Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines

for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

College of Arts and Sciences

Indiana State University

Approved by the Faculty Council, April 29, 2015

Revised by the Faculty Council, November 9, 2016

Revised by the Faculty Council, November 8, 2017

Table of Contents

I. Overview and Guiding Principles

A. Tenure in Relation to Academic Freedom and Shared Governance

Tenured employment is an unusual labor contract that should be justified by special circumstances and offered only after careful selection of the employee to be tenured. Tenured employment has been established in higher education as a means of promoting academic freedom and its associated convention, shared governance. Tenure in academic positions also provides a measure of economic security to keep the profession attractive to persons of high ability.

In both teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity, faculty members of colleges and universities should be engaged in a search for accurate understandings of society and the natural world, which can sometimes prove controversial. In order to allow this search to proceed without being unduly impeded by controversy, academic freedom is of critical importance. Tenure supports this by preventing academic controversies from being used as the basis of employment termination. Similarly, tenure supports shared governance by preventing managerial disputes from being used to terminate employment. Because faculty members are highly educated professionals, they have expertise required to manage the production of knowledge and education that are the essential products from colleges and universities. Faculty members are most qualified to determine curriculum and to evaluate the work of colleagues, for example. Tenure protects faculty in this managerial role so that the benefits of shared governance as an administrative strategy can reach its greatest potential.

Having tenure in employment is a privilege, but it also carries with it a responsibility to perform diligently the teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service work expected of faculty members. There is no guarantee the individuals selected for this privilege will work so diligently, but a careful and extended process of selection serves to assure that tenure is granted to individuals who will act professionally in their tenured positions. This is the reason for an extended probationary period (normally six years) during which the work of candidates for tenure is carefully evaluated in all dimensions of their professional responsibilities.

These principles have been articulated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and supported by the Association's recommended best practices, which are expressed in *AAUP Policy Documents & Reports*. The policies and practices outlined in these *Guidelines* intend to be fully consistent with AAUP's positions on these matters, which are also invoked as a guiding authority for the *University Handbook*.

B. University–level Authority

These guidelines for the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) are established in conformity with relevant University policies expressed in the *University Handbook*, primarily in Section 305. Efforts were made to ensure consistency with University-level practices and procedures. If parts of these Guidelines are found to deviate from policies established in the *Handbook*, the *Handbook* policy should be assumed to supersede provisions in these Guidelines.

Because University-level policies may affect recommendations based on annual reviews and reviews for tenure and promotion, candidates are strongly advised to familiarize themselves with those policies.

C. Primary Authority at the Department/School Level

Universities and colleges are usually complex organizations comprised of departments/schools based on disciplines. Faculty members are highly educated within their disciplines and thus possess essential knowledge needed for balanced evaluation of the work of colleagues in their departments/schools. Likewise their disciplinary knowledge should be brought to bear in establishing objective criteria to be applied in this evaluation process. In recognizing this efficient utilization of "local" information, the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) relies predominantly, although not exclusively, on judgments at the department/school level. Decisions on retention, promotion and tenure should be primarily based at the department/school level, with a great deal of deference to the opinions of departmental/school colleagues and the department/school chairperson. The *University Handbook* (305.14.4) makes this principle clear: "The candidate's departmental colleagues shall have primary authority and responsibility for assessing discipline-specific faculty achievements."

Because department/school–level policies can affect recommendations based on annual reviews and reviews for tenure and promotion, candidates are strongly advised to familiarize themselves with those policies.

D. The Role of College–level Review

With primary authority for evaluation of faculty performance set at the department/school level, the key role of the college-level review is to serve as a check on consistency and fairness of department/school-level recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure. This is carried out by the CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee, which should conduct its work in relation to the performance criteria established by departments/schools and should seek to ensure that candidates under review are treated fairly in relation to those criteria. The CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee shall not rank among the pool of candidates being evaluated. Rather, each candidate shall be evaluated on his/her own merits independently of all others. The CAS shall not have quotas for the maximum number of candidates who may be evaluated positively in any given year; each candidate shall receive a fair review. Faculty serving on the Promotion and Tenure Committee should not substitute their own disciplinary perspective in the conduct of this oversight mission. This principle is consistent with the *University Handbook*: "The college/library reviewers shall not substitute their own assessment of academic discipline-specific faculty achievements for that of the department." (Section 305.16.2) Any recommendation at the college level that is contrary to that of the department/school must be explicitly justified in relation to a candidate's performance and the department/school criteria for evaluation.

A second function for the CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee arises in relation to department/school criteria. Although performance criteria should be established by individual departments/schools and contained in approved department/school guidelines for retention, promotion, and tenure, minimal standards are required at the college level. Thus it would not be acceptable for a department/school to establish criteria that have no research/scholarship/creative activity or no service component. Moreover, historical precedent and current practice in the CAS emphasizes teaching as the predominant domain of faculty work. Thus department/school guidelines should reflect the general principle that teaching and learning are the central, most important activities in the CAS. CAS minimal standards are described in Section II, and departments/schools may choose to require performance at a higher standard.

In rare circumstances, such as department/school mergers or administrative restructuring, a department/school may not yet have its own guidelines that have been approved in written form and are readily available to faculty. In such cases, the CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee will use these CAS guidelines in evaluating the candidate. In such cases, the department/school-level review should also use these CAS guidelines in constructing its evaluation. Departments/schools without their own approved guidelines must remedy this deficiency as soon as possible.

E. Decisions in the Probationary Period: Reappointment, Conditional Reappointment, Non-reappointment

Annual reviews during the probationary period result in a decision by the University to retain or to dismiss a faculty member. At each level of review up to the Board of Trustees, evaluations provide recommendations to retain or dismiss a candidate, and retention may be achieved by a conditional reappointment or an unconditional reappointment.

An unconditional reappointment should be recommended when performance by the candidate has been evaluated as satisfactory in all domains. If candidates maintain this level of performance across the probationary period, they can expect to be granted tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. A conditional reappointment is appropriate when a candidate's performance is not satisfactory in all domains, but there is potential for lapses to be remedied during the probationary period and result in a recommendation for reappointment in the sixth year, which is also a recommendation to grant tenure and promotion. Faculty members who have received conditional reappointments are obliged to document their success in addressing the shortcomings by the time of their next evaluation.

Recommendations of non-reappointment aim for dismissal of the faculty member. They are appropriate when the level of performance is predominantly unsatisfactory, and the evidence reviewed in the annual evaluation suggests there is little potential that performance can be improved sufficiently during the probationary period so that a recommendation of tenure would be likely in the sixth-year review.

