

From 2010-11 *Administrative Manual*

1. Unit Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

305. TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES. The following document was endorsed by the faculty during the regular meeting of 12-3-96 and revised in 1998, 2003 and 2009.

As a guideline, this document complements and is to be read in conjunction with the policy statements on tenure and promotion issued by the Dean of the College and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. For present purposes, the term “tenure” refers both to tenure and to the promotion to Associate Professor which usually follows the granting of tenure; “promotion” refers to promotion to Full Professor.

I. Criteria

In tenure cases, there needs to be promise, in the candidate's accomplishments to date, of future national and international recognition in his/her field of expertise. In promotion cases, it must be clear that such recognition has been established. In both cases, the evidence should be submitted in a dossier and typically should include the candidate's statement, a curriculum vitae and list of publications, reviews and comments on his/her scholarly work, proofs of teaching ability, and letters of general support (for more on the dossier, see Procedures). The evidence is considered under three categories: Research, Teaching, and Service. The terms currently used for evaluation, in a descending scale, are: excellent, very good, effective, and unsatisfactory. In most cases a candidate must be excellent in at least one category and nowhere be less than effective. In a balanced case, the candidate's overall contribution to the university must be shown to be comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single primary area. The quality of performance is a primary consideration in the review, although quantity also matters insofar as it indicates productivity. Evaluations of likely productivity in the future, in all three areas, will be based on the demonstrable quality and quantity of work done to date, plus any evidence of projected work or work in progress.

Research. As a research institution, Indiana University places a high value on scholarship and publication and expects its faculty to be among the best of their peers. The main kinds of publications are: Works of scholarship and criticism, that is, books or articles (in recognized journals) on linguistics, literary history, criticism and theory.

Editions of texts, which include a substantial introduction, annotation, and critical apparatus.

Creative works (in recognized journals or with recognized publishing houses).

Translations. To be given credit as book-length publications, these must have a substantial introduction and commentary; the same is true of edited volumes, anthologies, and bibliographies.

Textbooks. Foreign-language pedagogy, applied linguistics, applied computer technology in foreign language learning, and allied fields constitute an appropriate area of scholarly investigation. Generally, such pedagogical publications can be considered as research if the work exhibits a clearly conceptual/theoretical orientation and there is evidence that the efficacy of the method has been systematically studied and evaluated. Presentations at well-regarded scholarly conferences, although not considered equivalent to publications, may be listed in the research dossier, along with details of competitive research grants or fellowships obtained by the candidate. Other activities such as organizing exhibitions or participating in the media may count as research when not more related to teaching or service.

For tenure or promotion, a book or the equivalent is generally needed; the term —equivalent is interpreted at the department's discretion, in line with the above criteria.

Teaching. A good teacher is able to design and run courses that inform and stimulate students at the undergraduate and the graduate levels. Evidence of such ability is gathered from student evaluations, peer observations, and course materials provided by the candidate. For promotion, the candidate should also show evidence of being able to guide students through theses and dissertations. If a candidate is to propose teaching as the major strength, skill and success in course supervision would support the case, as would the development and, where appropriate, the publication of widely applicable course materials and methods (textbooks, computer software, etc.). For publications with a clearly conceptual/theoretical orientation, see Research above.

Service. Beside research and teaching, a faculty member is expected to help in administration, and the normal committee work of the institution. This means supporting student activities and serving, in various capacities, the department, the College, the university, the profession, and the community. It is pertinent to note that book reviews are generally considered under this category, along with refereeing articles or being the advisory editor of a journal, or acting as a consultant to an academic body or foundation. Service cannot normally be proposed as the main category in tenure or promotion cases; neglecting or failing in it, however, diminishes the case that is outstanding in research and/or teaching, in all but quite exceptional circumstances.

