

## GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC TENURE AND PROMOTION

### COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

[Guidelines approved by Faculty Council on 5/1/01]  
[Revised guidelines approved by Faculty Council on 12/6/06]

Because faculty are evaluated for tenure and promotion at multiple levels -- by their departmental colleagues and chairperson, the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee, the College Dean, the Provost, and the President -- and awarded tenure and promotion by the action of the University's Board of Trustees, candidates must meet departmental, College, and University expectations. Therefore, candidates should familiarize themselves with this College document and with University and departmental personnel guidelines. Unless specially noted, the annual paperwork timeline, review procedure, and application format described below are currently in effect.

#### Introduction

Upon the recommendation of various levels of peer and administrative review, faculty members may be granted academic tenure and promotion by the University in recognition of documented, high-quality academic and professional performance. Pre-tenure faculty serve a probationary period stipulated in the initial letter of appointment. With tenure, the faculty member becomes eligible for continuous reappointment. Academic tenure ensures the University's commitment to both academic freedom and sufficient economic security to keep the profession attractive to persons of ability (*AAUP Policy Documents & Reports* 1995: 3). In return, accepting tenure expresses the faculty member's long-term commitment to enhancing the academic life of his/her department and the College as well as the mission of the University. During the probationary period a candidate for tenure is expected to show consistent and progressive evidence of achieving effectiveness in all aspects of faculty performance: (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and/or creative achievement appropriate to his/her discipline, (3) service to the University and to the community or the profession,<sup>[1]</sup> and (4) any additional areas stipulated at the time of the candidate's appointment. Those who do not perform satisfactorily in each of these domains should expect to be conditionally reappointed or terminated.

Because of the broad academic spectrum within the College of Arts and Sciences, it is impossible to establish unidimensional criteria by which to measure faculty performance. Most programs in the College are rooted in the traditions of the liberal arts; others are professionally oriented, or applied, in nature. Most departments offer baccalaureate and master's degrees, but others are limited to the baccalaureate while a few offer the doctorate. Moreover, methods of scholarly inquiry in College disciplines vary from laboratory or field research, to library or archival research, to studio or performance work. Thus, College performance standards and tenure and promotion guidelines reflect this diversity.

The College recognizes the central role of departments in the evaluation of their faculty. Because faculty are to be evaluated based on established criteria and performance standards appropriate to their positions, it is the responsibility of each department to

develop specific evaluative criteria and performance standards for tenure and promotion, consistent with the guidelines contained within this document, and to submit their departmental documents to the Dean for review and approval. In general, the relative emphasis a department accords the diverse aspects of teaching (including on-site versus distance delivery of instruction, advising, student research and other professional mentorship, undergraduate versus graduate assignments, etc.), research/creativity, and service should be closely aligned with that department's mission. Faculty in the tenure or promotion candidate's discipline are responsible for making the primary judgments about the candidate's competence in his/her discipline. Departmental criteria and guidelines do not supercede those contained in this document but (1) provide additional information designed to assist candidates for tenure and promotion in better recognizing what is expected of them and (2) provide certain key measures that peer and administrative evaluators will use in determining whether or not to recommend tenure and/or promotion. Relatedly, this document in no way supercedes the sections of the *University Handbook* that discuss faculty tenure and promotion (III-1 to III-6), but it does attempt to define qualitative standards of performance for College faculty while recognizing that no single standard can be taken as sufficient for the award of tenure or promotion. Because departments play a central role in the evaluation of faculty, *department-level reviewers must assume important responsibilities*: (1) they must offer *impartial professional assessments* of a candidate's relative strengths and weaknesses grounded in empirical evidence, and (2) they must help to *contextualize* a candidate's record of performance within a discipline.

College-level reviewers attempt to ensure the consistent application of standards across the departments of the Arts and Sciences. More specifically, they serve as monitors of procedural matters (reviewing, for example, departmental recommendations for consistency with departmental, College, and University tenure and promotion guidelines and other relevant standards), and they work to ensure that, insofar as possible, recommendations made by departments with similar expectations for professional accomplishment yield similar outcomes for equally qualified candidates. When questions arise concerning the merits of a candidate's professional achievements in his/her discipline, College-level reviewers should not substitute their own judgments for the professional judgments of faculty in the candidate's discipline. The tenure and promotion policies and practices outlined in this document are consistent with those articulated in the *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports*.