II. Criteria of Evaluation

A. General Statements

1. Scholarship

Scholarship (academic achievement) is integral to the work of university professors in all domains; it is a much broader concept than "research" or "creative activity." Scholarship is systematic inquiry into a topic and the application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. Scholarship builds on existing knowledge and employs critical analysis and judgment to enhance understanding. Research and creative activity, teaching, and in some cases, service, engage forms of scholarship. Faculty members are expected to use scholarship in their teaching and research/creative activities; many will also apply scholarship in their service work.

Scholarship results in a product. These products vary depending on the discipline and application. Examples might include the following: a book, a journal article, a lecture, a report, a speech bearing the synthesis of thought on a topic, a play, a concert using an original score, an art exhibit. What all of these items have in common is that they are intellectual products of the scholars.

The following table describes the broad continuum of scholarship and parameters to be used when judging the scholarly nature of a faculty member's achievements in evaluation reviews. (Adapted from Conrad I. Weiser, "The Value of a University–Rethinking Scholarship," draft version; and Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered– Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.)

Character of scholarship	Audiences for scholarship	Means of communicating scholarship	Criteria for validating scholarship	Means of documenting scholarship
Develops and communicates new understanding and insights. Generates, synthesizes, interprets, critically analyzes, and communicates new knowledge, methods, understandings, technologies, materials, uses, insights, beauty and so forth.	Peers, undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral associates, users, patrons, publics, etc.	Teaching materials and methods, classes, curricula; publications, presentations, exhibits, performances, patents, copyrights, distribution of materials or programs, etc.	Originality, significance, accuracy, replicability, scope, applicability, breadth, depth and duration of influence, persistence of influence or use, adoption by peers, impact or public benefits, etc.	Present evidence that creative intellectual work was validated by peers; communicated to peers and broader audiences; recognized, accepted, cited, adopted, or used by others. In other words, that it made a difference.

2. The Three Domains of Faculty Performance and University Mission-Based Activities

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the total spectrum of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. The CAS is committed to the principle that each domain is integral to the tripartite identity of a faculty member. Successful faculty members must demonstrate satisfactory performance in all three domains. However, the particular balance of contributions is subject to a degree of discretion by the individual faculty member, and expectations can vary across departments/schools, and at different stages in the career of a particular faculty member. For example, departments/schools with graduate programs generally place a greater emphasis on research/scholarship/creative activity, and more service is expected from tenured faculty than from untenured faculty. Individual strengths in the domains should be acknowledged, and a degree of specialization within a department/school is acceptable practice. Nonetheless, the CAS aspires to have well-rounded faculty and requires contributions in all three domains for success in tenure and promotion at all levels.

Within and across the domains of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, CAS faculty, like all ISU faculty, "are expected to contribute to the missions, visions, and values of their department/school, college, and the University." (*University Handbook*, Section 305.2.2) The *University Handbook*, Sections 305.2.2.1-4, lists four activities as Mission-Based activities: (1) undergraduate student academic advising; (2) graduate student advising/mentoring; (3) community engagement; (4) experiential learning. University policy

stipulates that: "Faculty activities in these areas are evaluated in the context of a faculty member's role at the University, which may change over time; the requirements of their department; the nature of their field; and other workload activities. Faculty are highly encouraged to incorporate mission-based activities throughout the domains of faculty work to effectively develop an integrated professional identity." (*University Handbook*, Section 305.2.2) More specifically, University Mission-Based Activities "do not constitute a separate domain of faculty work, nor may they be considered a basis for retention, promotion, or tenure in their own right." (*University Handbook*, Section 305.2.3) Rather, Mission-Based activities are to be *integrated into* the three domains of faculty work: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. (*University Handbook*, Section 305.2.3) For evaluative purposes, the exact ways in which Mission-Based Activities are integrated across the three domains of faculty work are to be determined according to discipline-specific conventions and practices at the department/school and college levels. As the *University Handbook* states: "Each department/school and college shall establish criteria and performance standards, whereby the mission-based activities described above will be placed within the Domains of Faculty Work and evaluated accordingly." (Section 305.2.3.1)

Therefore, it is incumbent upon individual CAS departments/schools to determine how, for evaluative purposes, Mission-Based Activities are allocated across the domains of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service, in line with discipline-specific conventions and practices at the department/school level. This integration of Mission-Based Activities shall be clearly set out not only in department/school personnel policy documents but also in any Memoranda of Understanding that enumerate the duties and performance expectations for individual faculty members.

3. Two Performance Levels: Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory

Satisfactory and *Unsatisfactory* are the two recognized performance levels used in evaluations. A rating of *Satisfactory* should not be understood as a standard that 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 discipline and within the University community. Without a rating of *Satisfactory* in each of the three basic areas of academic responsibility – teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service – a faculty member cannot expect to receive a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion at any level. A rating of *Unsatisfactory* may result due to lack of adequate activity, inadequate documentation in a faculty member's portfolio, or failure to submit supporting materials.

In the case of promotion to Full Professor, the University Handbook specifies the minimum standards:

> 305.12.4.5.1 Documented evidence of substantial and effective teaching or librarianship; of a record of substantial accomplishment in research, scholarship, or creativity which has led to professional recognition at the national level; and of active, substantive service to some combination of the University, the community and the profession; or
>
> 305.12.4.5.2 Documented evidence of excellence in one domain of faculty work, while also demonstrating substantial and/or sustained performance in the other domains.

Departments have primary authority and responsibility for applying the University's standards as informed by disciplinary conventions and practices. In particular, Departments should define *excellence, substantial,* and *sustained*.

4. Exclusion of Criteria Outside of Professional Performance

Criteria of evaluation should be restricted to professional performance in the three domains of faculty work referred to in the *University Handbook* Section 305.2.1: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. University Mission-Based Activities, including undergraduate and graduate advising/mentoring, experiential learning, and community engagement, do not constitute separate domains of activity but rather are integrated into and across the domains of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service in line with discipline-specific conventions and practices at the department/school level (see Section II.A.2 above). As the *University Handbook* explains: "Activities concordant with the mission, vision, and values of the University are expected of all regular faculty and will be integrated within the three domains of faculty work. The extent to which an individual faculty member's work will emphasize the mission, vision, and values of the University will vary depending on the faculty member's discipline, as well as their teaching assignments, advising and mentoring assignments, and other workload activities." (Section 305.2)

Consideration of other characteristics, such as collegiality, congeniality, and other personal aspects of an individual has no place in faculty evaluations. If such individual behaviors negatively affect a person's performance in any of the three domains of responsibility, then that will be evident in the appropriate criteria for review.

B. Teaching

All faculty members engage in the challenging work of teaching. The most important and time-consuming activities for most faculty members are instruction and associated tasks, such as evaluating student learning, curriculum development, guidance of student research, and student outcomes assessment. Faculty members should be active in their profession and provide instruction based on current scholarship. Faculty members must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in their fields, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments conducive to student learning.

