

PERSONNEL POLICY

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Proposed March 28, 2008

Adopted April 18, 2008

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Every faculty member keeps a file of his or her recent work. Typically, this file will contain a vita, copies of annual reports, copies and reviews of publications, manuscripts and working plans of research and writing in progress, course materials, evaluations and descriptions of teaching by students and colleagues, committee reports and other accounts of service. Other material relevant to evaluation -- letters from colleagues and students, reviews of publication, etc.--may be placed in this file.

2. All department promotion and tenure policies and procedures are subject to the rules of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/tandp/>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/tphbk.html>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~college/faculty/policy/collegepolicies/tenure2000.shtml>

3. The chair shall hold annual conversations with untenured faculty and those interested in promotion and document that the conversation occurred.

B. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE

First Year:

All tenure-track faculty should begin their appointment at IU by establishing a dossier file that corresponds to those used in tenure and promotion decisions. What follows describes the typical pattern of steps toward tenure.

Second Year:

1. The second year review constitutes a decision about reappointment for the fourth year.
2. The chair may request materials on teaching, research, service from non-tenured faculty members who are in their second year toward tenure.
3. The chair recommends reappointment unless a candidate's record clearly suggests a negative decision.
4. The circumstances that would typically suggest a negative reappointment decision would be an absence of research activity, negligent and/or ineffective teaching with little prospect for improvement, or inadequate service activities.
5. If the chair reaches a negative decision, the candidate may request a formal review by the tenure and promotion committee.
6. When there is a formal review, the tenure and promotion committee evaluates the candidate's performance and submits this written evaluation to the chair and the candidate. If there is a recommendation for non-reappointment, the report along with the chair's recommendation, will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences.

Third Year

1. The third year review constitutes a decision about reappointment for the fifth year.

2. The primary purpose of the third year review is to evaluate and advise the candidate as to progress toward tenure. In consultation with the candidate, the chair appoints a subset of the tenure and promotion committee to conduct the initial review and evaluation. This sub-committee submits its report to the tenure and promotion committee for deliberation and vote.

3. The tenure and promotion committee conducts the third year review in the first semester of the candidate's third year.

4. The candidate, with the assistance of staff and the chair, compiles a dossier. The dossier includes evidence of research activities, teaching evaluations including peer reviews, documentation of service activities, and a statement. The statement is a scholarly narrative of the candidate's work and its significance. Typically, the research section addresses choice of topics, patterns of publications, and other indices of research activities. It also discusses the research's significance. The teaching section includes a description of courses taught and their relationship to one another, pedagogical innovations, teaching goals, evaluation strategies, and a summary comment on student evaluations. Teaching-related publications, presentations and grants may be mentioned. Finally, the service section of the statement addresses the quality and quantity of departmental, College, University, and other service. Overall, the statement should suggest connections among research, teaching, and service activities.

5. The committee writes its report and submits copies to the chair and the candidate.

6. The chair writes a separate recommendation.

7. If there is a recommendation for non-reappointment, the report and the chair's recommendation will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences.

Fourth and Fifth Year Reviews

1. The fourth and fifth year reviews constitute a decision about reappointment for the sixth and seventh years respectively.

2. The candidate is normally reappointed after a review by the chair, unless the candidate

requests a tenure or promotion decision that year.

3. In those cases where the chair recommends against reappointment, the candidate may ask the tenure and promotion committee to review the decision.

4. The tenure and promotion committee will review the relevant materials and write a report.

5. If there is a recommendation for non-reappointment, the report and the chair's recommendation will be submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences.

Sixth Year (Tenure Decision):

1. The sixth year review constitutes a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

2. This decision is made by the tenure and promotion committee after a full review.

C. TENURE REVIEW

The department follows the university policies on tenure and promotion:

<http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/tandp/>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~deanfac/tphbk.html>

<http://www.indiana.edu/~college/faculty/policy/collegepolicies/tenure2000.shtml>

Typically, the tenure review process begins the semester before the department's tenure decision. Before the end of that semester, the candidate consults with the chair to help determine the primary criterion for tenure and begin the process of generating a list of potential internal and external referees.