This document also acknowledges that, for good programmatic reasons, faculty appointments are occasionally made that place different demands on pre-tenure faculty than is the norm in their unit. Whenever such appointments are made, departmental and College officials must make such demands clear to the affected faculty member and to those evaluating that individual for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Normally, this information is contained in a memorandum of understanding from the Dean at the time of the individual's appointment and/or in the faculty member's initial letter of appointment. Relatedly, while a terminal degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which a faculty member is appointed is normally required for tenure and/or promotion, an exception may be made for a person of indisputable national renown. Such a waiver becomes part of the written appointment record. Appointment letters also include notice of previous service credited against the standard probationary term, together with dates of eligibility for promotion and tenure, and general requirements for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Annual letters of reappointment that pre-tenure faculty receive from their departments, the Dean, and the Provost convey crucial information about their progress toward meeting these expectations. Just as it is incumbent on review committees, chairpersons, the Dean, and the Provost to express performance-related concerns to pre-tenure faculty, *the obligation to demonstrate empirically that one has meaningfully addressed all concerns that might be raised at any level of evaluation rests squarely with the pre-tenure faculty member.* Candidates for tenure and for promotion are responsible for developing a portfolio of materials that will merit favorable review. Persons lacking a strong record of accomplishment and/or unwilling to produce a coherent, focused review portfolio should not apply for promotion or tenure.

Ordinarily, a candidate must be reviewed favorably for tenure and/or promotion at each level of evaluation -- departmental, College, and University -- to be tenured and/or promoted. Tenure and promotion are conjoined for individuals at the assistant professor level; that is, candidates may be awarded tenure only upon meeting standards for promotion to associate professor. Accordingly, they submit one set of documentation to support their candidacy for tenure and promotion.

Individuals beginning their probationary period as assistant professor become eligible to apply for tenure and promotion during the sixth year of a regular faculty appointment, including at least four (4) years under a regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University. Individuals beginning their probationary period as associate professors may be given credit for up to three (3) years of regular faculty appointments at other accredited institutions, and persons beginning their probationary period at the rank of professor may be given credit for up to five (5) years of regular faculty appointments at other accredited institutions.<sup>[2]</sup> Those appointed as associate professors or professors become eligible to apply for tenure during the year in which years credited and years at Indiana State University total six (6).

A candidate in the fourth or fifth pre-tenure year may, under exceptional circumstances, be considered for promotion and tenure prior to the end of his/her six-year probationary period. For this to occur, the candidate's exceptional performance must be formally recognized by his/her chairperson's nominating the candidate for early consideration, and the candidate must, in turn, earn the support of every reviewing entity in the process. A negative vote from any review committee or administrative reviewer stops the review process and precludes the candidate's again being given early consideration. An associate professor is eligible to apply for a professorship in his/her fourth year in rank.

### **Performance Evaluation Levels and Other General Concerns**

Indiana State University depends on extramural funding to carry out its instructional, research, and service missions. Accordingly, the College seeks to recognize and reward faculty who attract significant extramural funds -- in the form of grants, contracts, or donations -- to the University. Success in securing extramural monies in support of departmental, College, and/or University priorities should be presented as evidence of effective performance.

The College also recognizes the value of effective partnerships, as well as the difficulty that sometimes accompanies assessing individual contributions to joint efforts. Thus, while the College strongly supports interdisciplinary teaching, research, and service, it recognizes that these activities often bring with them a special need on the part of the candidate to

describe carefully the importance and relevance of interdisciplinary projects and the candidate's specific achievements. Similarly, those engaged in multi-author research or multi-participant performances should specify their individual contributions to group works and characterize the extent of their involvement (e.g., first author, third author, statistical consultant, lead role, accompanist, full collaborator, etc.).

As described below, *Satisfactory* and *Unsatisfactory* are the two recognized performance levels used in making evaluations. A rating of *Satisfactory* ought not to be understood as a standard which accepts mediocrity. Rather, a rating of *Satisfactory* signifies that the faculty member's performance has met a high standard, as understood in the faculty member's field of expertise and within the University community. Without a rating of *Satisfactory* in each of the three basic areas of academic responsibility -- teaching, research and/or creative achievement, and service -- a faculty member cannot expect to receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion. Sustained, noteworthy success in all three areas is important for those seeking the rank of professor.

### **Evidence for Performance-Based Evaluation of Teaching**

The College of Arts and Sciences is committed to ensuring that its graduates acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to function as educated individuals, life-long learners, and responsible citizens. Faculty contribute to this mission through effectiveness in teaching, both inside and outside the classroom. The centrality of teaching in the University's mission and its prominence in faculty activity demand that the evaluation of teaching be given high priority in the assessment of faculty performance. Because of this centrality and the continual need to monitor one's teaching effectiveness, student evaluations will be conducted in every class a faculty member teaches. These evaluations should occur within a departmental context that produces meaningful, reliable data. In general, a department will adopt a single evaluation instrument and develop guidelines that remove the persons being evaluated from the administration of the instrument, data collection, and data reporting. Moreover, departments are encouraged to find a means of norming this data so that individual results can be understood within a broader context. A candidate's demonstration of instructional effectiveness can also include other types of student input, some of which are listed in Appendix A.