Evaluation of teaching can be guided by defining certain behaviors, characteristics, attitudes, and activities common among effective teachers along with tools that may be used to identify and document these qualities and to document student learning. Effectiveness of a candidate's teaching activities is demonstrated through student evaluations, peer evaluations, course materials, and timely administrative work. Indicators of teaching effectiveness developed by departments/schools must allow for peer and student input since both are required. (Guidelines for documenting teaching performance are provided below in Appendix 1.)

A 1998 University task force report[1] on teaching and learning at ISU delineated the following qualities of effective teachers:

- *They possess content expertise.*

- *They design their courses well.* – Courses have a clear instructional purpose, communicate high but realistic expectations, and match instruction to students' needs and interests.

- *They deliver their instruction well.* – Instructors 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.

- *They establish productive instructional relationships.* – Instructors show enthusiasm, create an environment of mutual respect with students, acknowledge and adjust to different student needs and learning styles, act fairly and impartially while interacting with students, and remain open to receiving feedback and adjusting instruction appropriately.

- *They manage their courses well.* – Instructional schedules are adhered to or appropriately adjusted as needed, and administrative tasks, such as grade submission, are completed in a timely fashion.

- *They engage in ongoing professional development.*

---

[1] *Assessing and Improving Teaching and Learning at Indiana State University*, 1998.

Satisfactory Teaching – To qualify for a *Satisfactory* rating, a faculty member applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must (1) present a variety of significant evidence which documents scholarly teaching effectiveness and (2) meet all instructional expectations established in the faculty member's department/school, including timely administrative work of teaching.

Those aspiring to the rank of Professor must meet these same requirements and go further to demonstrate maturity in their teaching by showing that their instructional contributions are significant and multi-faceted. They must incorporate new developments in their field of instruction and establish their teaching on a high level.

C. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

The CAS is committed to scholarship in research/scholarship/creative activity. All faculty members in the CAS are expected to engage in research/scholarship/creative activity that may include original work focused

on discovery and integration; research/scholarship/creative activity focused on teaching and learning; or research/scholarship/creative activity that applies methods and theories of their discipline to address substantial problems. Basic and applied research, library and archival research, the integration of knowledge through interdisciplinary scholarship, and creative activities in the fine and performing arts are included in this definition of research/scholarship/creative activity. Engaging the broader community through information sharing consistent with a department/school's mission may be included in this definition.

Typically, research/scholarship/creative activity results in such products as books, articles, and book chapters; novels, poems, and essays; performances, exhibitions, and productions; software, translations, edited works, research reports, research abstracts, and book reviews; grant proposals and contracts; and conference presentations.

Research/scholarship/creative activity focused on teaching and learning results in such products as textbooks, articles, videos, software, workbooks, lab manuals, invited lectures, and conference papers. The standards of rigor for research/scholarship/creative activity related to teaching and learning are the same as for other forms of disciplinary research/scholarship/creative activity.

Satisfactory Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity – To qualify for a *Satisfactory* rating, a faculty member applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate a record of research/scholarship/creative activity within his/her academic discipline. Specific expectations regarding the type and quantity of these research/scholarship/creative activities 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 research that has earned favorable peer recognition at the national level (typically four or more peer-reviewed journal articles or their equivalent). For candidates in the fine and performing arts or similar disciplines, a *Satisfactory* rating usually requires a body of creative work that has earned favorable peer recognition at the regional level. In all cases, department/school guidelines determine expectations for a *Satisfactory* rating.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must demonstrate national recognition in their discipline by producing a body of research/scholarship/creative work that meets department/school guidelines. They must have a history of commitment to scholarship/creative work.

D. Service

Service today is more important than ever. The view of service as the far least important of the three domains is a 20th-century model that no longer reflects the current demands on faculty time. Administrative programs and committees have multiplied, and attrition has reduced the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty to serve. Service must be acknowledged as significant work and be recognized toward tenure and promotion. Faculty members are expected to make professional contributions outside of their teaching and research/scholarship/creative activity. Often this occurs by serving on faculty committees and in the collective deliberative governance bodies, such as the University Senate. Another area of professional service is organizing special events, conferences, and visits from outside speakers that enrich the educational environment of the University. Faculty may also contribute expertise to broader groups of professionals outside of the University. These may be discipline-specific communities, such as a professional society or a disciplinary journal, or the overall profession of higher education. Another area of service is to the community broadly understood, which can be at the local, state, national or even international level.
Community service, as defined by the *University Handbook* (Section 305.2.1.3) includes any activities in which the faculty member offers discipline-related expertise to any external agency, company, or non-profit organization. Two special areas of service recognized in these *Guidelines are academic advising* and *directing/coordinating programs of study*.

Academic Advising

Many faculty members serve as academic advisors helping students to navigate degree completion and to plan their futures. Inherent in the duties of academic advisors are in-depth discussions about disciplines, employment opportunities, coursework, internships, and other experiences that will aid students in achieving their goals. To excel as an advisor requires a great deal of information on scholarly and disciplinary topics. Advising duties demand significant efforts to meet with students, monitor their progress, and keep appropriate records. The mentoring element is likely to be particularly pronounced in the advising of graduate students,

especially when it involves supervision of thesis or dissertation projects.

Recognizing that undergraduate and graduate advising are special kinds of service involving student contact, the *University Handbook* includes them in the roster of activities deemed "central to the University mission, vision, and values." (Section 305.2.2) The present document includes advising under the heading of service. This mainly reflects the basic fact that though academic advising involves student contact, it is not the same as teaching. Indeed, precisely because it is time consuming and because it requires the scholarly expertise of faculty members, any academic advising/mentoring work contributed by faculty members in the College of Arts and Sciences has long been considered as a significant part of their service contribution. However, differing conventions and practices at the department/school level may justify the treatment of advising as part of the teaching domain or, especially in the case of graduate advising/mentoring, as part of research/scholarship/creative activity. This is consistent with University policy under which the exact integration of Mission-Based Activities across the three domains of faculty performance, for evaluative purposes, should be determined at the department/school level (*University Handbook*, Section 305.2.3.1). As with other Mission-Based Activities, it is essential that the personnel documents of individual departments/schools, including Memoranda of Understanding with individual faculty members, clearly specify how any and all advising/mentoring work is allocated across the three domains of faculty activity for evaluative purposes (see Section II.A.2 above).

Directing or Coordinating Programs of Study

Faculty members who serve as directors or coordinators of a program of study within a department/school shall be evaluated for the work they do in this context, which is a specific form of service, especially if they do not receive release time or a course reduction for this work. Directors and coordinators of programs of study are responsible for some administrative duties, such as licensing and/or registering programs, maintaining compliance with national/international norms, and student scheduling. Unlike chairpersons and deans, their work is not primarily administrative because the tasks are closely connected to students, and they rarely supervise other faculty. They often teach in the programs that they coordinate, and they often advise students in the programs. Such positions are time consuming and require expertise and continuing scholarship in the discipline. Directing or coordinating a program of study shall be considered as a significant part of a faculty member's service contribution for the purpose of annual reviews or reviews for tenure and promotion at any level.