II. Procedures

Preliminaries. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Office provides new tenure-track faculty with copies of Tenure and Promotion guidelines based on criteria and procedures developed by the department, the College, the university (Academic Guide), as well as their own office (Tenure and Promotion Handbook and —Unit Criteria and Procedures!). The Chair shall ensure that these documents are made available to all incoming tenure-track and tenured professors. The Chair shall also consult with each new non-tenured faculty member about a departmental as well as an external mentor. The assignment of a mentor or mentors should occur no later than the first semester of the faculty member's second year. The mentor(s) shall provide advice and guidance on a range of matters pertaining to tenure during the faculty member's probationary period.

Annual Review Procedures for Assistant and Associate Professors. The department shall conduct annual reviews of all non-tenured faculty. The annual review is to be understood as a review that is *performed* annually--it is not a review of the accomplishments of only one year. In the case of assistant professors, a more substantive review will take place during their third year in rank. The purpose of this enhanced review, which may include one to two external evaluations, is to provide faculty members with a timely and detailed assessment of their progress toward fulfilling tenure requirements. Tenured associate professors in rank for more than seven years are also subject to annual reviews.

Documentation & Procedures:

A. Untenured Assistant and Associate Professors: annual review

1. The dossier will be the same one presented to the Salary Committee, with the proviso that the Salary Review Checklist may be supplemented with an optional cover statement of up to 500 words.
2. An Appendix to the salary dossier (which need not be physically separate from the other materials) will include the following material: a) publications that have been submitted and/or accepted, but have not yet appeared; b) works in progress, including book manuscripts.
3. One member of the tenured faculty, appointed by the Chair, will review the materials for each untenured faculty member and draft a written report.
4. The report will cover at appropriate length the three areas of research, teaching, and service.
5. The terms for evaluation are Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. All members of the tenured faculty will discuss, edit, and approve the final report. At the fourth- and fifth-year reviews, they will also vote on whether the faculty member's contract should be renewed.

6. A final copy of the report will be given to the person reviewed, and another copy placed in his/her personnel file. The Chair will meet privately with each person reviewed to discuss the written report.

B. Untenured Assistant and Associate Professors: enhanced third-year review. [NB: Applies also to individuals who wish to present a tenure case earlier than the sixth year.]

1. The dossier will include the same one presented to the Salary Committee. The optional cover statement (with the proviso as in A. 1) may exceed 500 words if appropriate.

2. An Appendix to the salary dossier (which need not be physically separate from the other materials) will include the following material: a) publications that have been submitted and/or accepted, but have not yet appeared; b) works in progress, including book manuscripts; c) further documentation of teaching (peer observations, course packets, descriptions of course development, etc.); d) further documentation of service.

3. A committee of two or three tenured faculty, appointed by the Chair, will review the materials and draft a report.

4. The report can be substantially longer than that of an annual review, as appropriate.

5. The terms for evaluation are Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. All members of the tenured faculty will discuss, edit, and approve the final report. They will also vote on whether the faculty member's contract should be renewed.

6. [See A.6]

C. Tenured Associate Professors 7+ years in rank: annual review

I. If there is no request for promotion

1. The dossier will be the same one presented to the Salary Committee.

2. The Chair will review the materials and write a brief report (as in A.3-4).

3. All the full professors will discuss, edit, and approve the final report.

4. [See A.6]

II. If there is a request for promotion

1. The dossier will include the same one presented to the Salary Committee. The optional cover statement may exceed 500 words if appropriate.

2. An Appendix to the salary dossier will contain additional material (as in B.2). Documentation will be oriented toward a review for promotion to Professor.

3. A committee of two or three full professors, appointed by the Chair, will review the materials and draft a report.

4. [See C.I.3]

5. [See A.6]

Procedures for Evaluating the Tenure and Promotion Dossiers.

In the case of tenure, the Chair will ask three members of the department's elected advisory committee to write a single report on the contents of the dossier. In order to assure the best assessment of an individual's work, the Chair may also appoint a specialist from other tenured faculty to join the three-person subcommittee. In the case of promotion to full rank, a subcommittee of the two full professors from the advisory committee will write the report on the dossier. A third full professor in the candidate's area of expertise will be named to the committee by the Chair.