1. The review begins with a request from the chair that the candidate starts to organize their materials on research, teaching, and service. The candidate, with the assistance of staff and the

chair, compiles a dossier. Ultimately, the dossier includes evidence of research activities, teaching evaluations including peer reviews, documentation of service activities, and a statement. The statement is a scholarly narrative of the candidate's work and its significance. Typically, the research section addresses choice of topics, patterns of publications, and other indices of research activities. It also discusses the research's significance. The teaching section includes a description of courses taught and their relationship to one another, pedagogical innovations, teaching goals, evaluation strategies, and a summary comment on student evaluations. Teaching-related publications, presentations and grants may be mentioned. Finally, the service section of the statement addresses the quality and quantity of departmental, College, University, and other service. Overall, the statement should suggest connections among research, teaching, and service activities.

2. The department and the candidate then generate a list of potential external reviewers. Normally, the candidate generates half the list and the department generates half the list. The list must include a brief description of each reviewer's professional credentials and stature, their contact information (both regular mail and e-mail addresses), plus any personal or professional relationship between the candidate and the reviewer. Once the list is formulated, the chair consults with the candidate to ensure its appropriateness. The candidate has the right to veto specific individuals. The list is then sent to the College for approval.

3. Once the list of external reviewers is complete, the candidate, with assistance from the department, assembles those materials that will be forwarded to the external reviewers for evaluation.

4. In consultation with the candidate and the eligible tenure faculty, the chair of the department appoints a three-member tenure subcommittee and designates responsibilities.

5. The department chair, as well as other members of the tenured faculty, shall guide each candidate through all stages of the review process. The department chair shall chair all department meetings concerning tenure and promotion decisions.

6. The subcommittee is encouraged to meet (ideally in the spring semester prior to the candidate going up for tenure) to review and discuss the candidate's teaching, research and service prior to drafting any reports. The subcommittee should also review the candidate's

third year review as part of this discussion. Members of the subcommittee are encouraged to talk with the candidate to clarify any issues that may arise in reviewing the materials in the candidate's dossier. The subcommittee's report is then forwarded to the tenure committee.

7. Each member of the tenure committee reviews the candidate's dossier and the subcommittee report before meeting to discuss the report. At this meeting, the tenure committee considers whether additional evidence might be useful. However, "if additional information is sought or received during the review of the dossier at any level, the candidate and all previous committees and reviewers must be notified and given the opportunity to respond to the additional information. The information and the responses shall then become part of the dossier" (University Faculty Council, April 23, 1991; Board of Trustees, June 20, 1991). The candidate can add anything to the dossier and they can do so throughout the entire review process.

8. The candidate's record is then discussed by the tenure committee. Each section of the tenure report is discussed separately and possibly modified.

9. The report, revised if necessary, is then provided to the candidate who may correct errors of fact within a reasonable period, typically five working days. The tenure committee must respond to the candidate's reply within a reasonable period, typically five working days.

10. The candidate's record and the committee report, including any corrections and replies, are then discussed by the tenure committee. Each section of the tenure report is discussed separately and a vote taken on that section of the tenure report. There is an additional vote taken on the general question of tenure. All votes are taken by secret ballot, the decisions depending on the majority vote. All final votes (on each section and on the general question of tenure) are reported.

11. Faculty members eligible to vote on promotion and tenure decisions shall include all those tenured faculty members who have at least half-time academic appointments in the Department of Criminal Justice. Eligible members of the faculty must be present in order to vote on a tenure and/or promotion decision.

12. The department chair shall make an independent evaluation of the candidate, and shall give that report to the candidate. Upon receiving the chair's recommendation, the candidate may add material to the dossier and request a reassessment. This request must be made within a reasonable period, typically five working days after receiving the chair's recommendation. The chair must respond to this request for a reassessment within a reasonable period, typically five working days.

13. Unless the candidate chooses to withdraw from the tenure process at this point, all materials are then forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences.

D. PROMOTION

Assistant to Associate Professor

1. Usually, the department's review of a candidate for promotion from assistant to associate professor coincides with the tenure review.

2. If early promotion is proposed, the chair of the department selects a subcommittee from the ranks of eligible associate and full professors in residence. The subsequent review follows the tenure review procedures.

3. The main difference between promotion and tenure is that "promotion to any rank is recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. Tenure, while also based on accomplishments to date also is based on promise of future accomplishments" (Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculties).

