

Approved by Department Faculty: 11-0-0 [5/10 /2021]

Approved by College Faculty Affairs Committee: vote [date]

Approved by College Executive Committee with amendments: vote []

Approved by University Promotion and Tenure Oversight Committee: vote [date]

## **GUIDELINES FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION AND TENURE**

### **Department of Applied Health Sciences**

### **College of Health & Human Services**

### **Indiana State University**

#### **Introduction**

As indicated by the College of Health & Human Services Guidelines for Academic Tenure and Promotion document and the University Handbook, the Department of Applied Health Sciences has the central role in the evaluation of its faculty. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Department to develop specific evaluative criteria and performance standards for tenure. These responsibilities are consistent with the College of Health & Human Services Performance Guidelines for Academic Tenure and Promotion and are submitted as Departmental documents to the College of Health & Human Services Faculty Affairs Committee and Executive Committee for review and to the University Faculty Affairs Committee for approval. The Department criteria contained in this document provides: (1) additional information designed to assist candidates for tenure and promotion in better recognizing what is expected of them; and (2) certain key measures that peer and administrative evaluators will use to determine whether or not to recommend the faculty member for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. This document respects the section of the most current University Handbook that discusses faculty tenure and defines standards of performance for Department of Applied Health Sciences' faculty while recognizing that all standards must be satisfied for the award of tenure. The tenure policies and practices outlined in this document are also consistent with those articulated in the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Policy Documents & Reports.

This document also acknowledges that, for appropriate programmatic reasons, faculty appointments are occasionally made that place different demands on pre-tenure and promotable faculty than are typically required for that position. Whenever such appointments are made, it is incumbent on Departmental officials to make such demands clear to both the affected faculty member and to those evaluating that individual for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion. Normally, this information is contained in the appointment letter or in a memorandum of understanding created by the Department Chairperson at the time the differential demands are placed on the pre-tenure or promotable faculty member. At the time of review, the Department Chairperson must inform the Department Faculty Affairs Committee Chairperson of special considerations for the pre-tenure or promotable faculty member.

The candidate will be evaluated for tenure and promotion at multiple levels: first, by the Department of Applied Health Sciences Faculty Affairs Committee; second, by the Department of Applied Health Sciences Chairperson; CFAC will review faculty portfolio's when there is incongruent review recommendations by DFAC, Chair, or Executive Director (where appropriate) during any review period including annual reviews except year one; fourth, by the College Dean; and lastly, by the Provost. Approval at all levels culminates in the faculty member being awarded tenure by the action of the University's Board of Trustees. The annual letters of reappointment that pre-tenured faculty receive from their Department, the Dean, and the Provost convey crucial information about their progress

toward meeting these expectations. Just as it is incumbent on peer-review committees, Chairpersons, the Dean, and the Provost to express performance-related concerns to pre-tenured faculty, **the obligation to demonstrate that one has addressed all concerns that might be raised at any level of evaluation rests with the pre-tenure or promotable faculty member.** The pre-tenure faculty member must include all previous reviews within each application for review. One must be evaluated favorably for tenure at each level of evaluation in order to receive tenure and promotion. Each year of probationary evaluation, faculty members shall initial review letters and sign their evaluation forms to indicate awareness of the comments on the forms.

### **Performance Evaluation Levels for Pre-Tenure and Promotable Faculty**

Satisfactory and unsatisfactory are the two recognized performance evaluation levels for pre-tenure and promotable faculty. A rating of Satisfactory signifies that the faculty member's performance has met a satisfactory standard, as understood both in the faculty member's field of expertise and within the University community.

**Mid-tenure** benchmarks should be evaluated during the 3<sup>rd</sup> year review of the six-year tenure timeline (or equivalent).

