarily result in publications. Faculty members and administrators must fully engage the totality of the candidate's work and reach their own judgments about its worth.

Status of Publications. The candidate's curriculum vitae and statement should clarify whether a manuscript is published (e.g., as a journal article or book)), accepted for publication (irreversible decision), under review, or in preparation. Article and book manuscripts that are published and accepted for publication are given the greatest weight. A book manuscript "under contract" will be given most weight if it is complete and if an irreversible decision to publish has been made. Published professional reviews are of great value in assessing a book or artistic event's impact.

Teaching: Considerations

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

Candidate's Statement. This statement is an opportunity for candidates to provide their vision of the classroom or clinic and that setting's opportunities and challenges and their pedagogical philosophy and accomplishments. The candidate should discuss the type of course(s) they developed or modified and explain how they consistently monitored the success of the course(s). They should also identify specific challenges or problems faced when teaching, and efforts to improve and indicators of improvement. Discussion should center on strategies for stimulating students' intellectual interests and incorporating new developments in the field into courses. The candidate should also describe how they engaged with individual undergraduate and graduate students (if applicable) and contribute to students' professional growth, including sponsorship of student Research/Creative Activity.

Student Mentoring. The eDossier provides opportunities for candidates to discuss significant mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students. Ideally, formal mentoring of students is purposeful, not incidental, and has demonstrated impact.

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. IU is actively committed to meaningfully promoting and recognizing diversity, equity, and inclusion before, during, and after the promotion process—a commitment that demands robust engagement from all faculty. Mentoring support should take into consideration each candidate's needs. In their personal statements, all promotion candidates are encouraged to describe how they have taken advantage of campus resources and their contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion, together with their individual, programmatic, and institutional impacts.

Advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion goals occurs primarily through interpersonal relationships, guided by informed institutional policies. Minority faculty perform often-hidden diversity services, including serving on diversity committees, mentoring students and faculty on diversity-related projects and issues, and educating others about equity. This particular area of

service may result in unbalanced service loads for candidates. These efforts should be documented so that these important contributions are recognized.

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

Student Course Evaluations. Judgments about teaching effectiveness cannot be reduced to a single indicator or measure. Quantitative data from student course evaluations should be interpreted in the context of other materials assembled to document pedagogical achievements, and not given greater weight. Student course evaluations may be most useful for tracking strengths, successes, and improvements over time and especially for identifying teaching and learning problems and measuring the impact of solutions. Statistical data must be presented in a summary spreadsheet or graph (showing all courses*, semester/year, and results on campus-wide survey items), to facilitate recognition of trends and comparisons to reference groups. *exception spring 2020

Peer Assessments of Teaching. The chair or dean may appoint rank-appropriate faculty colleagues to review a candidate's teaching performance and to observe instructional activities. Peer review of teaching should be ongoing (annually for probationary faculty or faculty at junior ranks, periodically after promotion). Departments and schools should develop instructions for peer assessors to distinguish "formative reviews" (that provide suggestions for improvement) from "summative reviews" (that evaluate teaching performance against department, school and campus standards). These instructions should promote transparency and consistency in the review process. Further guidance on peer assessments of teaching can be found at <https://vpfaa.indiana.edu/doc/peer-assessment-of-teaching>

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. SoTL is broadly defined as a field of study that includes scholarly and systematic investigations of questions concerning teaching and learning using methods appropriate for the discipline. Examples of evidence of SoTL engagement for promotion include contributions to workshops and lectures; teaching-related research projects; the receipt of grants and speaking invitations; pedagogical publications (e.g., articles, textbooks, publisher-distributed curricular materials, digital and new scholarly communications).

Service/Engagement: Considerations

How Much Service/Engagement? The amount of time spent on service is determined by the candidate's role and specific appointment. Chairs/deans/program directors must make sure that department- and school-level service responsibilities are distributed fairly among all probationary faculty members. Candidates for promotion to "associate" and "full" ranks are expected to assume greater service responsibilities by taking on tasks that are vital for sustaining the academic community, including mentoring younger colleagues.

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

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

APPENDICES

(eDossier Checklist, Sample Solicitation Letter for External Referees)

eDossier Folders

What your Chair/Dean/Campus sees (and adds to throughout the process):

- Dossier
 - Vote Record
 - Internal Letters
 - External Letters
 - List of Referees Contacted
- Solicited Letters
 - Teaching
 - Research
 - Service

What you see but only AFTER you submit for campus review (add materials here as needed after submitting the dossier):

- Supplemental Post-submission
 - Supplemental Supporting Items

What you see (and add to) before submitting for campus review:

- General
 - Department and School Criteria
 - Candidate's Curriculum Vitae
 - Candidate's Statements
 - Department (School) List of Prospective Referees
 - Candidate's List of Prospective Referees
- Research (ONLY FOR SCIENTIST/SCHOLAR APPOINTMENTS)
 - Copies of Publications and/or Evidence of Creative Work
 - Reviews of Candidate's Books, Creative Performances and Exhibitions
 - List of Grants Applied for/Received
 - Copies of Manuscripts or Creative Works in Progress
 - Evidence for the Impact/Influence of Publications or Creative Works
 - Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues
 - Awards and Honors for Research/Creative Activity
 - Candidate's Contributions to Collaborative Projects
- Teaching (ONLY FOR CLINICAL AND LECTURER APPOINTMENTS)
 - List of Courses Taught
 - Sample of Course Materials
 - Graduate Training
 - Student Awards, Honors, Collaborative Publications, Achievements
 - Undergraduate Research Experiences and Mentoring
 - Student Course Evaluations
 - Unsolicited Letters from Former Students
 - Evidence of Learning Outcomes
 - Peer Evaluations
 - Curricular Development
 - Professional Pedagogical Development
 - Teaching Publications
 - Teaching Awards, Honors, Grants, Fellowships
 - Research in Support of Teaching
- Service/Engagement
 - Evidence of Service to the University, School and Department
 - Evidence of Service to the Profession
 - Evidence of Engagement with Non-Academic Communities and Agencies
 - Research in Support of Service (ONLY FOR CLINICAL AND LECTURER APPOINTMENTS)

SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER FOR EXTERNAL REFEREES (initial contact)

Professor X is being considered for promotion to [assistant, associate, full, senior] research scientist/scholar, lecturer, teaching professor, clinical professor] in the Department of Y at Indiana University Bloomington. As part of our review procedures, we write to experts in the candidate's field to ask them for an independent judgment of the candidate's performance in rank.

Professor X is a candidate for promotion on the basis of [research, teaching, teaching and service].

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

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

[*Service/Engagement*: Your frank appraisal of the quality and impact of Professor X's professional service to academic and non-academic communities would be greatly appreciated.]

[*Balanced Case (Clinicals only)*: Professor X is being considered for promotion on the basis of balanced strengths in teaching and service/engagement, and we would appreciate your evaluation of the quality and impact of his/her performance in both areas.]

[Required in all letters]: Your letter will be seen by faculty members serving in a promotion advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to the entire dossier at any time, and the University is legally compelled to comply.

[Required in all letters]: This link explains the changes in access to campus resources promotion candidates may have experienced during the pandemic:

<https://vpfaa.indiana.edu/doc/institutional-fact-sheet.pdf>

Professor X's curriculum vitae is enclosed for your consideration.

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

We value your frank and detailed judgments. If you agree to prepare an evaluation of Professor X, we shall send you his/her materials and our criteria and expectations for promotion.

Please let us know by DATE if you will be able to take on this task. Your letter would be due by DATE. Many thanks for considering this request.