

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE  
Procedures for Annual Review, Reappointment,  
Promotion and Tenure of Faculty  
University Statements and Policies

The procedures of the Department for annual review, reappointment and non-reappointment, promotion and tenure follow the framework established by the University as set forth in the Academic Handbook. That document should be consulted for greater detail on some of these decisions. In addition, University officials notify the faculty from time to time of additions to or revisions of statements in the latest edition of the Handbook.

Regarding standards for the evaluation of performance and potential, the most explicit Handbook statement of the University's standards reads as follows (page 63):

Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion criteria. Promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual's contribution to the school/campus mission. The relative weight attached to the criteria above should and must vary accordingly. A candidate for promotion should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be satisfactory in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university. In all cases the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is a recognition of past achievements and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.

This is followed in the Handbook by descriptions of how the basic three criteria are evaluated (p. 63- 64).

Furthermore, the Department's procedures comply with the standards of fairness in promotion and tenure procedures as developed in the Faculty Affairs Report on Promotion and Tenure Procedures of 1977 (Circular BI9-77 reprinted-as Item 10 of Bloomington Faculty Council Agenda, April 19, 1977).

In practice, of course, these criteria must be applied more specifically within the Department as described below.

## The Departmental Committee

The main review instrument assisting in these decisions is the six member Departmental Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee is responsible for the review of faculty files in regard to: promotion, tenure, annual reviews for all faculty below the rank of full professor, and evaluation of faculty in consideration of salary merit increases. It also advises the Chair on all salary-related matters. Each year two new faculty members are elected to the Committee, thus, in any given year four of the members serving on the Committee will have been elected by the faculty. The Chair of the Department will appoint two more members each year for one year terms, to maximize the representativeness of the Committee with regard to rank, field, expertise or experience. The Committee is to have at least one non-tenured junior faculty member, who participates in all Committee activities except for voting on tenure and promotion cases. Every effort is to be made to assure that each untenured faculty member has an opportunity to serve on the Personnel Committee. The Personnel Committee elects its own chair. While the Chair of the Department serves as Executive Chair of the Committee, the Departmental Chair will participate in the deliberations of the Committee only at the invitation of the majority of its members.<sup>1</sup>

The record of the candidate is reviewed as a whole by the Personnel Committee. Although the Committee reviews and discusses the whole record, separate reports are prepared in each of the traditional areas of research, teaching, and service. After meeting to review, evaluate and discuss the candidate's performance in each of these areas, the chair of the Committee prepares a report which covers the three traditional areas. This report is circulated to the whole Committee for review and revision. The Committee may also consult with the Chair of the Department if additional data and documentation are required. The Committee comes to a judgment on a scale from less than effective to outstanding with regard to the candidate's performance in research, teaching, and service. At the invitation of the Committee, the Chair attends meetings of the Committee, hears its discussion, but does not vote or participate actively in its discussion except by raising questions and (if necessary) eliciting clarification of the nature and basis of the Committee's judgments. The Chair reviews the dossier of the candidate as well as the reports and statements of the Committee and reaches a judgment on which a recommendation to the Dean is based. This decision is conveyed to all Committee members, and to all persons who have been reviewed, whether the outcome is positive or negative. These discussions with candidates summarize the Committee's and the Chair's judgments, and provide the candidates an opportunity to raise questions and assess prospects for future decision. On reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions, should the Committee and the Department Chair arrive at conflicting conclusions, both recommendations, with supporting statements, go to the higher University officials and their committees.

There is one more stage to the procedures outlined above. After the Committee has made its recommendation and produced its report, it shall make these recommendations to the full faculty. At a special faculty meeting these recommendations will be presented to, and discussed by, the regular faculty. Candidates will not be present during the discussion of their cases; however the chair of the Personnel Committee will provide them with an oral summary of the proceedings. Later, a secret ballot of the regular faculty will be taken, except that only tenured

---

<sup>1</sup> Participation of Department Chair was the only change made in 2007.

members of the regular faculty will vote. The Chair also invites any member of the tenured faculty to write a memo explaining their vote. The informed vote and related memos of the tenured faculty will then become part of the dossier that is submitted to the College of Arts and Sciences.

