

Arts and Letters: Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Mission Statement

Pursuing enlightenment and creativity . . .

The School of Arts and Letters exists to foster the intellectual, creative, and personal growth of its students through courses in the humanities. We encourage our students to dream, to think critically, creatively, and insightfully, and to engage in their own lives, their communities and the world. Within our individual academic disciplines, we seek to create learning communities that will inspire and equip students to become the best, most independent, confident, and competent people they can be.

The mission of the faculty of the School of Arts and Letters is to develop in each student cognitive and creative language and artistic skills that allow for human thought and communication in the expression of ideas, emotions, and aesthetics. We believe that students more fully develop their own aesthetic and intellectual voice by knowing and experiencing the perspectives and values of others. These goals involve crossing cultural, philosophical, and artistic boundaries. As faculty and students, we seek to understand ourselves and others through our individual creative works and ideas as we become agents of our own lives.

It is clear to us that the intellectual, creative, and personal growth of each student benefits the faculty, staff, students, campus and local communities, and the world at large. Through our teaching, research, creativity, and service, we are committed to giving our students the tools to be informed citizens in a global society guided by democratic principles, as well as to succeed professionally. With this in mind, we seek to stimulate rather than suppress, challenge rather than confirm, create rather than imitate.

Section I

Membership and Appointment Procedure

The School Review Committee of the School of Arts and Letters will be elected each spring semester by the full-time members of the School to serve for one year. It will consist of five members and should include at least three tenured faculty members. No more than one member should be from any single academic discipline. In accordance with the appropriate sections of the IUS Faculty Manual (23rd ed., 2004), a faculty member will not be elected to serve on the SRC during the year in which that member will be considered for promotion or tenure. In addition, where possible, an attempt will be made to include a departmental colleague of each candidate applying for promotion or tenure. The

SRC committee can request consultation with a faculty member of the candidate's home department if no member from that department is on the SRC. Members will meet in the spring semester prior to deliberations to elect a chair. Service on the SRC implies service on the DAC (Dossier Advisory Committee, as described in Section III) whenever possible.

Section II

Duties and Responsibilities of the SRC Committee

The duties of the SRC shall include the following:

- A. To evaluate the candidacy of those being considered for promotion in rank, including lecturers, by examining the dossiers prepared by the candidates and any additional material and/or information it may collect, and to make a recommendation to the Campus Review Committee for Promotion according to the procedure set forth in the IUS Faculty Manual.
- B. To evaluate the candidacy of those being considered for the award of tenure by means similar to those spelled out in "A" above, and to make a recommendation to the Campus Review Committee on Tenure as specified in the IUS Faculty Manual.
- C. To evaluate the progress of third-year tenure-track faculty toward qualification for promotion and tenure; to inform the involved faculty member as to its judgment and make constructive suggestions for improved performance where possible; to report its judgment in writing to the School Dean.
- D. To evaluate the progress of third-year, non-tenure-track faculty toward qualification for promotion to Senior Lecturer; to inform the involved faculty member as to its judgment and make constructive suggestions for improved performance where possible; to report its judgment in writing to the School Dean.
- E. To do a spring evaluation of the uses of release time by those faculty members who are taking release time for research or creative work. Faculty taking this reassigned time will be reviewed at least each three years unless the faculty member has been reviewed for promotion during that period. The SRC will report its recommendation in writing to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs through the Dean, who will attach a recommendation.

The committee's primary responsibility must be to this institution and the future quality of its programs in the School of Arts and Letters, while supporting the candidate's responsibilities to his or her discipline and its scholarship. The committee is charged to protect the confidentiality of all information and documents placed in its trust.

The SRC should be recognized as an independent review level consisting of faculty. While the committee needs to communicate with the Dean, all parties should recognize that the SRC does not attempt to influence the deliberations of the Dean and vice versa.

III. Duties and Responsibilities of the DAC Committee

The Dossier Advisory Committee (DAC) will be composed of the members of the previous year's SRC whenever possible. The committee should strive to have a full complement of 5 members, but a minimum of 3 members.

A faculty member of the DAC may request release from this duty under special circumstances (e.g. sabbatical, being considered for Promotion/Tenure, among others).

The Purpose of the DAC is to review the dossiers of the candidates for the purpose of making suggestions to improve the dossiers before their submission to the SRC.

If the candidate wishes to take advantage of the services of the DAC he/she needs to submit a completed dossier draft on or before August 15 for consideration. It is recommended that the candidate utilize the DAC. The DAC will return the dossier to the candidate with comments by September 8. These dates are subject to change as a function of the deadline set by academic affairs.

In addition, it is the candidate's decision to include (or not include) suggestions made by the DAC in regard to the dossier.