The most important and time-consuming activities for most faculty members are instruction and associated work (such as student outcomes assessment, curricular development, student advisement, and sponsorship of student internships) and scholarly and/or creative work. Therefore, the evaluation of this work must be inclusive. The evaluation of teaching can be guided by defining certain behaviors, characteristics, attitudes, and activities common among effective teachers,<sup>[3]</sup> along with tools that may be used to identify and document these qualities and to document student learning. The criteria for and indicators of teaching effectiveness departments develop within their disciplines must allow for peer and student input since both are *required*. A guide to documenting teaching performance appears in Appendix A. College-level teaching standards appear below:

- §     **Satisfactory Teaching** --To qualify for a *Satisfactory* rating, a faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor must (1) present a variety of significant evidence which documents teaching effectiveness, (2) meet all instructional expectations established in the faculty member's department and, in the case of pre-tenure faculty, in annual performance reviews, and (3) meet the basic instructional

expectations of University faculty specified in the *University Handbook* (3-2 to 3-5).

Those aspiring to the rank of professor must demonstrate the maturity of their teaching by showing that their instructional contributions are significant and multi-faceted and have developed to a high level which has been sustained over time.

- § **Unsatisfactory Teaching** -- An *Unsatisfactory* rating means that the candidate has not fully met performance expectations and/or has not sufficiently documented teaching effectiveness. This judgment may result from the fact that the candidate has not presented enough evidence of high instructional quality and/or has not presented sufficiently compelling evidence.

### **Evidence for Performance-Based Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Achievement**

The College of Arts and Sciences is also committed to the value of scholarship, which may be defined as the documented distribution among peers of work grounded in research and/or creative achievement through publication, performance, or display and through presentations at professional conferences. Library and archival research, basic and applied research, the integration of knowledge through interdisciplinary scholarship, and creative activities in the fine and performing arts are included in this definition of scholarship, which recognizes the diversity of talents among College faculty. Because of this diversity, it is *essential* that departments clearly state their expectations for the scholarly and especially for the artistic production of their faculty.

Any faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion has the right to have his/her scholarly or creative accomplishments reviewed by peers external to Indiana State University as part of the evaluation process. Typically the candidate for tenure requesting an external review would submit to the department chairperson a list of five (5) or more potential referees who share the candidate's area of scholarly or creative expertise. The department chairperson and personnel committee would select a subset of these persons to serve as referees, then add a like number of persons from a list the chair and committee develops. The candidate, in turn, would provide the department chairperson with one set of materials for each referee, and the chair would send the materials out for review. This process would need to be initiated in time for the responses to meet the established departmental deadline for the submission of materials for review. Every response received by the chairperson would be regarded as confidential and would be placed in the candidate's tenure and/or promotion dossier. At the conclusion of the departmental review, the candidate receives from the department chairperson copies of the external evaluations along with the recommendations of the department personnel committee and chairperson.

According to the College definition, scholarly and creative achievement takes the form of published books, articles, and book chapters; performances, exhibitions, and productions; software; translations, edited works, research reports, research abstracts, and book reviews; grant proposals and contracts; and conference presentations. Evidence of significant refereed, peer-reviewed work is important in establishing the quality of one's scholarly and creative achievement. A guide to documenting scholarly and creative achievement appears in Appendix A. College-level scholarly and creative standards appear below:

- § **Satisfactory Scholarly and Creative Achievement** -- To qualify for a *Satisfactory* rating, a faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor must demonstrate a record of *sustained* scholarly or creative achievement within his/her academic discipline. Specific expectations regarding the type and quantity of these scholarly and/or creative achievements will vary, depending on one's academic assignment and discipline, but in each case the candidate's achievements will have earned professional recognition at the national or regional level. For those in traditional academic areas, a *Satisfactory* rating usually requires a body of published, refereed research that has earned favorable peer recognition at the national level (typically four or more substantial refereed journal articles, or their equivalent, which have impacted the candidate's profession). Favorable *regional* recognition by peers is more commonly the expectation for assistant professors in the fine and performing arts or similar disciplines, and this work must have influenced the candidate's profession.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must demonstrate that they have achieved national recognition in a discipline by producing a coherent body of substantial, favorably reviewed scholarly and/or creative work which has influenced the candidate's profession. National recognition will typically be reflected in such accomplishments as one or more well-reviewed books, a series of major articles, or an extended series of art exhibitions.

- § **Unsatisfactory Scholarly and Creative Achievement** -- An *Unsatisfactory* scholarly and creative rating indicates that the faculty member's scholarly and/or creative achievements fail to meet departmental, College, and/or University expectations fully, and/or that the faculty member has not sufficiently documented his/her scholarly or creative prowess. This judgment may result from the fact that evaluators deem the quality and/or quantity of the faculty member's scholarly and/or creative achievements to be insufficient.