In the case of both tenure and promotion, subcommittee report is sent electronically to the appropriate faculty constituencies for comment. The faculty then has two meetings: (1) to discuss the report and offer suggestions for change, as well as to vote by paper ballot on the rankings (Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory) in Research, Teaching and Service; (2) to vote by paper ballot up or down on tenure and promotion. Note: the subcommittee's final report is sent electronically to the faculty prior to the second meeting, but no changes to the report may be made at that meeting. Faculty who abstain will supply the Chair by the following day with a brief written statement explaining their reason for

abstention. Faculty unable to attend the meeting may vote by providing the Chair with a written evaluation of the candidate prior to the faculty meeting. In all cases, the Chair does not vote.

The Chair shall inform the candidate of the departmental decision and the vote. The Chair will then forward to the Dean of the College the departmental vote, the subcommittee report, and his/her own recommendation. In cases where there is considerable difference of opinion among the faculty, the Chair shall summarize the various points of view.

Calendar for Annual Reviews and Tenure and Promotion Evaluations.

Annual Reviews: Each fall semester, the Chair shall ask assistant and associate professors to prepare materials to submit for their annual review in the spring. The Chair is responsible for issuing a written statement to each candidate about the results of the annual review.

Tenure: At the end of the candidate's fifth year, the Chair and candidate will go over the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs' checklist of materials for the dossier. Letters from external reviewers will be solicited no later than April. From a list of twelve reviewers submitted by the department (half proposed by the candidate and half by the faculty), the Dean of the College will select eight. Letters from these persons will be solicited by the department on behalf of the Dean. By late April, or the time allowed by the Dean's office, packets of materials must be assembled by the candidate to send to external reviewers. Over the summer, the candidate and the Chair will assemble the dossier, which should be ready for the tenure subcommittee to review by the middle of August. The subcommittee shall prepare its report no later than the second week in September. A faculty meeting to discuss the report and to vote on the candidate will occur shortly thereafter. The dossier along with all other materials will be sent to the Dean of the College and from there to the Dean of the Faculties for review and recommendations to the President and the Board of Trustees.

Promotion: Once an individual decides to go forward for promotion to full professor, the same procedures apply as described in the Tenure section above.

2. Any other documents connected to promotion and tenure reviews

The department uses the College's template, unmodified, for all letters to outside reviewers.

Sample paper (secret) ballot:

For the promotion and tenure case of X, I vote: ___ YES ___ NO.

Prior to this ballot, at a separate meeting, the appropriate faculty constituency votes in a secret ballot on each of the three areas of research, teaching, and service.

3. Salary-setting criteria and procedures

304. SALARY POLICY.

The following document was endorsed by the faculty during the regular meeting of 9-22-98 and revised and endorsed at the faculty meetings on 9-28-99, 4-2-02, 3-6-07 and 10-30-09:

Guiding Principles:

- A. It is important to distinguish between making policy and implementing policy. The Salary Committee is charged with implementing policies.
- B. All decisions affecting faculty salaries rest with the faculty. In addition to being an ex-officio member on the Salary Committee, the Chairperson serves as advocate for faculty decisions.
- C. The Chairperson must press vigorously at every opportunity for equity adjustments. Funds for such adjustments must come from outside the Department budget. The Chair may consult with the salary committee for assistance in identifying inequities and building potential arguments to be presented to the dean.
- D. Merit compensation will take into account the diversity of faculty talent and missions.
- E. The type and quantity of documentation required from the faculty by the salary committee shall be kept to a minimum.
- F. Salary increments will be calculated in a combination of dollar and percentage amounts for merit.

Composition: three members, plus the Chairperson (ex-officio).

Term: One-year, not renewable. The Chairperson is a permanent ex-officio member.

Appointments: Each year, the Chair appoints one committee member from each rank, using an alphabetical sequence, with the goal of ongoing and fair rotation. The Chair has the discretion to appoint the closest approximate person to the committee—for example, to achieve gender representation, to allow for sabbaticals and other leaves, etc. Faculty members who are less than 100% in the Department budget will serve every other time their names come up in rotation.