Section IV **Responsibilities of a Candidate for Promotion or Tenure**

The candidate is responsible for the preparation of his or her own dossier according to the procedures and guidelines established by the *IU Academic Handbook*, the Indiana University Southeast Faculty Manual, and the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The dossier should include only material directly related to the professional activities of the candidate. The SRC has the right and responsibility to seek additional information relevant to the dossier during their evaluation of the candidate.

Candidates should assemble materials for review of their research (a CV and copies of articles or examples of creative work) by **August 15** in order for outside reviewers to have adequate time for evaluation. By the same date, names of all reviewers should be submitted to the Dean's office.

It is a candidate's responsibility to submit an electronic, copy-edited dossier that is complete, coherent, and factual. The candidate may add appropriate material

not available at the time of submission (e.g. notice of acceptance of publication) at any time for consideration during the review by the SRC.

Promotion and tenure candidates are encouraged to meet with the Dean and as well as School colleagues who have successfully made it through promotion and tenure in order to discuss the e-dossier process.

Section V Procedures

A. Review of Non-tenure-track Appointees

Mechanisms for appointment, reappointment, review and promotion of full-time Lecturers will follow the same guidelines as those for tenure-track faculty except that Lecturers will be evaluated on teaching and appropriate service (with the consideration of research when it is in support of their teaching). After a probationary period of no longer than seven years (analogous to the tenure process) candidates who are successfully promoted to Senior Lecturer will be awarded long term contracts structured as rolling three-year contracts.

Annual Reports and Points of Review, such as the Dean's Annual Review, the Notification of Reappointment, and the Third-Year Review apply to non-tenure-track as well as tenure-track appointees except that the former are reviewed only on teaching and service, and not on scholarship, except as noted above.

The standards for evaluation of teaching and service apply to candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer, as well as to tenure-track appointees.

B. Promotion and Tenure

Due to the established university deadline for applications of promotion and tenure (established by Academic Affairs on its annual Promotion and Tenure Schedule for the appropriate year), review of these candidates must be scheduled during the fall semester. Since the responsibilities of the SRC for review of promotion and tenure are the same, the review of promotion candidates and tenure applicants should be held at the same time.

1. The SRC should allow at least 2 weeks and no more than 4 weeks after the submission deadline of dossiers before scheduling confidential faculty interviews. During this time, all non-confidential materials will be available in the School office for perusal by the Arts and Letters faculty. The SRC should consider appropriate material (e.g. notice of acceptance of publication) added after the final submission of the dossier.
2. During the review the committee will collect confidential materials essential to its investigation. These should include:

- a. School Dean's Annual Reviews for each candidate
 - b. Letters of recommendation from students
 - c. Letters of recommendation from Arts and Letters faculty and faculty outside the School
3. By August 15th, tenured and tenure-track candidates should submit the names of a minimum of six research reviewers. The Dean will solicit research reviews from everyone on the candidate's list.
4. Each candidate should submit the names of at least 10 students and 10 colleagues (from IUS or other institutions) who will be asked to write letters of support. As a complement to the feedback provided by individuals chosen by the candidate, the Dean will also solicit letters from 30 students selected randomly from the candidate's class rosters.
5. Requests for letters of recommendation from students and faculty should be sent at least 3 weeks in advance of the deadline for submission of dossiers. Requests for letters from outside specialists should be sent by the first week in September. Such deadlines allow adequate time for these individuals to send back their responses. It should be noted that the Dean is responsible for soliciting letters of recommendation from students and faculty and sending samples of the candidate's research to outside specialists included on the candidate's list, as well as other sources from whom the Dean and/or the SRC may request input (see *IUS Faculty Manual*, section B-14-3).
6. After the SRC and school faculty have had an opportunity to review the candidate's dossiers (and, in the case of the SRC, additional confidential materials), confidential interviews should be scheduled. The following interviews could include:
- a. Colleagues from the candidate's discipline who are not members of the SRC
 - b. Arts and Letters faculty
 - c. Students (current and former)
 - d. Faculty from other IUS schools
 - e. Other professional colleagues
7. The SRC will meet to discuss the accumulated information. If no member of a candidate's department is represented on the SRC, the department coordinator (or a colleague) will again be invited to meet with the SRC. In instances where no departmental colleague is available due to sabbatical leave, an effort will be made to contact him/her by mail or telephone.
8. The existence and general content of evidence leading to a negative decision must be conveyed to the candidate so that the candidate may respond.

9. The SRC will review all materials and make final written recommendations as to the promotion or tenure applications of each candidate.
10. All candidates will be given an opportunity to meet with the SRC to respond to its final recommendations and challenge any omissions or discrepancies.
11. The recommendations will be forwarded to the CRC via the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, with a copy to the Dean and to the candidate.