### **Evidence for Performance-Based Evaluation of Academic Service**

As the *University Handbook* states, "a member of the faculty of Indiana State University is considered to be an officer of a public educational institution, a member of a learned profession, and a citizen of the community" (3-1). The College of Arts and Sciences expects members of its faculty to document a pattern of significant, high-quality service both within and outside the University. A guide to documenting academic service appears in Appendix A. College-level standards in this area appear below:

- § **Satisfactory Academic Service** -- To qualify for a *Satisfactory* rating, a faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor must make contributions to the University and to either the profession or the community that are significant in quality and quantity. Such service could take the form of major intradepartmental assignments; a range of departmental, College-level, and University-level assignments; or major efforts that draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise in service to the profession or the community.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor must document a pattern of

active, significant service to the University, the profession, *and* the community. Typically, this means that the individual will have successfully assumed leadership roles on the campus, and sometimes off.

- § **Unsatisfactory Academic Service** -- An *Unsatisfactory* service rating indicates that the faculty member's service achievements fail to meet departmental, College, and/or University expectations fully, and/or that the faculty member has not sufficiently documented his/her service effectiveness. This judgment may result from the fact that evaluators deem the quality and/or quantity of the faculty member's service achievements to be inadequate.

## **Performance Evaluation and Tenure and Promotion Review Procedures**

### **Annual Reviews of Performance Prior to the Tenure Year.**

Each year, pre-tenure College faculty are evaluated by their departmental colleagues and chairperson, as well as the Dean and Provost. (In the case of joint appointments, each department will conduct its own evaluation within the framework of a memorandum of understanding established prior to the beginning of the appointment and in a manner that respects the disciplinary judgment of the other department.) These annual evaluations usually lead to reappointment, but can lead to conditional reappointment or nonreappointment if the faculty member fails to present clear evidence of having fully met performance expectations. Each level of the annual review includes a candid written assessment of the materials presented by the faculty member in support of his/her success in meeting expected goals with respect to (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and/or creative achievement, and (3) service to the University and profession -- as well as any additional areas stipulated in writing at the time of the person's appointment. Candidates for reappointment and tenure should exercise care in preparing materials for review. Solid performance and continuing achievement in each area identified above are required as a basis for a recommendation for reappointment and, eventually, for tenure. Reviewers are obliged to make concerns and shortcomings known to pre-tenure faculty members, along with means by which the candidate might address these concerns and shortcomings. Faculty notified of performance concerns have the obligation to document their success in addressing these matters satisfactorily by the time of their next evaluation.

Each pre-tenure faculty member and chairperson will meet following the year's evaluation cycle to discuss the faculty member's performance. It is the right of pre-tenure faculty to request an informational meeting with the Dean. Pre-tenure faculty who believe their annual performance evaluations are inaccurate or unjust may request that those evaluations be reviewed using the process described below. After a faculty member's evaluation has been completed at the departmental level by the appropriate committee and the chairperson, both written evaluations are transmitted to the faculty member, who must sign the evaluation form to indicate receipt. The candidate has five (5) working days after receiving the form to cite in writing to the department chairperson any areas of disagreement prior to the evaluation's being forwarded to the Dean's Office for the next level of review. The candidate's statement is added to the candidate's review materials for consideration by subsequent reviewers.

In addition to the dean's review, faculty in their third pretenure year will be reviewed by the College's Promotion and Tenure Committee. When the College committee and the dean

have completed their evaluations, the dean's administrative assistant will notify the candidate that his/her College-level evaluation(s) must be signed for and picked up in the Dean's Office. A copy of the College-level evaluation(s) is forwarded to the candidate's department chairperson and to the chairperson of the departmental review committee. The faculty member has five (5) working days in which to cite in writing to the Dean any areas of disagreement prior to the evaluation's being forwarded to the Provost for action. The candidate's statement is added to the candidate's review materials for consideration by subsequent reviewers.

Generally, persons not reappointed for a second or third year have failed to meet a basic performance expectation (e.g., degree completion or instructional adequacy). In keeping with AAUP guidelines, the contracts of those not reappointed in this time frame are terminated at the end of the first or second year of service, respectively. Those not reappointed during the third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service have the right to serve one additional year; the purpose of this practice is to provide the faculty member ample opportunity to pursue employment elsewhere. The reappointment status of first-year faculty is determined by March 1; the determination date for second-year faculty is December 15; and the determination date for faculty in the third year and beyond is the close of the spring semester. Normally, tenure evaluation occurs during one's sixth credited year of service. Tenure is formally conferred on those recommended for continuous reappointment by action of the Board of Trustees effective with the beginning of the fall semester following the sixth year of credited service.

Persons conditionally reappointed receive written notice of the need to improve performance in one or more areas, or face nonreappointment. In general, persons reappointed without formal conditions are on-track for tenure, although sixth-year (or more junior) faculty who have not received a conditional appointment should not assume that they will earn tenure, especially if unresolved concerns appear on their annual evaluations.