Responsibilities: The Committee is charged with implementing the Department Salary Policy as approved by faculty vote.

Distribution: Salary increments will be calculated in a combination of dollar and percentage amounts for merit. The funds will be assigned for merit, one-half in dollar amounts, and one-half as a percentage of current salary. Merit will be assessed according to these guidelines; higher merit will earn a higher percentage of current salary, and lower merit a lower percentage of current salary.

Documentation: Each faculty member is responsible for turning in to the Chair by an announced date the following documentation: (a) The Salary Checklist; (b) The Faculty Annual Reports for the past three calendar years; (c) CV with publications, grants, and papers in three-year window highlighted; (d) copies of publications from the past three calendar years; (e) course syllabi and BEST data summary sheets [not individual student evaluations]; (f) (for the Chair and program directors only) a max. 500-word statement on duties performed in the past three years. This documentation should be presented in a reasonably-sized binder per person.

Merit Weighting: There will be two weighting systems. The committee will choose the one most advantageous to the faculty member.

Relative weights: $R = 3 \quad T = 2 \quad S = 2$

$$R = 2 \quad T = 3 \quad S = 2$$

Merit Rating Procedures: Each year every faculty member will be reviewed for a three-year period, including the last calendar year and the two preceding ones. The review will cover Research, Teaching, and Service, and the following numerical scale will be used:

4 outstanding 3 highly effective 2 effective 1 minimally effective 0 unsatisfactory

For faculty on leave without a Teaching or Service record for some portion of the three-year period, points will be assigned equal to the average for the remainder of the period.

A total score for each faculty is derived by multiplying the committee's four evaluations by the assigned weight for the category. Where discrepancies of more than one point arise in the evaluation of a single case, the committee must reach a consensus. Individual judgments of committee members are confidential but all faculty members will have access to the overall ratings, broken down by category, of all faculty members.

4. Teaching Evaluation Policies and Procedures

This statement (from the section on criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion) lies at the heart of all evaluation of teaching:

“Teaching. A good teacher is able to design and run courses that inform and stimulate students at the undergraduate and the graduate levels. Evidence of such ability is gathered from student evaluations, peer observations, and course materials provided by the candidate. For promotion, the candidate should also show evidence of being able to guide students through theses and dissertations. If a candidate is to propose teaching as the major strength, skill and success in course supervision would support the case, as would the development and, where appropriate, the publication of widely applicable course materials and methods (textbooks, computer software, etc.). For publications with a clearly conceptual/theoretical orientation, see Research above.”

In addition, the following procedures apply with regard to the evaluation of teaching:

- A. For recruitment interviews:
 - a. 3 sets of recent student evaluations are solicited in the job ad or for finalists
 - b. The Chair requests information directly from the candidate’s dissertation director or other person knowledgeable about the candidate’s teaching.
 - c. A portion of the interview at each level (initial search and screen, phone interview, MLA interview, on-campus interview) directly addresses teaching. If considered relevant, a candidate may also be asked to do a teaching presentation or workshop.

- B. For annual reviews:

As noted under “Annual Review Procedures,” faculty who receive an annual review present their Salary binders for consideration, with one exception: the salary binder contains only work actually published, while the annual review dossier may contain additional items that could relate to Teaching (“1. The dossier will be the same one presented to the Salary Committee, with the proviso that the Salary Review Checklist may be supplemented with an optional cover statement of up to 500 words. 2. An Appendix to the salary dossier (which need not be physically separate from the other materials) will include the following material: a) publications that have been submitted and/or accepted, but have not yet appeared; b) works in progress, including book manuscripts.”) Information on BEST evaluation mean scores,

teaching or mentoring awards, teaching-related publications or grants, teaching-related service, and participation in dissertation, thesis, and examination committees is included in this material. In addition, the Chair or the candidate provide evidence that the faculty member under review has had a peer observation; the normal expectation is that an untenured faculty member would have a formal peer observation of teaching at least once per year. The annual review reports always contain a section evaluating Teaching, which includes a summary rating at the end of the section.