C. Third Year Review

As stated in the IUS Faculty Manual, the purpose of the 3rd year review is to have colleagues in the individual's school advise and evaluate the tenure-track faculty member concerning his/her progress toward promotion and tenure based on teaching, service, and scholarship. For non-tenure-track faculty, the purpose of the review is to have the peers in the individual's school advise and evaluate the faculty member concerning his/her progress toward promotion to Senior Lecturer based on teaching and service. March 1 is the deadline for submission of the mini-dossier for the 3rd year review.

When the SRC gives the Third Year Review candidate notification of the dossier due date, the candidate is strongly encouraged to review models of previous Third Year Review dossiers. The Dean will collect and maintain a file of model dossiers to serve as a guide for candidates preparing the Third Year Review.

Since the purpose of the 3rd year review is quite different from review for promotion or tenure, complete tenure and promotion dossiers and SRC interviews of school faculty members are not essential. The SRC will inform the candidates of the deadline for submission of materials for review. at the beginning of the Spring Semester (i.e. within the first two weeks of the Spring Semester).

The core of this mini-dossier should be the candidate's annual reports and the Dean's annual reviews, supplemented by any materials the candidate feels are essential in reviewing his or her teaching, service or research. It should include such things as a statement of teaching philosophy, evidence of student learning and effective teaching, and evidence of research and service. It should be organized in the form of a tenure dossier (without letters of recommendation). Although the standing SRC will set a schedule of dates, the following procedure is recommended for the SRC:

1. Review the candidate's mini-dossier and the annual reports and reviews.
2. Solicit commentary from discipline colleagues and other faculty wishing to provide information relevant to the review.
3. Request additional information from the candidate when necessary.

4. Discuss each candidate and prepare a preliminary written evaluation, including important strengths and areas of concern.
5. Provide the opportunity to meet with each candidate to discuss the committee's findings.
6. Write the final evaluation and give copies to the candidate and the Dean for the school file only.
7. Third year reviews may not be used for reappointment decisions.

D. Release Time Review

The purpose of the Release Time Review is different from the Third Year Review and from the Review for Promotion or Tenure. Therefore, complete dossiers and interviews are not essential. By March 1 the Dean should provide the committee copies of the research section of the annual reviews from the preceding three years of each tenured faculty member who is taking release time for research and whose research has not been evaluated by a SRC within the preceding three years of release time. Service and teaching activities are not relevant to this Review. Release time will be granted provided the faculty member shows evidence that he or she has been using release time appropriately for creative work or scholarly research.

1. If there is some doubt about a faculty member's research, the faculty member may be called in for an interview.
2. If there is clear evidence that a faculty member has not been able to use his or her release time for research, he or she will be given one year's grace period and specific instructions by the Dean and the SRC about what can be done to improve his or her use of time.
3. In all cases it is the faculty member's responsibility to make his or her case for the continued use of release time.
4. The SRC will provide a written recommendation to be submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs through the Dean, who will attach a recommendation.

Section VI Standards for Evaluation of Candidates

Consistent with the IU *Academic Handbook*, in order to meet the criteria for promotion above the level of Assistant Professor, a candidate's performance shall normally be excellent in one area and at least satisfactory in the other two areas.

To achieve the rank of associate professor, faculty are expected to establish:

- a record of effective teaching and student learning in an appropriate range of courses.

- a post-doctoral program of scholarship (research or creative activity) and a record of successful sharing of this work with professionals beyond the campus.
- a record of service to various levels of the university, to the profession, and/or to the external community.

To achieve the rank of professor, faculty are expected to establish while at the rank of Associate Professor:

- a record of effective teaching and student learning plus evidence of functioning as a senior model and leader within the discipline, campus, university, and/or profession.
- a record of contributions to scholarship within the areas of expertise through sharing of original research or creative work and/or consultation based on established expertise.
- a record of extensive service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community.

The IUS Faculty Manual leaves it to the SRC to determine what is excellent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory.

It is understood that there may be overlap between the areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. However, the candidate should attempt not to duplicate information, but to simply cross-reference and provide an explanation if necessary.

Criteria for Teaching

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Excellent -- has developed an outstanding record of effective teaching and student learning across a range of courses that supports the mission and needs of the discipline and/or school.

Satisfactory -- has developed a record of effective teaching and student learning in an appropriate range of courses that supports the mission and needs of the discipline and/or school.

Unsatisfactory -- has not developed a record of effective teaching and student learning in an appropriate range of courses that adequately supports the mission and needs of the discipline or school.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Excellent -- has developed a consistently outstanding record of effective teaching and student learning, as well as provided evidence of unusually effective

functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university and/or profession.

Satisfactory -- has developed a consistent record of effective teaching and student learning, as well as provided evidence of functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university and/or profession.