### **The Timeline for Annual Performance Process**

The due date for annual performance portfolios are set each year by each level of review. Typically, all materials are due to the College around December 15 for faculty in their first pre-tenure year; around October 15 for faculty in their second pre-tenure year; and around January 10 for faculty in their third, fourth, or fifth pre-tenure year. Each department establishes its own due date based on its departmental review process; the date is typically four to six weeks before the due date to the College.

### **Preparing Materials for Tenure and Promotion Reviews.**

The preparation of tenure and/or promotion review materials is extremely important. Professionalism and expertise are represented not only in the content of the application materials but also in the care and efficiency with which the materials are presented. Therefore, faculty should attend carefully to the format recommended for tenure and promotion applications in Appendix A and should seek the advice of experienced faculty in assembling and arraying their materials. As part of the tenure and promotion review processes, departments may require and solicit statements from external referees and/or stakeholders (e.g., expert peers on scholarly and/or creative achievement, former students on teaching effectiveness, or officeholders in professional organizations on service achievements). All documents prepared and submitted by the candidate for tenure or promotion, along with documents solicited on behalf of the candidate, are transmitted



through each step of the review process.

Among those reviewing a candidate's work for tenure or promotion beyond the departmental level are colleagues who do not know the candidate or his/her work personally and who have different fields of expertise. Therefore, it is incumbent upon candidates to present their accomplishments clearly, specifically, and succinctly. Candidates must provide adequate documentation/evidence of the quality and the quantity of their performance in each of the areas to be evaluated. Any concerns raised in pre-tenure evaluations should be addressed directly by candidates in their tenure review materials. Materials may *not* be added to an application once a departmental recommendation has been reached.

### **The Review Process.**

Tenure and promotion reviews are conducted at the department level by an identified departmental committee composed, wherever possible, of tenured faculty. (In the case of joint appointments, each department will conduct its own evaluation within the framework of a memorandum of understanding established prior to the beginning of the appointment and in a manner that respects the disciplinary judgment of the other department.) This committee prepares and transmits to the department chairperson its evaluation and recommendation, which are subsequently shared with the candidate. At the time of evaluation, the committee will have available all pertinent provisions of a tenure candidate's appointment, such as educational and scholarly and/or creative expectations and years remaining until tenure eligibility; the committee will also have copies of all previous annual evaluations of the candidate. These materials are a requisite part of a tenure candidate's application portfolio.

When the departmental committee and chairperson have completed their review of the candidate's materials, the department chairperson will transmit to the candidate the written evaluations and recommendations of the departmental committee and the chairperson.

The candidate must sign the evaluation form indicating receipt of the departmental evaluations and recommendations. The department chairperson and the chairperson of the departmental committee will meet with the candidate to discuss the evaluations and recommendations. Within five (5) working days of receiving the written evaluations and recommendations, the candidate may submit to his/her chairperson a statement responding to them. The candidate's statement is added to the candidate's review materials for consideration by subsequent reviewers. A candidate for promotion and/or tenure receiving a negative recommendation from the departmental committee and/or chairperson must elect either to terminate the process or to prepare a written response, as described above. In choosing to terminate the process at this or any subsequent level, a candidate for tenure (except in the case of early consideration for tenure) also withdraws from further regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University beyond one academic year following the review year. A tenured candidate for promotion who terminates the review process may later apply for promotion without prejudice. In deciding whether to terminate or move forward an application, a candidate should be mindful of the fact that, ordinarily, one must be reviewed favorably at *all* levels of evaluation to be tenured and/or promoted.

The candidate's portfolio, the departmental evaluations, and any written response to them submitted by the candidate are then forwarded to the College for the next level of review. When the College committee and the dean have completed their evaluations, the dean will

notify the candidate that his/her College-level evaluations must be signed for and picked up in the Dean's Office. Copies of the College committee's and Dean's evaluations are forwarded to the candidate's department chairperson and to the chairperson of the departmental review committee. A candidate may request a meeting with the dean and the chairperson of the College committee to discuss the evaluations.

Within five (5) working days of signing for receipt of the evaluation, the candidate must return a signed copy of his or her evaluation to the Dean's Office and must sign the evaluation form. Also within the same time period, the candidate may submit a statement responding to the evaluations. A candidate for promotion and/or tenure receiving a negative recommendation from the College committee and/or Dean must elect either to terminate the process or to prepare a written response, as described above. In choosing to terminate the process at this or any subsequent level, a candidate for tenure (except in the case of early consideration for tenure) also withdraws from further regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University beyond one academic year following the review year. A tenured candidate for promotion who terminates the review process may later apply for promotion without prejudice. In deciding whether to terminate or move forward an application, a candidate should be mindful of the fact that, ordinarily, one must be reviewed favorably at *all* levels of evaluation to be tenured and/or promoted.