C. For promotion and tenure:

See Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion descriptions above. The appropriate constituency in the department has the opportunity to provide input on the evaluating committee's report, which includes an evaluation of teaching, and a meeting is then held for a formal vote on tenure and promotion. At that point, separate secret ballots are held on the candidate's research, teaching, and service, and a final YES/NO secret ballot is taken on tenure and promotion. The Chair's letter also addresses the candidate's teaching and is reflected in his/her ultimate evaluation of the candidate.

5. Departmental Rights and Regulations for Non-tenure Track Faculty.

302.1 NON-TENURE-TRACK (NTT) FACULTY: VISITING LECTURER, LECTURER, SENIOR LECTURER AND VISITING LECTURER WITH PHD APPOINTMENTS

The following policy was endorsed by the faculty during the regular meeting of 4-23-02; revised on 4-8-08, 12-2-08, and again on 3-27-09.

1. Scope and Rationale

This policy is in conformity with the College of Arts and Sciences —Policy on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (1997; Revised 2007),^l the University's *Non-Tenure-Track Academic Appointee Handbook* (Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculties, August 2002), and the *IUB Academic Guide* (Dean of Faculties – updated May 2008); link: www.indiana.edu/~vpfaa/download/ntt_handbook_2002.pdf. The appointment of instructional staff to the ranks of Visiting Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Visiting Lecturer with PhD shall be limited to situations in which an immediate short-term need presents itself, or where such appointments are consonant with the specific teaching and service missions of the department.

2. Definition

Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD contribute either by teaching alone or by some combination of teaching and service.

3. Conditions of Employment

Visiting Lecturers are appointed for terms as per university policy and continued employment is contingent upon satisfactory performance and continuing institutional need. Visiting Lecturers must have an MA degree (ABD preferred) and a minimum of two years teaching experience at the college/university level; they generally teach first- and second-year courses. Visiting Lecturers seeking appointment at the Lecturer rank may apply and submit materials based on the guidelines specified for the nationally-advertised Lecturer positions.

Lecturers are hired through a nationally-advertised search and appointed for terms as per university policy. Lecturers' continuation of employment is dependent upon satisfactory performance and other factors specified in the *NTT Academic Appointee Handbook*. Lecturers must have an MA degree (ABD preferred) and a minimum of four years teaching experience at the college/university level; they generally

teach first- and second-year courses. After completion of a minimum of three years in rank and no more than six years, Lecturers may seek promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer.

Senior Lecturers are appointed for terms as per university policy and continuation of employment is dependent upon satisfactory performance and other factors specified in the *NTT Academic Appointee Handbook*. The Senior Lecturer title may involve administrative or other duties well beyond the scope of ordinary classroom instruction. In general, Senior Lecturer candidates will have demonstrated significant pedagogical achievements, such as assuming teaching leadership roles, developing classroom innovations, receiving national recognition for their work, and, if applicable, assuming administrative duties.

Visiting Lecturers with PhD are appointed for one-year terms (specifically 10 months) as per university policy, with the possibility of one 1-year renewal if performance is satisfactory and there is continuing institutional need. Visiting Lecturers with PhD must have the PhD in hand by the date of appointment; they generally teach courses at the advanced second-year and third-year levels.

Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Visiting Lecturers with PhD are expected to report annually on their teaching and/or service, and to provide appropriate evidence of the quality of their performance. The Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Review Committee annually 1) evaluates the quality of NTT faculty's performance in the areas of teaching and/or service, and 2) makes recommendations to the Departmental Chair on contract renewal/reappointment based solely on performance in these two areas. The NTT Review Committee will assign one of the following performance ratings to each member of the instructional staff: outstanding, good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. If the NTT Review Committee recommends promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, the Departmental Chair will bring that recommendation to the full faculty for a vote. In all other cases, the NTT Review Committee makes recommendations to the Departmental Chair. The Departmental Chair communicates the review results to NTT faculty within two weeks of receiving the committee's recommendations although decanal permission for the department to reappoint may not be guaranteed at that time.