### **Eligibility and Recognition**

Individuals beginning their probationary periods at the rank of assistant professor become eligible to apply for an award of tenure during the sixth year of continuing faculty achievements under a tenure-track faculty appointment in accredited institutions, at least four (4) years of which must have been served under a tenure-track faculty appointment at Indiana State University (ISU). Such candidates are awarded tenure only upon meeting the established criteria and performance standards for promotion to the rank of associate professor. Under *exceptional* circumstances, a candidate in the fifth (5<sup>th</sup>) pre-tenure year may be considered for promotion and tenure prior to the end of his/her stated probationary period with evidence of excellent performance in all three domains over the four-year period. For this to occur, the candidate's exceptionality 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. Faculty are eligible to apply for the academic rank of professor in their fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) year as Associate Professor at ISU. A negative recommendation from any reviewing entity provides two options: one, the candidate has the right to stop the review process and later apply for promotion without prejudice. Two, the candidate has the same right to appeal the decision as any other candidate **and must follow the same appeal process as faculty members assigned a negative review for their annual evaluations.**

### **Overall Standards by Rank**

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the total spectrum of teaching, scholarship, and service. Successful faculty members must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three domains.

#### **Assistant Professor**

Documented evidence of adequacy in teaching; of potential for achievement in scholarship; and of service appropriate to the mission of the College and Department of Applied Health Sciences are

required. Faculty members are to demonstrate continuous professional growth in teaching; research, scholarship, or creativity; and service.

### **Associate Professor**

Documented evidence of effective teaching; a record of scholarship which has earned professional recognition at the regional or national level; and evidence of effective service to the College, the University, and to either the community or the profession are required.

### **Professor**

To obtain the rank of full professor, faculty must demonstrate evidence of one of the examples below in terms of sustained, substantial, or excellent performance.

For example, a faculty member might present:

- Documented evidence of substantial and effective teaching; of a record of substantial accomplishment in scholarship which has led to professional recognition at the national level; and of active, substantial service to some combination of the University, the community and the profession; **OR**
- Documented evidence of excellence in one domain of faculty work, while also demonstrating substantial and/or sustained performance in the other domains.

## **Degree Requirements**

A doctorate degree in a field appropriate to the discipline in which the candidate teaches and conducts research, scholarship, or creative activity is required for tenure and promotion. Exceptions may be made in cases of persons of indisputable national renown.

## **Evaluation of Teaching**

Teaching is an integral part of a faculty member's responsibilities. The faculty member must have a teaching philosophy, teaching goals, and reflection of his/her teaching experience. The faculty member should continually seek to improve teaching over time. Evidence of working on improvement can include: staying current with subject matter (attendance at professional conferences); comparison of syllabi from year one to subsequent years; revisions or additions to course curricula; attendance at teaching workshops or conferences; or evaluation feedback indicating student comments remain positive or improve over time. This list is not exhaustive and can include other evidence of teaching efforts. Where appropriate, the faculty member should indicate how he/she has incorporated community engagement in teaching. It is expected that all teaching is performed within ethical guidelines (i.e. academic and professional).

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

#### **1. Summary of Teaching Achievement**

The faculty member must provide a Teaching Philosophy, including goals and reflection of how he/she has met or not met/achieved/exceeded the goals.

## **2. List of Classes Taught at Indiana State University**

The faculty member must ensure the FAD generated tables of classes taught and community engagement/experiential learning is correct.

## **3. Sample Course Syllabi**

The faculty member must provide current syllabi for all courses. Syllabi should follow University and Program regulations. Provide information or examples and material to support effectiveness of course-based community engagement, where appropriate.

## **4. Peer & Department Chairperson Evaluations**

The pre-tenure faculty member must be evaluated at least once per year by the Department Chairperson *and* Department's Faculty Affairs Committee. In the event accreditation requires review by the Program Director, he/she too will complete an independent review of faculty's teaching. The faculty member can seek additional review by other peers or a reviewer from outside the department. The faculty member should reflect on the evaluations. Peer evaluations are coordinated by the Chairperson of the Department's Faculty Affairs Committee.

## **5. Evidence of Student Learning**

The faculty member must provide samples of student work a minimum of one assignment for each class they taught in the year that is being evaluated. Samples may include exams, instructions and rubrics for projects or written work, and/or a summary of how student-learning outcomes were assessed.

## **6. Student Evaluations**

The faculty member must provide a copy of *each* course evaluation that includes both the quantitative report and the students' qualitative comments for that course. Should a faculty member state they receive evaluations higher than department colleagues, then a table with his or her evaluations compared to department, college, and university averages must be provided.