Unless withdrawn by the candidate, the portfolio, departmental evaluations, College-level evaluations, and any written response(s) by the candidate are then forwarded to the Provost for the next level of review.

### **The Timeline for the Tenure and Promotion Review Process**

The due date for application materials for tenure and promotion are set each year by each level of review. Typically, all materials are due to the College around January 10 and to the Provost around March 1. Each department establishes its own due date based on its departmental review process. Units that do not require external evaluations may have a due date in October or early November, whereas units requiring such evaluations may have a due date during the summer.

### **Grounds for Formal Reconsideration of a Decision Not to Reappoint.**

The policies of the AAUP provide, in exceptional cases, for the reconsideration of nonreappointment decisions by those alleging (1) violation of academic freedom, (2) improper discrimination, or (3) inadequate consideration. Allegations in the first two categories can lead to a formal institutional review, the result of which could be a recommendation to reappoint (or tenure) the complainant; an allegation of inadequate consideration can lead to a formal review the purpose of which is to request that the faculty body(ies) or administrator(s) who did not afford the pre-tenure faculty member adequate consideration reconsider that individual's qualifications for reappointment or tenure. *In all three cases, the burden of proof rests upon the faculty member requesting reconsideration.* (See *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports* 1995: 18-20). Recommendations of nonreappointment and denials of tenure and/or promotion may be appealed to the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee. After the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this body have been forwarded to the President, and the President has conferred with the Committee and made his/her recommendation, the appeal process is completed.

### **The Awarding of Tenure and Promotion**

As noted above, recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are based on the candidate's documented achievement in (1) teaching, (2) scholarly and/or creative work appropriate to his/her discipline, (3) service to the University and profession, and (4) any additional areas stipulated at the time of the candidate's appointment. To receive a positive recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, a candidate must ordinarily demonstrate *Satisfactory* performance in *all* categories.

In the case of joint appointments, both departments will recognize tenure and/or promotions approved by the Board of Trustees.

There is a final tenure qualification *not* discussed above. The award of tenure may also be contingent upon the mission and need of the department at the time the tenure decision is made, as stated in the *AAUP Policy Documents and Reports*. For example, recent or pending changes in program emphasis, or significant enrollment declines, or changes in teaching areas of a discipline may obviate the need to grant an otherwise qualified faculty member tenure. Whenever a department or the University anticipates such changes, it is obliged to inform potentially affected faculty of contingencies that might affect their being tenured, including the wisdom of their exploring retraining opportunities within disciplines in transition.

#### **Addendum:**

**The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College is elected in accordance with the procedure stipulated in the by-laws of the College. "Section 2.A Promotion and Tenure Committee" reads as follows:**

#### **A. Promotion and Tenure Committee**

##### **1. Identification of Candidates for Committee Membership**

The College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee is composed of nine (9) members, all of whom must be tenured faculty members of the College of Arts and Sciences and at least two-thirds of whom must hold the rank of professor. Department chairpersons may not serve on the Committee, nor may faculty who are candidates for promotion.

At the beginning of each Fall semester, the Dean shall contact the department chairpersons and the directors of the academic centers requesting names of nominees for membership on the Committee. After consultation with the department or center faculty and having obtained agreement from the nominee(s) to serve if elected, the chairperson or director shall forward the name(s) of the selected individual(s) to the Chairperson of the Faculty Council. In case of departments or centers of ten or fewer faculty members, the chairperson shall submit one name. In the case of departments of more than ten members, the chairperson shall submit two names. Individuals serving on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee may not discuss, rank, or vote on the candidacy for promotion or tenure of those in their home department (or in another department, if

they have served on an outside review committee); furthermore, individuals serving on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee may not serve simultaneously on the University Promotion Committee.

The Chairperson of the Faculty Council shall transmit the names of all candidates to the Chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Faculty Affairs Committee, at its next regular meeting, shall select a slate of nominees from the names of qualified nominees.

## 2. Preparation of the Slate

The Faculty Affairs Committee shall endeavor to provide equal balance of nominees from the three faculty groups among the general categories of: a) Arts and Humanities, b) Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and c) Social and Behavioral Sciences. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall select nominees from the area of Arts and Humanities to insure that at least one of the three members shall represent the fine and performing arts (e.g., music, arts, theater, and oral interpretation) and at least one shall represent the humanities. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall select at least three nominees for each regular position to be filled, being certain to assure that, insofar as possible, the slate reflects the gender and ethnic diversity of the College faculty as a whole, and forward these names to the Faculty Council. The election of faculty to standing committees shall be entered on the agenda for the regularly scheduled October meeting of the Faculty Council each year. At that meeting, the Vice Chairperson of the Faculty Council shall place in nomination the names of the candidates slated by the Faculty Affairs Committee. The Chairperson shall then call for nominations from the floor providing the nominee is one that has been recommended by the academic unit and is from the appropriate faculty group. When nominations from the floor have closed, the Chairperson shall distribute ballots. Each Faculty Council member shall vote for the number of nominees equal to the number of positions to be filled. Ballots with votes in excess of the number of vacancies shall not be counted for any purpose. Ballots shall be sufficiently large to permit the writing in of the names of nominees from the floor. The nominee receiving the largest number of votes shall be the regular member. Alternates, who shall replace resigning members, shall be elected in like manner; they may be elected at the same time or at any other time during the year as needed. If elected during the same vote, the nominee receiving the second largest number of votes shall be the alternate member.