### Higher Administrative Reviews

In the cases of tenure and positive promotion recommendations of the Chair and/or the Personnel Committee, the Chair forwards the recommendation and the Departmental vote, accompanied by supporting statements and materials on the candidate's research, teaching and service, to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The latter's decision, made in consultation with a faculty advisory committee, is then reviewed by the Bloomington campus Dean of Faculties and Vice President, also assisted by a faculty advisory committee. Final action on their recommendations is taken by the University Board of Trustees, usually in April.

Departmental recommendations on reappointment of non-tenured faculty are normally accepted by the College and the Dean of Faculties. The annual reviews do not circulate outside the Department.

Attention is called to the existence of the University's Faculty Board of Review and its procedures concerning non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty, which are described elsewhere than in this statement.

### Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

In making each of these recommendations, the Department Chair and the Personnel Committee rely on elaborations of the criteria set forth at the *College and* University levels.

In keeping with the policy of the College Tenure and Promotion Committees, the Department's Personnel Committee uses the following rankings in its review of candidates: outstanding (excellent for the balanced case criteria), effective, and less than effective. Because Personnel Committees have found these labels not sufficiently discriminating, the use of pluses and minuses has been established. As required by the Academic Handbook, to be promoted or tenured, a candidate must normally be rated outstanding in at least one of the three categories and must be rated at least effective in the other(s).

Alternatively, 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 emphasizing a single primary area. In research, this means evidence of significant contribution to a substantial field. In teaching, it means evidence of an important contribution to teaching inside this university and, where possible, outside of it. And in service, it means evidence of significant impact on the university or one's discipline.

In reaching tenure and promotion decisions, the Personnel Committee, as required by the Academic Handbook, considers the qualifications of faculty members in terms of the professional standards for research, teaching and service elaborated below.

Research Criteria. In evaluating research, the following are the criteria applied by the Committee:

- 1) The quality and quantity of research.  
What is the overall quality of the research output to date? Does it appear that the individual is asking significant questions and pursuing thoughtful analyses; are arguments clear, well-documented? Are articles and books being accepted after a rigorous refereeing process, and what do those reviews indicate about the quality of the publications? Are articles being published in the major journals of political science? Are articles being published in the major journals of the individual's subfield? Is the quantity of research output below normal expectations, adequate, excellent? Do the publications show a steady research effort?
- 2) The growth and development of research performance.  
Is there ample evidence of the development of an overall research program beyond the doctoral dissertation and publications derived from it? Does the individual have a central research focus that coordinates her/his various papers and projects? Can we see where the individual is going? In tenure cases, is there clear evidence of growth beyond the Ph.D. thesis?
- 3) The growth of a national or international reputation.  
Is there evidence that this scholar is making a national or international reputation for her/himself? Is she/he participating in professional activities outside the University -- presenting papers on convention panels, participating as a discussant or panel chair, reviewing manuscripts, and so on?
- 4) The full use of research opportunities.  
Has the individual received grants, time off from teaching responsibilities, etc.? Have opportunities been used to further the research program?
- 5) A comparison of the candidate's research performance with that of her/his professional peers.  
Does this individual compare favorably with others at a similar level in comparable political science departments at other major research universities?

Note that the Department usually offers non-tenured faculty a one semester pre-tenure research leave. Normally, this leave is to be granted during the period subsequent to the faculty member's initial three year appointment. The purpose of the leave is to promote the faculty member's research program, particularly in moving that program beyond the dissertation.

Teaching Criteria. In evaluating teaching, the following are the criteria applied by the Committee:

- 1) Stimulus to students' knowledge and critical thinking.

What evidence is revealed in student evaluations, both graduate and undergraduate, in letters from former students and in memoranda or statements from other instructors about the ability of the instructor under review to teach students to think critically? What does the evidence in the form of course syllabi, sample examinations and other class handouts reveal about the instructor's emphasis on critical thinking? Has the instructor had an evident influence on the excellence of term papers, honors essays, Ph.D. dissertations or on the professional careers of her/his students?