General areas of service contribution include the following:

Service to the University – Standing committees are established at department/school, college, and University levels, and work at any of these levels is considered as service that should be evaluated for retention, promotion, and tenure. There are also special committees or ad hoc task forces that engage the effort of faculty members and should be evaluated as service contributions. Another area of university-level service is organizing special events, conferences, and visits of outside speakers that enrich the intellectual environment of the University.

Service to Professional Groups – Professional associations and societies, usually self-governed by members, afford many opportunities for faculty members to serve their colleagues and their disciplines. Faculty members often find leadership roles and editing/reviewing responsibilities in their professional organizations due to their experience and expertise. Service to professional groups and organizations, especially leadership roles, qualifies as service toward retention, promotion and tenure at all levels.

Service to the Community – Community service refers to activities in which the faculty member offers discipline-related expertise to an external agency, company, or non-profit organization at the local, state, national or international level. Given the diversity of disciplines in the CAS, the diversity of community service will be great. All community service qualifies as service toward retention, promotion, and tenure at all levels.

Satisfactory Service – To qualify for a Satisfactory rating, a faculty member applying for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must document a pattern of service, including some service to the university. As stated in the *University Handbook* Section 305.13.4, for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor "a record of effective service to the University and to either the community or the profession" is required. Service to the university could take the form of department/school, College-level, or University-level assignments. Satisfactory service can also include 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 engaged, significant service that is more substantial than the requirements for Associate Professor. Typically, this means that the individual will have successfully assumed leadership roles on campus and/or off campus. The *University Handbook* Sections 305.12.4.5.1 and 305.12.4.5.2 stipulate that to attain the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate a record of "substantial or sustained performance" in the service area, or of "active, substantive service to some combination of the University, the community and the profession."

III. Procedural Matters

A. Administrators and Committees Involved in Faculty Evaluation

As explained in the *University Handbook* Section 305.16, reviews of faculty performance are conducted by individuals and committees at three levels: department/school, college, and university. The Board of Trustees makes all final decisions regarding retention, promotion, and tenure. Although this may seem to be a hierarchy of authority from lower to higher levels, this is true only for the Board of Trustees. The other levels make recommendations to the Board based on evaluation of a candidate's performance, and the department/school level has primary authority among the other three levels for reasons described in Section I, Part C.

At the department/school level, the personnel committee and the chairperson provide independent reviews. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean of the CAS provide separate reviews at the college level. Normally the Promotion and Tenure Committee will review evaluation files only in the third and sixth years of a candidate's probationary period. Exceptions are covered below in Part E. At the University level, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (hereafter simply "Provost") and the University President will subsequently review candidates' evaluation files and provide recommendations based on their evaluation of the candidates. The President presents recommendations to the Board of Trustees.

Tenure-track faculty members shall meet with their chairperson during the year's evaluation cycle to discuss results of the review. Tenure-track faculty members also have a right to a meeting with the Dean to discuss results of annual reviews. Faculty members under review in the probationary period or for promotion have the right to respond in writing to each level of evaluation in each year that they are evaluated. (See Section III, Part B.3 below.)

As explained in the *University Handbook* Section 305.17, recommendations of non-renewal during the probationary period and denials of promotion and tenure may be appealed to the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee.

Use of External Evaluators

It is sometimes beneficial for a review to have professional opinions from experts outside the University, particularly in the case of reviews for tenure and promotion. External reviews typically come in letters of evaluation that speak to a candidate's contributions in the domain of research/scholarship/creative activity, but sometimes they address service contributions where those contributions are to a community of professionals such as a disciplinary association. In rare occasions an external evaluation may address teaching. The CAS neither requires nor disallows these outside opinions as part of a candidate's portfolio. However, it is CAS policy to guarantee the right for candidates for promotion or tenure to have his/her research/scholarly/creative accomplishments reviewed by peers external to the University. Procedures to be followed in eliciting such evaluations and whether or not they are required are left to the discretion of individual departments/schools. The following paragraph offers guidelines to be followed when using external evaluators. Note that this process must be initiated early, in order to allow time for external responses to meet the established department/school deadline for the submission of the candidate's evaluation file to the Dean.

External evaluators are typically identified partly from a list the candidate provides and partly from a list developed by the department/school chairperson and personnel committee. If external evaluators are part of a review, the candidate must organize an appropriate set of materials, which the chairperson would send to the chosen evaluators.

Responses received by the chairperson would be regarded as confidential and placed in the candidate's portfolio. At the conclusion of the department/school-level review, the department/school chairperson will provide copies of the external evaluations to the candidate, along with the evaluations and recommendations of

the department/school-level personnel committee and chairperson.

B. Documents of the Evaluation Process

1. The Faculty Evaluation File: Evidence and Evaluation of Performance

The basic element of the evaluation file is a portfolio of evidence submitted by the candidate. Portfolios should be well organized and contain evidence of performance in all domains of faculty responsibility: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. It is incumbent on the candidate to assemble and submit these materials, and candidates are encouraged to start the process well before submission deadlines. Guidance for portfolio construction is provided below in Appendix 1, and senior colleagues can also provide valuable advice for this.

The recommendation and evaluation statements at all levels are added to the evaluation file, as are any responses that candidates write. Thus the evaluation file expands as it is moved through the evaluation process.

2. Evaluation Statements and Recommendations

Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure must be based on the evidence of performance contained in a candidate's portfolio and other sources of evidence available to the evaluators, such as outside evaluations. Consequently, the evaluation statement that justifies the recommendation must make some reference to the evidence. The evidence should be summarized in the statement and related to the relevant criteria of performance. Statements by evaluators that simply make a recommendation without engaging the evidence, or with only very terse reference to the record, are not acceptable. A recommendation for conditional reappointment must clearly specify what improvements in performance are expected.

At each level of review, from department/school, to College to Provost, candidates shall be provided with copies of the evaluation and recommendation statements and shall be asked to sign a copy as evidence that they have received these documents.

3. Faculty Responses to Evaluation Statements

Faculty members under review in their probationary period have the right to respond in writing to each level of evaluation in each year that they are evaluated. Similarly, candidates for promotion have the right to respond in writing to each level of evaluation. These responses shall become part of the evaluation file before it is forwarded to the next level.