Immediately following election of members and alternates, the Chairperson of the Faculty Council shall notify them of their election.

At the first election of the Committee three members and alternate members shall be elected for terms of three years; three members and alternate members shall be elected for terms of two years; and three members and alternate members of the Committee

shall be elected for terms of one year. In subsequent elections, members shall be elected for three-year terms.

3. Term of Membership

Election to the Committee is for three (3) years with one-third of the Committee members completing the term each May. In case of resignations from the Committee, the elected replacement shall complete the three-year term of the individual no longer able to serve.

Members of the Committee are not eligible for re-election to the Committee until the expiration of a period of five years from their last day of service on the Committee.

4. Replacement of Alternates

In the event that both the regular and the alternate member is unable to complete a term on the Committee, the Faculty Council may, at a special election during any regular Council meeting, elect new alternate members as needed to fill vacancies for the unexpired portions of the original members' terms. The Executive Committee shall prepare a slate of nominees, being careful to insure equal representation among the three faculty groups (Humanities and Arts; Natural Sciences and Mathematics; and Social and Behavioral Sciences). Nominations shall be accepted from the floor, providing the nominee has given prior consent and is from the appropriate faculty group. The election shall be conducted in the same manner as elections to standing committees of the Council.

5. Organization of the Committee

The first meeting of the Promotions and Tenure Committee shall be called by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences who shall charge the Committee with its responsibilities. The members of the Promotions and Tenure Committee will select a chairperson from its members at the initial meeting.

6. Procedure for Voting

After deliberation, the members of the Committee shall vote "yes" for approved or "no" for not approved for each individual candidate for tenure and/or promotion. If the "yes" vote is greater than a tie, the candidate is approved. After this vote, those candidates being approved will be ranked by the members voting. Each candidate will be assigned a rank based on the mean ranking of the Committee members. When candidates are tied during ranking, voting members shall rank within the tie. A statement of justification will accompany each recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. Committee member(s) from a nominee's department shall

neither participate in discussion nor vote on that candidate; moreover, persons from another department whose personal or professional closeness to a candidate suggests a possible conflict of interest should recuse themselves from consideration of that candidate.

[Guidelines revised and Addendum added; approved by Faculty Council 10/9/02]

## **Appendix A: Tenure and Promotion Application Template, College of Arts and Sciences**

A well-prepared tenure and/or promotion application facilitates effective communication between the applicant and those reviewing his/her application. To this end, the following template has been devised. While those being considered for tenure and/or promotion need not follow the template in every detail, they must present three (3) sets of documentation -- one each for teaching, scholarly and/or creative work, and service. Key generalizations to keep in mind when presenting materials for review are these:

§ *Be Selective and Concise:* Include only the most significant information in the main body of your application;

§ *Be Well-Organized:* Place important supporting information in appendices, and include road signs for those reviewing your application, such as tables of contents and clearly labeled binder dividers; and

§ *Build a Self-Contained Case:* Present your major academic achievements in a way that, *based on the evidence contained in the materials you submit*, clearly demonstrates the quality, the quantity, and the importance of these achievements.

### **Cover Page**

Application for Tenure/Promotion

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Year \_\_\_\_\_

### **Table of Contents**

### **Body of Application**

#### **Part I Preliminary Materials**

##### *Curriculum Vitae*

Letter of initial appointment (if a candidate for tenure) and, if applicable, any official memoranda of understanding affecting your appointment

Copies of annual reappointment reviews, including letters of reappointment (if a candidate for tenure)

## Part II Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness

One-page statement of teaching philosophy

Logically arranged list of all classes taught at ISU, including course name and number, credit and contact hours, and number of students for each class (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Three or four course syllabi that represent the range of courses taught and demonstrate the practical application of your teaching philosophy

Brief description of any new or significantly revised courses, newly employed pedagogies, or significant teaching materials developed at ISU (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Number and type of students advised (if applicable), a brief description of your advising practice, and student assessment of advisement (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Brief description of undergraduate/graduate-student research involvement and student assessment of such involvement (if applicable, and since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Brief description of undergraduate/graduate-student professional-development involvement and student assessment of such involvement (if applicable, and since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of instructional grant and contract applications, including source, date, amount, status (funded/unfunded/pending), and a brief description for each item (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of donations secured in support of instruction, including source, date, amount, and a brief description of the project funded (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Documentation of the *quality* of one's teaching, including (1) a summary of student evaluations for all courses taught (results from SIRs and/or departmental instruments are required), (2) copies of all peer teaching evaluations (required), (3) letters from current and former students, (4) input from the Student Consultation Program (if applicable), and (5) a list of teaching awards (if applicable, and since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Summary of professional pedagogical-development activities (e.g., participation in Center for Teaching and Learning initiatives and workshops, since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of material supporting teaching effectiveness included in Appendices

### Part III Documentation of Scholarly and Creative Achievement

One-page description of scholarly and/or creative goals pursued to date, and future scholarly and/or creative directions.