As per the *IUB Academic Guide* and the *NTT Academic Appointee Handbook*, in the event of non-reappointment, Visiting Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD must be given notice at least 1 pay period prior to end of the present appointment. Instructional staff in their first year as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer must be given three months' notice (Feb. 1; during their second year, six months' notice (Nov. 1); and thereafter, 12 months' notice (May 1). Longer-term contracts offered to Lecturers and Senior Lecturers do not carry the same guarantees as tenure. An instructional staff member in these ranks may not be reappointed if his or her performance is judged by the department or the College to be unsatisfactory; if the expedient need which created the demand for the position is no longer present; or if the position is no longer consonant with the academic mission of the department.

4. Rights and Obligations

Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD are expected to provide evidence of up-to-date understanding of the substantive materials of their field, and to show readiness to assume responsibility for classroom pedagogy. They are also expected to participate in departmental activities that are pertinent to their assigned tasks; in return, the department will provide the necessary resources for their teaching and service responsibilities.

Faculty meetings are attended only by tenured and tenure-track faculty and the DLI (see section 303. Faculty Meetings). Other instructional staff may be invited to attend as non-voting consultants on relevant issues.

Teaching loads for Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD will be decided by the department in consultation with the Dean, and will be consistent with prevailing standards at peer research institutions. In some cases, special service or administrative duties will be assigned at the time of appointment and may affect teaching loads. Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD are not expected to carry out research, but they will have the opportunity for intellectual development and growth as instructors, for example by attendance at workshops and conferences on pedagogy, or through practice in the application of technology to language teaching.

The salary structure for Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD will be separate from that for tenured and tenure-track faculty. The NTT Review Committee will evaluate Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD for the purpose of making recommendations to the Chair on performance review, promotion, and contract renewal. The Chair will take these evaluations into consideration when determining annual performance, promotion, and contract renewal.

Additionally, all NTT faculty will be evaluated in writing by the course supervisors, DLI, ADLI, DIT, or DUGS as appropriate. These supervisor evaluations provide the NTT faculty the ability to reply in writing to observations on their performance. Any grievance of the evaluative process by the NTT under review allows for due process. The following outlines the grievance procedure:

- a. The NTT faculty member must meet with the supervisor in charge of the evaluation to discuss the review and his/her written reply. The meeting must take place within 10 business days of the date on the evaluation. The supervisor will write up a short report on the meeting and provide a copy to the NTT faculty member for his/her possible written reply.

- b. For NTT faculty teaching at or below the S250 (4th semester) level:

In the event of disagreement on the evaluation and supervisor's follow-up report, the NTT faculty member has 10 business days from the date of the supervisor's follow-up report to file a written grievance with the Assistant Director of Language Instruction (ADLI). The ADLI will convene a meeting of the supervisor and the NTT faculty member to discuss the written materials and grievance. The ADLI will document the results of that discussion, and provide a copy to the NTT faculty member, to which he/she may reply.

Should disagreement on the evaluation continue, the NTT faculty member must file a written grievance with the Director of Language Instruction (DLI) within 10 business days of the date of the ADLI report. The DLI will discuss the evaluation and reports with the NTT faculty member and will write a follow-up report on their meeting. A copy will be provided to the NTT faculty member for his/her consideration and possible reply.

- c. For NTT faculty teaching above the S250 (4th semester) level who are not directly supervised by the DUGS: In the event of disagreement on the evaluation and the supervisor's follow-up report, NTT faculty who are not directly supervised by the DUGs have 10 business days from the date of the supervisor's follow-up report to file a written grievance with the DUGS. The DUGS will convene a meeting of the supervisor and the NTT faculty member to discuss the written materials and grievance. The DUGS will document the results of that discussion, and provide a copy to the NTT faculty member, to which he/she may reply.