## **7. Self-Evaluation**

The faculty member must reflect on peer, chairperson, and student evaluations and how to effectively incorporate suggestions into classes or offer explanations for lower performance. The faculty member should also reflect on how their evaluations change over time (years) through the tenure and promotion process. They must also provide reflection of course-based community engagement/experiential learning activities when applicable.

## **8. Pedagogical development activities**

The faculty member should provide a list of the following activities:

- Teaching seminar(s) attended
- Professional conference(s) in your subject field or teaching conferences
- Other developmental activities as appropriate

## **9. Undergraduate and/or Graduate Student Academic Advising Report (if applicable)**

The faculty member should provide a summary report of advisees (# of advisees per year), advising philosophy, and summary of advising evaluation.

## **10. Undergraduate and/or Graduate Research Advising/Mentoring (if applicable)**

The faculty member should provide a list of student research, including community-based research (see example table below). Faculty must include student's name, research title, and expected/date of completion.

**11. Program/Curriculum development activities (if applicable)**

The faculty member should provide a list of the following activities:

- Development of new course(s)
- Substantial Change(s) to an existing course

**12. Awards and recognition**

Faculty member must provide documentation of the award or recognition

**Satisfactory Teaching** - To qualify for a satisfactory rating, a faculty member must provide evidence of meeting the following teaching benchmarks:

**Mid-tenure:** Teaching effectiveness, as documented by evidence of student learning, teaching performance, student perception, classroom visitation, and self-evaluation should be at least satisfactory, without serious limitations or shortcomings in classroom performance, curricular development, or pedagogy. Evidence of activities focused on pedagogical growth must also be documented (e.g. Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence or other training accomplishments).

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Rank:** Teaching effectiveness, as documented by evidence of student learning, teaching performance, student perception, classroom visitation, and self-evaluation. This documentation should demonstrate continuous attention to pedagogy, curricular development, and classroom management without serious limitations.

**Promotion to Full Professor Rank:**

**Sustained Performance:** Teaching effectiveness, as documented by evidence of student learning, teaching performance, student perception, classroom visitation, teaching professional development attendance, and self-evaluation. This documentation should demonstrate continuous improvement (since the last promotion, date of appointment or at least 3 years), without serious limitations or shortcomings in classroom performance, curricular development, or pedagogy.

**Substantial Performance:** Teaching effectiveness, as documented by evidence of student learning, teaching performance, student perception, classroom visitation, and self-evaluation. This documentation should demonstrate continuous improvement (since the last promotion, date of appointment or at least 3 years), without serious limitations or shortcomings in classroom performance, curricular development, or pedagogy. **Demonstrated substantial performance in teaching** should include implementation of a new or revised courses/program (i.e. delivery format, degree elevation), or using assessment data to foster continuous quality improvement in teaching, and/or institutional recognition of teaching.

**Excellent Performance:** Teaching effectiveness, as documented by evidence of student learning, teaching performance, student perception, classroom visitation, and self-evaluation. This documentation should demonstrate continuous improvement (since the last promotion, date of appointment or at least 3 years), without serious limitations or shortcomings in classroom performance, curricular development, or pedagogy. **Demonstrated excellent performance in teaching** should include University-level or extra-institutional recognition of teaching, curricular or program development.

**Unsatisfactory Teaching** - An unsatisfactory rating means that the candidate has not fully met performance expectations and/or has not sufficiently documented teaching effectiveness or that there is an inability to perform within ethical boundaries. 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.

### **Evaluation of Scholarship**

The Department of Applied Health Sciences is committed to the value of scholarship. In accordance with College Promotion, Tenure, and Retention documents, the Department has a broad definition of scholarship as defined by Boyer's Model of Scholarship. This may include original work focused on discovery and integration; and/or scholarship focused on teaching and learning; and/or the scholarship of application/engagement that utilizes disciplinary methods and theories to address substantial problems. The intellectual products of faculty members' research/scholarship/creativity will necessarily be highly varied and take many forms. Scholarship may be defined as any peer reviewed document or activity that contributes to the faculty member's field of expertise or to the academy. Scholarship can occur at multiple geographic locations; local, state, regional/national or international levels and may take many forms. In general, peer reviewed documents or activities include research publications and presentations at professional conferences (which help disseminate new knowledge), grant applications, grant awards, and intellectual property (e.g. copyrights and patents). The faculty member should indicate scholarship activities that include community engagement and/or experiential learning. It is expected that all scholarly activity is performed within professional and scientific ethical guidelines.