Procedures in cases of negative recommendations are explained in the *University Handbook* Section 305.16.1.3. "If one or both of the department/school-level recommendations is negative, candidates may choose to terminate or continue the process. Faculty may include a response in the evaluation file before it is forwarded to the next level of review." Likewise, at the college level, "If one, or both, of the recommendations is negative, candidates may elect to a) terminate the review process, or b) prepare a written response which is forwarded with their materials to the next level of review." (*University Handbook*, Section 305.16.2.3)

Other than the candidate's response to an evaluation, no new materials may be added to the candidate's portfolio above the department/school level. The candidate and the department/school are responsible for assuring that the portfolio is complete.

C. Calendars of the Review Process

The University has distinct deadlines for completing evaluations and informing faculty members of the outcomes. This overarching need combined with evaluation at several levels requires careful coordination. Each fall the Office of Academic Affairs issues a calendar of due dates for particular steps in the process. The CAS Dean specifies additional dates that apply at the college level. The calendars for evaluation of tenure track faculty members in their first and second year reviews are substantially different from the others. Evaluations for promotion decisions generally follow a calendar similar to that used for the sixth-year review for tenure track faculty. Details of a generic calendar are included below in Appendix 2 to assist in planning for reviews.

Generally, faculty members not reappointed in their first or second-year reviews have failed to meet a basic performance expectation (e.g. degree completion or instructional adequacy). In keeping with AAUP guidelines, contracts of faculty members not reappointed in this time frame are terminated at the end of the

first or second year of service, respectively. Those not reappointed in their third, fourth, fifth, or sixth-year reviews have the right to serve on the faculty for one additional year before employment is terminated.

D. Special Points on Promotion to Professor

A number of features of promotion to Professor distinguish the review process from that applied for annual reappointment and tenure decisions.

- First, faculty members are not obliged to submit an application for this promotion. In contrast, annual reviews leading to a tenure decision and promotion to Associate Professor are required of all tenure track faculty.

- Second, if a candidate for this promotion is not approved, he/she may apply in a subsequent year with no prejudice resulting from an earlier failed attempt.

- Third, while the domains of evaluation for this promotion are the same as for other reviews, a higher level of accomplishment is expected in each domain. These distinctions of performance expectations are outlined above in Section II under each of the domain subheadings.

- Fourth, a minimal time of four years in the rank of Associate Professor is required before a faculty member is eligible to apply for promotion to Professor. No prejudice should be held against a candidate who applies with minimum time in rank. Likewise, no prejudice should be held against a candidate with many years in rank.

- Finally, portfolios submitted in support of an application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor should provide evidence of accomplishments since the previous promotion, including all departmental and college-level reviews.

E. Oversight Review of Decisions

1. College–level Review of Negative Evaluation Results in Probationary Years 1, 2, 4 and 5

The Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews and advises on all portfolios of tenure track faculty members in the third and sixth years of their probationary period. The intent of consideration by a college committee is to provide a collective evaluation at the college level of individuals' professional work to ensure that department/school and college standards are upheld and that due process is followed. This work is intensive and would be even more burdensome if the Committee had to review portfolios in each of the six annual evaluations. The requirement of the Committee to review in only the third and sixth years attempts to strike a balance between the demands on committee members and the need to have oversight of the review process at the college level.

Although college–level reviews in years 3 and 6 alone provide a collective voice that can protest the retention of candidates whose performance is below college standards, it does not provide an opportunity for a collective voice in questionable cases that result in dismissal where these occur in years 1, 2, 4 or 5. The following procedure addresses this by providing for oversight review in cases where faculty members in their probationary period have received a negative evaluation.

If tenure track faculty members receive negative evaluations at the department/school level (i.e. recommendation of conditional reappointment or of non-reappointment) in years 1, 2, 4, or 5 of the probationary period, they have the right to request a review of their evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Committee has an obligation in such cases to undertake a review of the faculty member's performance using procedures and criteria similar to what they would employ in a standard third-year evaluation, while making appropriate allowances for the review calendar in the case of first and second-year reviews. Such a request for review should be made in the form of a brief memorandum to the Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2. University-level Review of Negative Evaluation Results

When a negative recommendation for either retention or promotion emerges at the University level from the Provost, candidates have the right to seek review of the decision through an appeal process carried out by the University Promotions and Tenure Oversight Committee (*University Handbook*, Section 305.16.3.3). The procedures for this are explained in Section 305.17 of the *University Handbook*. Details on the operation of

this Committee are contained in the *University Handbook*, Section 305.18.

IV. Special Issues

A. Accelerated Tenure Track Exceptions

1. Credit for Accomplishments Prior to an ISU Appointment

Individuals with previous faculty experience at other accredited colleges or universities are sometimes hired at ISU with a provision that shortens the probationary period, and they may be hired at an Associate Professor or Professor level. The CAS allows this and requires that the details of divergence from the standard period be specified in the initial letter of appointment. Eligibility for tenure is achieved in a faculty member's sixth year of employment at accredited colleges or universities. Although the performance of faculty members in their work at ISU is crucial for their annual evaluations even when they are appointed on an accelerated tenure track, the record of their accomplishments prior to their appointment at ISU should also be brought under review, particularly in the year of the tenure decision.

Faculty hired in the CAS at the Assistant Professor level, who have held a regular faculty appointment elsewhere, may be given credit for up to two years of professional academic work, becoming eligible to apply for tenure in their fourth year at ISU. Faculty hired at the Associate Professor level, who have held a regular faculty appointment elsewhere, may be given credit for up to three years, becoming eligible to apply for tenure in their third year at ISU. Faculty hired at the Professor level, who have held a regular faculty appointment elsewhere, may be given credit for up to five years, becoming eligible to apply for tenure in their first year at ISU.

In exceptional cases individuals may be hired and awarded tenure at the time of appointment. The particular procedures followed in such cases are outlined in the *University Handbook* (Section 305.11.2.1.1.4 Waiver of Probationary Period).

2. Exceptional Performance

University policy allows tenure track faculty who have shown exceptional performance during their probationary period to apply for tenure and promotion in the fourth or fifth year of the period, rather than waiting until the sixth year as is customary. The CAS adopts this same provision for exceptional performance, which should be manifest in all three domains of faculty work. In accordance with University requirements, candidates for early tenure and promotion consideration must be nominated by their chairperson and achieve a positive recommendation at each level of review in order to be successful in such early applications.