Unsatisfactory -- has not developed a consistent record of effective teaching and student learning, nor provided evidence of functioning as a model and leader within the discipline, campus, university, or profession.

List of evidence for evaluating Teaching:

The following list should not be considered exhaustive or preclusive.

1. Internal or external competitive teaching award
2. Evidence of effective classroom performance
May include the following: student evaluations, assessment materials, course materials, letters from students, peer-review feedback, etc.
3. Work with students outside of class, including independent studies
4. Attending/facilitating teaching workshops (on and beyond campus)
5. Publication of pedagogical essays
6. Development of new courses or redesign of existing courses
7. Development of curricula
8. Expertise and knowledge of the highest standards of the discipline and the ability to convey that to students.
9. Teaching and/or serving on Thesis committees in the MLS program (to the extent this item is not listed under 'Service')

The SRC may wish to take into account the prestige of particular articles, workshops or teaching awards in assigning its ratings. It may also wish to consider factors such as the range of courses taught, the offering of independent studies, and the evidence of self-critique and revision of teaching materials present in the dossier.

Criteria for Scholarship

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Excellent -- has developed a post-doctoral program of scholarship and has produced an outstanding record of sharing this work within the profession.

Satisfactory -- has developed a post-doctoral program of scholarship and has produced a record of successful sharing of this work with professionals.

Unsatisfactory -- has not developed a post-doctoral program of scholarship and/or has not produced a record of successful sharing of the work with professionals.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Excellent -- has developed a consistently outstanding record of scholarly contributions within the area(s) of expertise through sharing of original research or creative work and/or consultation based on established expertise.

Satisfactory -- has developed a strong and consistent record of scholarly contributions within the area(s) of expertise through sharing of original research or creative work and/or consultation based on established expertise.

Unsatisfactory -- has not developed a strong and consistent record of scholarly contributions within the area(s) of expertise through sharing of original research or creative work and/or consultation based on established expertise.

Lists of evidence for evaluating Research

The SRC may also wish to consider other contributions and works in progress, as well as the relative prestige of journal articles and performing or exhibition venues when assigning a rating. SRC members are encouraged to seek the advice of faculty in the candidate's field in determining the importance of evidence of research/creativity, and candidates are encouraged to clarify this importance in their own discussion of these events/achievements in the dossier. The following list should not be considered exhaustive or preclusive. In general, Group A is considered a higher level of scholarship than Group B and Group C.

The candidate can make an argument within the dossier for moving up an item from a lower to a higher group.

Group A.

- Publication of a book or book under contract with a reputable academic press
- Peer reviewed articles (must be accepted for publication, but not necessarily published)
- External Grant funded and evidence of progress on project
- Solo exhibition, performance or production with a reputable gallery, museum, performing venue, or recording.
- Book chapter

Group B.

- Refereed or invited presentation at regional, national, or international professional meeting
- Major IU system grant

- Exhibition, performance, or production with a reputable gallery, museum, performing venue, or recording

Group C.

- Book reviews
- Major external grant submitted but not funded
- IUS internal grants
- Non-refereed presentations
- Local exhibition, performance, or production with a reputable gallery, museum, performing venue, or recording

Criteria for Service

Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Excellent -- has developed an outstanding record of service to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Satisfactory -- has developed a strong record of service to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the external community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Unsatisfactory -- has not developed a strong record of service to the university, the profession, and/or the external community and/or become a contributing member of the academic community.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Excellent -- has developed a consistently outstanding record of service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession and/or the community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Satisfactory -- has developed an extensive and consistent record of service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the community and is a contributing member of the academic community.

Unsatisfactory -- has not developed an extensive and consistent record of service and leadership to various levels of the university, the profession, and/or the community and/or been a contributing member of the academic community.

Lists of evidence for evaluating Service

Record of service at all levels (department, school, university, IU system level, community, and profession).

Evidence of significant contribution to committee work that led to completion of the task with which the committee was charged. In addition, the committee may want to ascertain the significance or impact of the committee.

Criteria for Tenure

After the appropriate probationary period, tenure may be granted to those faculty members whose professional characteristics indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. The principle of faculty tenure imposes reciprocal responsibilities upon the university and upon the faculty member: the university provides academic freedom and economic security; the faculty member, on the other hand, is obligated to maintain high standards of professional performance and professional ethics. Tenure means that the faculty member has become a full and permanent member of the academic body of the university. Tenure will generally be conferred only to those who have achieved, or give strong evidence of potential to achieve, promotion in rank according to the criteria at Indiana University Southeast. The granting of tenure will also reflect careful consideration of the qualifications of the faculty member in terms of the missions and needs of the school and the professional standards of his or her discipline.