4. Because promotion is "a recognition of past achievement," only materials pertinent to the period that the candidate has been in her/his present rank are considered.

Associate to Full Professor

1. The chair of the department and eligible full professors consider the candidate's record for promotion to full professor.

2. The review begins with a request from the chair that the candidate starts to organize their materials on research, teaching, and service. The candidate, with the assistance of staff and the chair, compiles a dossier. Ultimately, the dossier includes evidence of research activities, teaching evaluations including peer reviews, documentation of service activities, and a statement. The statement is a scholarly narrative of the candidate's work and its significance. Typically, the research section addresses choice of topics, patterns of publications, and other indices of research activities. It also discusses the research's significance. The teaching section includes a description

of courses taught and their relationship to one another, pedagogical innovations, teaching goals, evaluation strategies, and a summary comment on student evaluations. Teaching-related publications, presentations and grants may be mentioned. Finally, the service section of the statement addresses the quality and quantity of departmental, College, University, and other service. Overall, the statement should suggest connections among research, teaching, and service activities.

3. The department and the candidate then generate a list of potential external reviewers. Normally, the candidate generates half the list and the department generates half the list. The list must include a brief description of each reviewer's professional credentials and stature, their contact information (both regular mail and e-mail addresses), plus any personal or professional relationship between the candidate and the reviewer. Once the list is formulated, the chair consults with the candidate to ensure its appropriateness. The candidate has the right to veto specific individuals. The list is then sent to the College for approval.

4. Once the list of external reviewers is complete, the candidate, with assistance from the department, assembles those materials that will be forwarded to the external reviewers for evaluation.

5. In consultation with the candidate and the eligible full professors, the chair of the department appoints a three-member promotion subcommittee and designates responsibilities.

6. The department chair, as well as all full professors, shall guide each candidate through all stages of the review process. The department chair shall chair all department meetings concerning tenure and promotion decisions.

7. The subcommittee is encouraged to meet (ideally in the spring semester prior to the candidate going up for promotion) to review and discuss the candidate's teaching, research and service prior to drafting any reports. Members of the subcommittee are encouraged to talk with the candidate to clarify any issues that may arise in reviewing the materials in the candidate's dossier. The subcommittee's report is then forwarded to the promotion committee.

8. Each member of the promotion committee reviews the candidate's dossier and the sub-committee report before meeting to discuss the report. At this meeting, the promotion committee considers whether additional evidence might be useful. However, "if additional information is sought or received during the review of the dossier at any level, the candidate and all previous committees and reviewers must be notified and given the opportunity to respond to the additional information. The information and the responses shall then become part of the dossier" (University Faculty Council, April 23, 1991; Board of Trustees, June 20, 1991). The candidate can add anything to the dossier and they can do so throughout the entire review process.

9. The candidate's record is then discussed by the promotion committee. Each section of the promotion report is discussed separately and possibly modified.

10. The promotion committee report, modified if necessary, is then provided to the candidate who may correct errors of fact within a reasonable period, typically five working days. The promotion committee must respond to the candidate's reply within a reasonable period, typically five working days.

11. The candidate's record and the committee report, including any corrections and replies, are then discussed by the promotion committee. Each section of the promotion report is discussed separately and a vote taken on that section of the promotion report. There is an additional vote taken on the general question of promotion. All votes are taken by secret ballot, the decisions depending on the majority vote. All final votes (on each section and on the general question of promotion) are reported.

12. Faculty members eligible to vote on promotion to full professor decisions shall include all those full professors who have at least half-time academic appointments in the Department of Criminal Justice. Eligible members of the faculty must be present in order to vote on a promotion decision.

13. The department chair shall make an independent evaluation of the candidate, and shall give that report to the candidate. Upon receiving the chair's recommendation, the candidate

may add material to the dossier and request a reassessment. This request must be made within a reasonable period, typically five working days after receiving the chair's recommendation. The chair must respond to this request for a reassessment within a reasonable period, typically five working days.

14. Unless the candidate chooses to withdraw from the promotion process at this point, all materials are then forwarded to the College of Arts and Sciences.

15. The main difference between promotion and tenure is that "promotion to any rank is recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments." (Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculties).

16. Because promotion is "a recognition of past achievement," only materials pertinent to the period that the candidate has been in her/his present rank are considered.