The evidence for performance-based evaluation for scholarship must include a summary of scholarship achievement that contains scholarship philosophy and research agenda and reflection of how he/she has or has not met/achieved/exceeded the goals.

### **Evidence of Scholarly Activities & Documentation**

1. Book or monograph published by a national or international publisher (Documentation: Copy of book cover or page indicating authorship and the electronic file of the publication)
2. Book chapter published by a national or international publisher (Documentation: Copy of book cover or page indicating authorship)
3. Publications in a peer-review journal. (Documentation: Copy of first page or page indicating authorship and the electronic file of the publication) Examples include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Original research contributions
  - b. Literature reviews, Systematic review, Meta-analysis
  - c. Case reports/series
  - d. Manuscript commentaries
  - e. Journal editorials
  - f. Evidence-Based Research Paper (e.g. critically appraised topic, clinical bottom line)
  - g. Other
4. Invited conference presentation (Documentation: Copy of the conference proceeding page indicating authorship and email from initiator requesting attendance)
5. Peer-reviewed conference presentation (abstract, oral, or poster) (Documentation: Copy of the conference proceeding page or abstract indicating authorship)

6. Awarded internal grants (Documentation: Copy of Routing Form page indicating investigators and the award letter)
7. Submitted external grants (Documentation: Copy of Routing Form page indicating investigators)
8. Awarded external grants (Documentation: Copy of Routing Form page indicating investigators and the award letter)
9. Patent application/file (Documentation: Copy of Patent Application/Approval page indicating authorship)
10. Community engagement research projects (Documentation: Copy of research project indicating authorship and the electronic file of the publication)
11. Accreditation or certification self-study documents (Documentation: confirmation of submission from accrediting agency)
12. Accreditation or certification site visit documents (Documentation: confirmation of accreditation visit, including itinerary)
13. Authorship on public documents at the local/state/national level
14. Awards and/or recognition related to scholarship
15. Other scholarship

**Satisfactory Scholarly Achievement** - To qualify for a satisfactory rating, a faculty member must demonstrate a record of scholarly achievement that meets the following scholarly benchmarks (See Table 2 for detail):

**Mid-tenure:** Assistant Professors must show evidence of at least one scholarly product at the time of mid-tenure review.

**Associate Professor:** Scholarship at the associate professor level is peer reviewed at the regional and/or national and international levels. The body of scholarly works demonstrates a level of commitment to development of scholarship throughout a faculty member's career. He/she will be involved in (a) state, regional, or national-level presentations of scholarly endeavors within one's academic field, (b) publications within recognized professional media, such as scholarly articles accepted by or published in peer-reviewed professional journals, monographs, or chapters, books, within one's academic field, and (c) grants or projects from state or national sources within one's academic field are desirable.

**Full Professor:**

At the professor level, the level of scholarship is peer reviewed at the state, national and international levels. He/she will be involved in (a) state, national or international presentations of scholarly endeavors within one's academic field, (b) publications of scholarly works with a consistent record of activity within peer-reviewed professional journals, media, and scholarly books within one's academic field, and (c) grants or projects from ISU, state, or national sources within one's academic field is desirable. The following criteria will be used for the evaluation.

**Sustained Performance:** Evidence of successful scholarly activities since the last promotion/date of appointment or at least 3 years. Demonstrates a level of commitment to development of scholarship with relevant scholarly activities. Examples are: (a) state, regional, or national-level presentations of scholarly endeavors within one's academic field, (b) publications within recognized professional media, such as scholarly articles accepted by or

published in peer-reviewed professional journals, monographs, or chapters, books, within one's academic field, and (c) submitted/unfunded grants or projects from ISU, state or national sources within one's academic field.

**Substantial Performance:** Evidence of **substantial performance in scholarship** should include (a) state, national or international presentations of scholarly endeavors within one's academic field, (b) publications of scholarly works with a consistent record of activity within peer-reviewed professional journals, media, and scholarly books within one's academic field, and (c) submitted and/or funded grants or projects from ISU, state or national sources within one's academic field.