- d. Following a meeting with either the DUGS or the DLI, should the NTT faculty member wish to continue the grievance, she/he must contact the Departmental Chair in writing within 10 business days of the DLI report. The Departmental Chair will appoint an ad hoc committee of 2 members of the faculty and 1 member of the NTT faculty to review the grievance and write a

final decision on the case. The written decision will be sent to the Departmental Chair and to the grievant. In the event that the department finds the grievance to be without merit, the Departmental Chair shall inform the NTT faculty member of avenues of appeal beyond the department.

5. Procedures for NTT Annual Performance Reviews and Promotion

For the purposes of annual performance reviews for Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD, promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, and enhanced third-year reviews for Senior Lecturers, all NTT faculty will submit their dossiers to the NTT Review Committee by a pre-announced date so that the committee may make its recommendations to the Chair prior to relevant reappointment notification deadlines. The dossier should include materials from the NTT faculty member's time in the NTT ranks at Indiana University up to but not more than the past three calendar years. The DLI will provide the Committee with copies of standard syllabi for both Spanish and Portuguese language courses. All NTT faculty will be evaluated only on the written documentation included in the dossier.

Materials to be submitted in a professional, organized and easy-to-read format:

A. For Visiting Lecturers, Lecturers and Visiting Lecturers with PhD:

Regular Annual Reviews a) CV with focus on teaching and administration; b) Personal statement (suggested 500 word maximum) on professional activity, pedagogical achievements and future goals, and, if applicable, curriculum development and administrative duties; c) A summary chart including the term and year, course number(s), number of students, BEST mean score ratings for outstanding course quality and for outstanding instructor performance, and the percentages of students who strongly agree/agree on these BEST items of outstanding course quality and outstanding instructor performance; d) BEST student evaluations (original forms or photocopies, with computer printouts); e) A summary chart of supervisor evaluation results, if applicable, including the term and year, course number(s), number of instructors and the average for items 15 and 16 on the BEST evaluation sheet; f) BEST supervisor evaluations, if applicable (original forms or photocopies, with computer printout); g) Class observation reports; h) Supervisor's evaluation (in cases where NTT faculty teach beyond the S250 level these evaluations may be completed by the Director of Undergraduate Studies and/or the faculty or course supervisor); i) Director's Evaluation of Supervisor, if applicable. [note: (c) and (e) are created by the candidate based on information found in (d) and (f), respectively];

Lecturer seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer:

In addition to the materials listed above for a regular annual review, the dossier for promotion should include documents from every year in rank and the following materials should be added to the dossier: a) Personal statement (suggested 750 word maximum) on professional activity, pedagogical achievements and future goals, and, if applicable, curriculum development and administrative duties; b) Evidence of curriculum development, if applicable: any original pedagogical materials and evidence of course development; c) Further evidence of pedagogical excellence: leadership positions in teaching, awards or formal recognition of teaching excellence, unsolicited student feedback, etc.; d) Evidence of professional development: attendance or presentations at conferences, classroom innovations, pedagogical research/publications, professional activities beyond the university, special workshops or training, etc.

B. For Senior Lecturers:

Regular Annual Reviews

a) CV with focus on teaching and administration; b) A summary chart including the term and year, course number(s), number of students, BEST mean score ratings for outstanding course quality and for outstanding instructor performance, and the percentages of students who strongly agree/agree on these

BEST items of outstanding course quality and outstanding instructor performance; c) BEST student evaluations (original forms or photocopies, with computer printouts); d) A summary chart of supervisor evaluation results, if applicable, including the term and year, course number(s), number of instructors and the average for items 15 and 16 on the BEST evaluation sheet; e) BEST supervisor evaluations, if applicable (original forms or photocopies, with computer printout); f) Director's Evaluation of Supervisor, if applicable; g) Any original syllabi and/or original curriculum development, if applicable.

Enhanced review for Senior Lecturers (to coincide with Three-Year Contract Renewal): In addition to the materials listed above for regular annual review of Senior Lecturers, the following materials should be added for an enhanced review:

a) Personal statement (suggested 500 word maximum) on professional activity, pedagogical achievements and future goals, and, if applicable, curriculum development and administrative duties; b) Class observation reports.