List of scholarly and/or creative outcomes, including basic reference information and a brief description for each item: books, refereed articles, and book chapters; performances, exhibitions, and productions; software; translations, edited works, research reports, non-refereed articles, research abstracts, articles in proceedings volumes, and book reviews; conference presentations; etc. (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of forthcoming works, including place, approximate length, acceptance letter, etc., and a brief description for each item

List of works-under-review, including place, approximate length, and a brief description for each item (if a candidate for tenure only)

List of major works-in-progress, including contracts or invitations where applicable (if a candidate for tenure only)

List of research grant and contract applications, including source, date, amount, status (funded/unfunded/pending), and a brief description for each item (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of donations secured in support of scholarly and/or creative work, including source, date, amount, and a brief description of the project funded (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Documentation of the *quality* of one's scholarly and/or creative work, including reviews, abstracts, citations, awards, letters from editors or conference organizers, etc. [**Note:** Some departments require external peer reviews of tenure candidates' scholarly and/or creative work.]

List of material supporting scholarly and/or creative achievement included in Appendices

### Part IV Documentation of Service Achievement

One-page description of service goals

List of departmental, College, and University service assignments, including dates, major responsibilities and achievements, and a brief description for each item (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of professional service activities, including dates, major responsibilities and achievements, and a brief description for each item (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of community service activities, including dates, major responsibilities and achievements, and a brief description for each item (since last promotion if a candidate



for promotion only)

List of service grant and contract applications, including source, date, amount, status (funded/unfunded/pending), and a brief description for each item (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

List of donations secured in support of service, including source, date, amount, and a brief description of the project funded (since last promotion if a candidate for promotion only)

Documentation of the *quality* of your service, including peer and, if applicable, student assessments, letters, printed notices, awards, etc.

List of material supporting service achievement included in Appendices

## Appendices

### A. Teaching

Sample assignments, examinations, and other teaching materials

Printouts of all student-generated teaching evaluations and, if applicable, copies of prose comments from *all* responding students in selected classes

### B. Scholarly and Creative Achievement

Copies of published material, tapes, slides, programs, etc. (Minimally, this should include a representative sample of one's scholarly and/or creative work; it may include all of that work.)

### C. Service

Major committee reports, consulting reports, or other tangible records of service achievements (if applicable)

2001 -- Indiana State University College of Arts and Sciences

---

[1] Throughout this document, the term *community service* has a specific meaning -- namely, a faculty member's providing discipline-related expertise in service to an external agency, company, or non-profit organization.

[2] The probationary period for professors may be waived, and tenure may be awarded at the time of appointment, subject to the following conditions: (1) the appointee must have previously earned tenure and the rank of professor at one or more accredited educational institutions; (2) the academic department and the program area to which the

candidate is to be assigned must recommend appointment with tenure. A positive recommendation shall advance through the department committee and chairperson, the College Committee, and the College Dean to the Provost; (3) the Provost and the President shall consult with the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and receive its recommendation; and (4) the President shall convey the actions on the recommendation at each level to the Board of Trustees. The documents that accompany a recommendation for appointment with tenure must include the complete application materials for the position (letter of application, vita, letters of reference, etc.), sample publications/slides/recordings, and representative recent teaching evaluations. Individual departments may require additional materials.

[3] According to the 1998 task force report *Assessing and Improving Teaching and Learning at Indiana State University*, *effective teachers possess content expertise, design their courses well* (i.e., have a clear instructional purpose, communicate high but realistic expectations, and match their instruction to students' learning needs and interest), *deliver their instruction well* (i.e., employ good communication skills, design learning environments that encourage time on task, engage students in actively acquiring and utilizing knowledge, use an array of appropriate pedagogical methods, encourage students to work together to learn, and provide regular, helpful evaluations of learning), *effect productive instructional relationships* (e.g., show enthusiasm, create an environment of mutual respect with students, acknowledge and adjust to different student needs and learning styles, act fairly and impartially when dealing with students, and remain open to receiving feedback and adjusting instruction appropriately), *manage their courses well*, and *engage in ongoing professional development*.

---

*Last modified: January 02, 2007*

Copyright © 2007 by [Indiana State University](http://www.indstate.edu).