**Excellent Performance:** In addition to the all evidence in substantial performance in scholarship **Excellent performance in scholarship** should include evidence of continuous productivity in scholarship and received recognition from the candidate's field in one or more methods, including, but not limited to, awards, publications in reputable peer reviewed journals, substantial internal/external funding, and external invitations for related expert-level contributions.

**Unsatisfactory Scholarly Achievement** -An unsatisfactory scholarly rating indicates that the faculty member's scholarly achievements fail to fully meet Department, College, and/or University expectations or that there is an inability to perform within ethical boundaries. This judgment may result from the fact that evaluators deem the quality and/or quantity of the faculty member's scholarly achievements to be insufficient.

### **Evaluation of Service**

The Department of Applied Health Sciences expects all of its faculty members to document a pattern of significant, high-quality service related to the profession of the candidate and/or community at large. Department-level standards in this area appear below. It is expected that all service activity is performed within professional and ethical guidelines (i.e. academic and professional).

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

1. Summary of Services

The faculty should provide a service philosophy, including the goals and reflection of how they have not met/achieved/exceeded the goals.

2. Documentation of Services Examples:

- a. Appointment letters
- b. Copies of minutes
- c. Letters acknowledging service
- d. Evidence of Community Projects
- e. Self-reflective statement that summarizes contributions and future directions

#### **Service Activity Examples**

### **PROGRAM SERVICE**

1. Sponsorship and/or advisement of a student association, honor society, alumni list serve, or professional organization
2. Preparation for accreditation site visit review
3. Participation in self-study development
4. Other

### **DEPARTMENT SERVICE**

1. Member of professional committee for discipline
2. Member of positional committee (e.g. Program Director, Research, Inter-professional Education)
3. Chair of positional committee
4. Member of search committee (faculty and/or staff)
5. Chair of search committee
6. Member of Department subcommittee/ad hoc committee/task force
7. Officer or Chair of Department subcommittee/ad hoc committee/task force
8. Other

### **COLLEGE SERVICE**

1. Member of College standing committee (e.g. CAAC, FAC, SAC, Exec Committee, Assessment Committee)
2. Officer or Chair of College committee
3. Member of College subcommittee/ad hoc committee/task force
4. Chair of College subcommittee/ad hoc committee/task force
5. Other

### **UNIVERSITY SERVICE**

1. Member of University Committee (e.g. AAC, CAAC, Exec. Committee, FAC, Diversity Council)
2. Officer or Chair of University committee
3. Member of University subcommittee/ad hoc committee/task force
4. Chair of University subcommittee/ad hoc committee/task force
5. Other

### **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

1. Serve as officer in professional organization in your discipline
2. Member of professional subcommittee or ad hoc committee
3. Officer or Chair of professional subcommittee or ad hoc committee
4. Conference planner/organizer and/or Chair at local or regional level
5. Conference planner/organizer and/or Chair at national or international level
6. Peer reviewer for nationally funded grants or presentations
7. Peer reviewer for national or international journals
8. Provide consultative services to government, business, industry or other educational institution in area of your expertise
9. Member of editorial board for a nationally/internationally published print or online journal or website
10. Site visitor for discipline specific accreditation

11. Provide discipline specific clinical healthcare services
12. Other

### COMMUNITY SERVICE

1. Member of community committee (e.g. RHIC, United Way, Special Olympics, American Cancer Society, Red Cross, Susan G. Komen , etc.)
2. Officer of community committee
3. Participate in off-campus programs for community such as non-credit continuing education related to your discipline and/or expertise
4. Make presentations to community groups in areas related to your discipline and/or expertise as well as University affiliation
5. Deliver lectures, speeches, presentation, and/or poster sessions in business/industrial settings
6. Contribute services to the community that are relevant to the faculty member's role in the university including clinical healthcare services
7. Contribute to the University and community by developing and/or participating in partnerships that are related to University affiliation, the discipline, or area of expertise
8. Other

**Satisfactory Service-** To qualify for a satisfactory rating, a faculty member must make consistent contributions to the University, their profession, and the community that are deemed significant in terms of quality and quantity. Service should include involvement in Departmental, College, and University committees. Community and professional service efforts that draw upon a faculty member's expertise within his/her professional organizations and discipline are also considered a significant contribution. The list provided is not exhaustive but should provide a guide for organization. Faculty must provide a summary page of services as well as a list of service activities with appropriate documentation.