B. Joint Appointments in Two or More Departments/Schools

The CAS allows individuals to maintain appointments in more than one department/school when that best promotes the mission of the College. (See College of Arts and Sciences Policy on Joint Appointments of Regular Faculty, approved by Faculty Council, October 12, 2016.) Details of the faculty member's responsibilities to each of the departments/schools shall be clarified in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) formulated and agreed to by the departments/schools involved, the Dean's office, and the faculty member at the time the joint appointment is made. The MOU shall also specify the personnel and procedures governing all evaluation, retention, promotion and tenure decisions for the faculty member. This includes the composition of department/school-level review committees; i.e., the ratio of committee members from the respective departments/schools in which the faculty member serves, and the assignment of the chair of these review committees. In these connections, the MOU should naturally place greater decision-making weight on faculty from the joint appointee's Administrative Home Unit (AHU). However, in all cases appropriate weight shall be given to all departments/schools participating in the joint appointment, not just the AHU. Moreover, in all cases any department/school-level reports concerning the faculty member's performance (including all performance evaluations, as well as retention, tenure, and promotion decisions) shall be consolidated into a single report submitted to the college level (Dean's Office and CAS P&T Committee).

C. Changes in Evaluation Criteria after Appointment to the Faculty

Criteria for promotion and tenure at both the department/school and college level are subject to revision, and administrative restructuring may place a faculty member in a department/school different from the one into which he/she was hired. Both of these contingencies imply that changes in the criteria for performance may

occur during the probationary period or between promotion to Associate Professor and application for promotion to Professor. The question thus arises, whether faculty performance should be evaluated in relation to new standards or by standards in place at the time and department/school of initial appointment. The position of these *Guidelines* is to allow a degree of choice by the individual faculty member.

The default option is for faculty evaluation to be based on the criteria in place at the time and department/school of appointment. Alternatively, faculty members may elect to be evaluated in relation to different criteria adopted subsequent to their appointment or applied in a new department/school. In this case they must inform their department/school personnel committee and chairperson of their preference to be evaluated using updated criteria and must compose a brief memorandum to this effect that should be included it in their portfolio submitted for review. The memorandum should make specific reference to the date and department/school of appointment and the revision of performance criteria, clarifying whether these changes were at the College or department/school level. In their evaluation and recommendation statements, the department/school personnel committee and chairperson should acknowledge this departure from the default option. To support the default option, it is important that all departments/schools and the CAS maintain an archive of evaluation criteria used for retention, promotion and tenure.

D. Faculty Service in Administrative Positions

Faculty members are sometimes recruited to undertake extensive work of an administrative nature, including positions such as department/school chairperson or associate dean. While these efforts are clearly in service to the University, they are substantially different from the traditional service roles of faculty in shared governance, such as faculty committees and the University Senate. Such administrative positions have their own evaluation process and distinct ways of recognizing contributions as superior or inferior. They are important in the overall operation of the University, but they are not a part of the work of faculty members that should be considered for adequate performance toward retention as a faculty member, or promotion and tenure. Contributions in such administrative positions are not part of the standard work of tenured and tenure track faculty and shall not be considered as meeting performance requirements for promotion or tenure.

Some roles of an administrative nature, such as coordinating or directing programs of study, are closer to the traditional understanding of the service work of faculty, and contributions of this type should be considered in evaluations for retention, promotion and tenure as service work. (See Section II, Part D above.)

E. Modification of These Guidelines

These *Guidelines* comprise one of the basic governance documents of the CAS adopted by the Faculty Council. Accordingly, amendments to the *Guidelines* may be adopted by majority vote of the Council following the standard procedures for conducting business in its regular meetings.

F. Multiple Disciplines within One Department/School

As mentioned in Section I.C of this document, each faculty member's department/school shall have primary authority and responsibility for assessing discipline-specific achievements. In academic departments/schools composed of more than one discipline, it should generally be the case that the department/school's evaluation of a candidate is informed by the evaluation of the candidate by the department/school faculty from within their same discipline. If these two evaluations do not agree, the department/school personnel committee and chairperson should provide an explanation of the discrepancy and why the department/school recommendation goes against the recommendation from the faculty within the same discipline as the candidate. Departments/schools that are home to multiple disciplines are encouraged to address such possible situations in their department/school promotion and tenure guidelines. The college promotion and tenure committee will rely on department/school guidelines in addressing discrepancies.

Candidates from departments/schools composed of multiple disciplines are highly encouraged to consider using external review as part of their supporting documentation, as discussed in Section III.A.

Appendix 1: Guidelines for Portfolios

The key to constructing an effective portfolio for annual evaluation, tenure, or promotion is to be concise and well organized. Professionalism and expertise are represented not only in the content of the portfolio but also in the care and efficiency with which materials are presented. Candidates should refrain from placing more into a portfolio than is necessary to properly communicate with those evaluating the candidate.

Candidates for tenure and promotion should build a self-contained case that presents major academic achievements and service contributions in a way that clearly demonstrates the quality, quantity, and importance of their work. Portfolios for annual evaluations toward retention, while not expected to be as full, should be compiled in a similar fashion with the eventual tenure application in mind as a future goal. For the purpose of annual reviews during a candidate's probationary period, the portfolio should highlight accomplishments since the previous review in addition to all accomplishments since appointment at Indiana State University (and previous accomplishments if granted prior service credit). The sixth-year review, however, is also the tenure review, so the supporting portfolio should present evidence of accomplishments across the entire probationary period. Portfolios submitted in support of an application for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor should provide evidence of accomplishments since the previous promotion. Results from Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations may be included.

There is no comprehensive fixed set of requirements for items to include in a portfolio. Rather, individual judgment and precedent in particular disciplines should be followed. The presentation requirements that follow below are intended to be general minimum guidelines for candidates. *Given the importance of discipline-specific conventions and practices, all candidates are strongly encouraged to seek the advice of their chairperson and senior colleagues of their department/school when compiling their portfolios.* The primacy of discipline-specific evaluative criteria applies in particular to the integration of a candidate's University Mission-Based activities into the three domains of faculty performance: teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service (see Section II.A.2). As explained in Section II.D, the College of Arts and Sciences formally considers undergraduate and graduate student advising as part of the service domain, and this is reflected in the portfolio requirements listed below. However, at the department/school level student advising may be considered as part of the teaching domain, or even (especially in the case of graduate advising and mentoring) as part of the research/scholarship/creative activity domain, depending on discipline-specific factors. In such cases, the organization of the candidate's portfolio should be in line with department/school-level conventions. In addition, activities that contribute to the missions of community engagement and experiential learning may be integrated into any one, or specific combinations, of the teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service domains (*University Handbook*, Section 305.2.3). As such, documentation of community engagement and experiential learning activities should be naturally and intuitively contained within the portfolio requirements listed below as guided by discipline-specific conventions and practices at the department/school level.

A. Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Preliminary Materials
1. A brief cover letter indicating the purpose of the performance review and containing an overview of materials in portfolio.
2. A current version of the candidate's curriculum vita.
3. Candidates must also include a copy of their letter of initial appointment and MOU that outlines performance expectations.
4. A copy of each of their annual reviews across the probationary period, i.e. the evaluation statements and recommendations from all levels (for tenure applicants).
5. A copy of all departmental and college-level reviews since promotion to Associate Professor.
6. Deviation from standard review circumstances, e.g. joint appointments, accelerated calendar toward tenure, or adoption of performance criteria revised from those in place at the time of the faculty member's appointment.
7. Clarification of role in collaborative efforts

B. Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Evidence of Teaching Performance
1. Brief statement on teaching philosophy.
2. Short summary of the teaching work in which the candidate has been engaged (e.g. Are the courses basic undergraduate classes, upper-division undergraduate, graduate courses, research guidance, etc.?).
3. A list of all courses taught at ISU, include course number and title, credit hours and number of students enrolled.

4. A list of all students writing theses, dissertations, or significant undergraduate research papers under the guidance of the faculty member. (This should distinguish membership on a thesis or dissertation committee from a role as chairperson of the committee.

5. Course syllabi – three or four that represent the range of courses taught. Some collection of syllabi is *required* in the portfolio.

6. Copies of all reports from peer evaluation of teaching.

7. A summary of all student course evaluations.

8. Brief descriptions of teaching awards received (if any).

9. Brief descriptions of participation in instructor training and development programs (if any).

10. Brief descriptions of new course development, significant course revision and notable innovations in pedagogy and course materials (in appendix).

11. Brief descriptions, including date, dollar amount and status of application, of any grant or contract applications related to instructional activities (in appendix).

C. Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Evidence of Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity

1. Brief statement of efforts and accomplishments that indicates the context of the candidate's activity and characterizes a research or scholarly or creative agenda.

2. List of individual works with brief annotations to provide a very brief explanation for each entry (including provide bibliographic information of co-authors).

3. Published works: books, journal articles, articles in conference proceedings, review articles, book chapters, translations, research reports, software, and collected volumes for which the candidate served as editor.

4. Minor publications such as book reviews and brief encyclopedia entries.

5. Artistic performances, exhibitions, and productions. (Include details of venue.)

6. Forthcoming works: include evidence of acceptance.

7. Conference presentations: include details on title, co-authors, and conference venue (sponsoring organization, city and date).

8. Works under review: include date of submission, publisher/journal or other relevant submission information.

9. Works in progress: include any relevant details on contracts or invitations and any plans for submission toward publication.

10. Research grant and contract applications: include details on status (funded/unfunded/pending), source, date, and dollar amount.

11. List of donations secured in support of research.

D. Portfolio Presentation Requirements: Evidence of Service Contributions

1. Summary of the service work.

2. List of key positions or contributions to service, with brief annotations to provide context.

3. Faculty members who claim <u>academic advising</u> as a service contribution must provide a brief description of their advising practice, academic programs for which they advise, information on the number and type of students advised, and any available assessments of advising performance by students or colleagues.

4. Faculty members who claim administration of programs of study as a service contribution must include the following in their portfolio: a brief description of the program, data on the number of students served, a short summary of their managerial duties in relation to the program, and the time frame for this special service.

5. The same degree of evidence and detail is not necessary in every circumstance. For example, routine service work that is understood and recognized by colleagues across disciplines and units may be presented in minimal form; for work that is in some way unique or more significant than typical service contributions, faculty should provide a greater degree of clarification, which can be presented in bullet lists or in brief narrative summaries of up to five or six sentences.

6. When additional clarity is necessary and appropriate, faculty should include the following kinds of information:

    Role. – Describe one's role in the service work (e.g., director or coordinator of a program, member of a review board, editor of a journal, officer of an organization, member of a committee, chairperson of a committee, advisor of a group, and so on).

    Affiliation. – Identify the organization, group, or unit for which the work was done. Use full titles, not acronyms.

    Nature of the Work. – Briefly explain the service work and one's specific contribution.

    Length of Service. – Provide inclusive dates to indicate the length of one's service.

Approximate Time Commitment. – Give some sense of the scope of the work (e.g., provide the approximate number of hours devoted to the activity or the number and frequency of meetings).

Results. – Summarize the results of the service work (e.g., a journal was published, a conference or festival took place, a report was prepared, a program was assessed, a website was created, scholarships were awarded, and so on).

Other information. – Provide any other information that can help reviewers assess the quality of one's work. Letters that describe a faculty member's unique contribution may be included, but letters that merely acknowledge membership or participation should not be included.

Appendix 2. Calendar Details for the Review Process

Dates specified below are approximations for planning purposes. In any particular year, the calendar issued by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Dean should be followed. Departments/schools have some flexibility regarding internal timelines for evaluations, but they must meet deadlines for submission of evaluation files to the Office of the Dean.

First-Year Review ~ ISU deadline to inform candidates: March 1.

Faculty portfolio submitted to department/school personnel committee by third week of October.

Evaluation by department/school personnel committee completed and transmitted to chairperson by first week of November.

Evaluation by chairperson, including any needed reconciliation with department/school committee, completed and transmitted to the faculty member by second week of November. The chairperson should also forward the evaluation of the personnel committee to the faculty member at this time.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Dean by third week of November.

Evaluation by Dean completed and transmitted to the faculty member by first week of January. Within five 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. A copy of the College-level evaluation is also forwarded to the candidate's department/school chairperson and to the chairperson of the department/school review committee.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Provost by second week of January.

Second-Year Review ~ ISU deadline to inform candidates: December 15.

Faculty portfolio submitted to department/school personnel committee by third week of August.

Evaluation by department/school personnel committee completed and transmitted to chairperson by first week of September.

Evaluation by chairperson, including any needed reconciliation with department/school committee, completed and transmitted to the faculty member by third week of September. The chairperson should also forward the evaluation of the personnel committee to the faculty member at this time.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Dean by fourth week of September.

Evaluation by Dean completed and transmitted to the faculty member by second week of October. Within five 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. A copy of the College-level evaluation is also forwarded to the candidate's department/school chairperson and to the chairperson of the department/school review committee.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Provost by third week of October.

Third-Year Review ~ ISU deadline to inform candidates: 12 months before expiration of appointment (close of spring semester).

Faculty portfolio submitted to department/school personnel committee by fourth week of September.

Evaluation by department/school personnel committee completed and transmitted to chairperson by fourth week of October.

Evaluation by chairperson, including any needed reconciliation with department/school committee, completed and transmitted to the faculty member by third week of November. The chairperson should also forward the evaluation of the personnel committee to the faculty member at this time.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Dean and CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee by first week of January.

Evaluation by Promotion and Tenure Committee completed and transmitted to Dean by first week of February.

Evaluation by Dean completed and transmitted to the faculty member by second week of February. Within five 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. A copy of the College-level evaluation is also forwarded to the candidate's department/school chairperson and to the chairperson of the department/school review committee.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Provost by third week of February.