**Mid-Tenure:** Service effectiveness should be documented by service to the Department and College. Assistant Professors need to have at least one successful service commitment at mid-tenure review.

**Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor:** Service effectiveness should be documented by service to the Department, College, University, Community and profession. Leadership roles within various committees are highly encouraged after faculty reach the mid-tenure mark.

#### **Promotion to Full Professor:**

**Sustained Performance:** Participation in service to the University, College and Department and continued participation in National, Regional and/or Local Professional Organizations across the time period since the last promotion/date of appointment or at least 3 years.

**Substantial Performance:** Participation in service to the University, College and Department and continued participation in National, Regional and/or Local Professional Organizations across the time period since the last promotion/date of appointment or at least 3 years. **Demonstrated substantial performance in service** should include multiple impactful service activities and leadership roles within the University, state, regional, national, international level, or community.

**Excellent Performance:** Participation in service to the University, College and Department and continued participation in National, Regional and/or Local Professional Organizations across the time period since the last promotion/date of appointment or at least 3 years. **Demonstrated excellent performance in service** should include University-level or extra-institutional recognition of impactful service at the national or international level, or an elected position at the regional, national, or international level.

### **Unsatisfactory Service:**

An unsatisfactory service rating indicates that the faculty member's service achievements fail to meet the Department, College, University, and professional or community expectations fully or that there is an inability to perform within ethical boundaries. 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 in comparison to the standards set forth in the Department Guidelines for Academic Promotion and Tenure.

### **Department Review Procedure**

1. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion electronically submit materials documenting faculty's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service to the chairperson of the Department no more than one week before the announced due date. All submissions take place through the Faculty Activity Database (FAD) to ensure proper routing and tracking. These materials are reviewed independently by the Department FAC and Chairperson. Each makes a separate recommendation, applying the recognized department evaluative criteria and performance standards and taking into account the precise terms and conditions of the appointment letter and the comments generated during previous annual reviews. In the event accreditation requires review by the Program Director, he/she too will complete an independent review of faculty's achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service and provide this review for incorporation into the Chairperson's recommendation.
2. The Department FAC will independently prepare and transmit to the candidate being evaluated (and to the Department Chairperson,) its evaluation and recommendation. At the time of evaluation, the committee will have available all pertinent provisions of appointment, such as educational and scholarly expectations and years remaining until tenure eligibility. The FAC will also have copies of all previous annual evaluations of the candidate. These materials are a requisite part of a candidate's retention, tenure, and promotion application portfolio.
3. Separately, the Department FAC chair and the Department Chairperson will provide timely written notification of their recommendations (with corresponding rationales) to each candidate in a scheduled meeting. At this meeting, the candidate must initial and date the evaluation form to acknowledge that he/she has received it. This signature is confirmation of, but not agreement with, the receipt of a recommendation of the level of review.
4. If both department-level recommendations are positive, the candidate's materials and the recommendations are forwarded to the College Dean for consideration for each year of the pre-tenure probationary period. During the mid-tenure and promotion/tenure reviews of the probationary period (if there are no negative recommendations), the candidate's materials

and the recommendations of both departmental review levels will be forwarded to the College Faculty Affairs Committee (CFAC) for review before being forwarded to the Dean.

5. For those faculty seeking appointment as associate professor, if one or both of the department-level recommendations are negative (non-reappointment or conditional reappointment), candidates may choose to a) terminate the process; or b) prepare a response, which is forwarded with his/her materials to the next levels of review. The written response needs to be completed within five (5) working days from the date the candidate initials the evaluation forms. He/she may submit to his/her Chairperson any statement responding to this evaluation. In the case of a negative review, the candidate's materials, department level recommendations, and the candidate's written letter of rebuttal (if written within the allotted time period) is forwarded to CFAC for review before these items are forwarded to the Dean. In choosing to terminate the process, except in cases of early consideration for tenure or promotion to Professor, a candidate also withdraws from consideration for further regular faculty appointment at Indiana State University beyond one academic year following the year of the process. A tenured candidate for promotion who terminates the promotion review process may later apply for promotion without prejudice.