Fourth and Fifth-Year Reviews ~ ISU deadline to inform candidates: 12 months before expiration of appointment (close of spring semester).

Faculty portfolio submitted to department/school personnel committee by third week of October.

Evaluation by department/school personnel committee completed and transmitted to chairperson by second week of December.

Evaluation by chairperson, including any needed reconciliation with department/school committee, completed and transmitted to the faculty member by first week of January. The chairperson should also forward the evaluation of the personnel committee to the faculty member at this time.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Dean by second week of January.

Evaluation by Dean completed and transmitted to the faculty member by second week of February. Within five 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. A copy of the College-level evaluation is also forwarded to the candidate's department/school chairperson and to the chairperson of the department/school review committee.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Provost by third week of February.

Sixth-Year (Tenure) Review ~ ISU deadline to inform candidates: 12 months before expiration of appointment (close of spring semester).

Faculty portfolio submitted to department/school personnel committee by second week of September.

Evaluation by department/school personnel committee completed and transmitted to chairperson by fourth week of September.

Evaluation by chairperson, including any needed reconciliation with department/school committee, completed and transmitted to the faculty member by first week of October. The chairperson should also forward the evaluation of the personnel committee to the faculty member at this time.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Dean and CAS Promotion and Tenure Committee by second week of October.

Evaluation by Promotion and Tenure Committee completed and transmitted to Dean by fourth week of November.

Evaluation by Dean completed and transmitted to the faculty member by second week of December. Within five 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. A copy of the College-level evaluation is also forwarded to the candidate's department/school chairperson and to the chairperson of the department/school review committee.

Response (if any) by faculty member completed within five working days and included into evaluation file, which is transmitted to the Provost by first week of January.

Appendix 3. College Promotion and Tenure Committee

Administrative details pertaining to the Promotion and Tenure Committee are more fully developed in the Bylaws of the CAS Faculty Council. Selected points of particular importance are described below.

A. Composition and Selection

The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the CAS is composed of nine tenured faculty members of the College, with representation from each of the traditional disciplinary areas: (a) Arts and Humanities, (b) Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and (c) Social and Behavioral Sciences. At least six of the members must hold the rank of Professor. Department/school chairpersons are excluded, as are faculty members who are candidates for promotion.

The Faculty Council elects members to the Committee each spring from a slate prepared by the CAS Standing Committee for Faculty and Administrative Affairs (AFAC). AFAC shall attempt to provide a slate equally balanced among the three disciplinary areas. The standard term of service is three years, with the terms staggered so that, normally, one third of the Committee is elected each year. If a member resigns before completing their term, they are replaced from a pool of alternate members, which itself is selected by the Faculty Council in the same election. Individuals may not serve two consecutive terms on the Committee and are not eligible to serve on it again until three years have passed from the end of their last day of previous service.

B. Responsibilities

The main responsibility of the Committee is to engage in college–level reviews in the third and sixth years for faculty in their probationary periods and to review applications for promotion. Generally a sixth-year review is also a review for the tenure decision and promotion to Associate Professor. These efforts are closely coordinated with the Office of the Dean.

As outlined above in Section III, Part E, faculty members may request a review of a negative evaluation at the department/school level in years 1, 2, 4 or 5 of the probationary period. The Committee is obliged to respond to these requests and should follow the procedure it would apply in a third-year review.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee also serves as a general personnel committee at the college level. One responsibility in this role is to provide oversight of procedures and criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure at the department/school level. The Committee should show a high degree of deference to individual departments/schools in this regard, but it needs to ensure that each department/school has an established set of practices and documents for this purpose, and to ensure that the criteria of faculty performance in those documents are consistent with minimal accepted practices across the College. Working with the Office of the Dean, the Committee shall maintain an archive of department/school-level guidelines for retention, promotion and tenure, each of which should indicate the date at which it became policy in the department/school.

A second responsibility assigned to the Committee as the CAS personnel committee is to engage in the biennial review of performance for all tenured faculty of the College. As stated in the University guidelines, college-level review is called for only in cases where faculty members have been placed in the extraordinary categories of *Contributing Exceptionally* or *Contributing Below Expectations* by department/school-level reviews. The main goal of college-level review is to serve as a check on whether these results are appropriate in relation to the goals of the University policy and in relation to criteria of performance as established in department/school-level policies for biennial evaluations. It is ISU policy that faculty members may not be placed in either of these categories without the consent of both dean and personnel committee of the relevant college.

C. Procedures

The Dean shall convene a first meeting of Promotion and Tenure Committee early in the fall semester. The first order of business is to select a chairperson, who serves in this role for one year. The second order of business is to review the expected work for the coming academic year and make plans to accomplish those goals. In all of its work the Committee must respect a code of confidentiality regarding deliberations on faculty evaluations of all types. Discussions within Committee meetings should present frank opinions of Committee members, but members should not discuss the details of deliberations with parties external to the Committee.

In conducting college-level reviews for recommendations of retention, promotion and tenure, the Committee should not rely on its members' judgment of appropriate faculty performance, but should instead defer to the criteria

established at the department/school level. The role of the Committee is rather to ensure that appropriate procedures have been followed and that the criteria of performance have been fairly applied in relation to the evidence presented. In order to complete these reviews, then, the Committee must have at hand copies of department/school-level retention, promotion, and tenure guidelines. If a department/school's guidelines are not on file with the Office of the Dean, or if the guidelines on file are outdated, the Chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee must request a current copy from the department/school.

The Committee has a degree of latitude in how it divides the required work among its members, but a minimum of two primary reviewers, insofar as possible reflecting the candidate's area (i.e., Arts and Humanities, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Social and Behavior Sciences), shall carefully engage in detailed review of that candidate's evaluation file. All Committee members shall familiarize themselves with every file by reading at least the preliminary materials and the candidate's statements on teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service.

Moreover, the Committee must provide collective consideration of all evaluation files presented to it and provide the following in each case: a recommendation, the voting record on which that is based, and a brief statement of justification. Recommendations of approval for retention, tenure, and/or promotion are based on a majority vote. A tie vote is understood to be a recommendation against approval. Committee members must not be present during the review of candidates from the committee member's own department/school. Similarly, if a committee member has a close personal tie to a candidate, or if the member participated in a department/school-level review of a candidate as a reviewer external to the department/school, recusal from review of the candidate is required regardless of the departments/schools involved.

In completing its responsibilities with respect to Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations, the Committee should follow procedures established in the document adopted by the Faculty Council in October, 2016 specific to that purpose. (*College-level Procedure for Biennial Faculty Performance Evaluations*, College of Arts and Sciences ~ Indiana State University)

Other responsibilities assigned to the Committee do not recur with sufficient regularity to establish particular procedures. It is incumbent on the Committee to address those matters in a fair and balanced fashion, using its best professional judgment.