- 2) Scholarly command of subject matter.  
What do student evaluations, especially the open-ended comments, and letters from students suggest about the breadth and depth of the instructor's courses? What statements from other instructors are there giving evidence of this instructor's classroom performance in this respect? What does the evidence in the form of course syllabi, sample examinations and other class handouts reveal about the instructor's scholarly command of the subject matter?
- 3) Effectiveness and creativity of teaching methods.  
What are the instructor's methods of teaching? How have her/his students responded to them? Has the instructor adopted appropriate and effective teaching innovations? Do student evaluations reflect the instructor's efforts to motivate students? Has the instructor engaged in research or had publications relevant to teaching? What is their quality?
- 4) Attitude toward and concern for students.  
Do student evaluations reveal the instructor to be sympathetic to and interested in students? Do they have easy access to the instructor? Does the instructor accept service on student service committees-- Departmental, housing, independent learning, etc.?
- 5) Comparison of the candidate's teaching performance with that of her/his Departmental colleagues.  
What are the student evaluations comparing this instructor with his Departmental colleagues? What is this instructor's reputation for teaching among colleagues who have had the occasion to work with her/him or in parallel courses? Does the teaching role of the instructor serve Departmental needs effectively or is her/his effectiveness more limited to her/his professional specialties?
- 6) Size and variety of instructor's courses (given Departmental needs). How many different courses has the instructor taught?  
Has the instructor been effective in all sizes and level of courses, both graduate and undergraduate? Has the individual developed new courses or modified old courses? What has been the quality of such efforts?
- 7) Teaching outside the classroom.

What evidence is available and what does it show about the effectiveness in such areas of teaching as academic advising, service on graduate student committees and undergraduate honors committees, work in independent readings courses, undergraduate field experience courses, etc.?

All faculty are expected to conduct student evaluations for each class that they teach. In addition, the College Policy Committee (May 6, 1998) has strongly endorsed the departmental use of regular and recurring peer evaluations in the tenure and promotion process.

Service Criteria. In assessing the faculty member's service performance the Department will judge the quality and the frequency of the individual's service under the following headings:

- 1) Service to the profession.  
This includes service at the local, national or international level in the form of participation in the activities of professional associations and foundations, attending meetings, holding office, reviewing manuscripts for journals and publishers, serving as a professional consultant.
- 2) Service to the University.  
This includes committee service (elective and appointive) and administrative appointments in the Department, the College, and the University, as well as representing the University to the community.
- 3) Public service.  
This includes service at the local, the state, the national or the international level, in the form of membership and activity in governmental affairs, in civic and service organizations, the media, cultural organizations.

The faculty should be aware of the following summary guidelines:

To achieve adequacy in research it is expected that the faculty member will develop and sustain a research program. Evidence of such a program includes participation in professional activities and publication of chapters in edited books, articles in refereed journals and/or book-length manuscripts.

Achieving an outstanding rating in research goes beyond these expectations and focuses on the quality of the research performance. An outstanding research record requires the regular publication of high quality work. Relevant evidence includes articles in major refereed journals, invitations to publish in prestigious edited volumes, and book-length manuscripts with prestigious university and commercial presses. Emphasis is on the quality of the research contribution. Do leading scholars evaluate the research as being original and significant in relation to the body of knowledge?

To achieve adequacy in teaching it is expected that the individual has been a responsible faculty member. The faculty member is expected to prepare relevant syllabi, hold regular office hours, meet classes regularly, and receive acceptable student evaluations.

Achieving an outstanding rating in teaching goes beyond these expectations. The teaching must be judged and documented as qualitatively superior at all levels. This includes teaching a variety of courses, old and new, large and small, graduate and undergraduate. It requires not just highly favorable student evaluations but a quality of teaching performance that is judged superior by both students and colleagues. It also could include the development of teaching-relevant publications or materials, participating in and conducting teaching seminars and conferences, and the promoting of quality teaching generally. In order to achieve an outstanding rating, candidates should also provide evidence of a significant educational impact within political science or within their particular area of study, both inside and outside of Indiana University.

The Department prides itself on its record of teaching, scholarship and professional service. The Personnel Committee does not view the pursuit of quality teaching and research as mutually exclusive goals--teaching and research should be reinforcing. In practice the Committee has found that making the case for an outstanding recommendation in one area is facilitated if the record in the other area also is strong.

#### Annual Review and Reappointment of Faculty

Each non-tenured faculty member and each tenured associate professor is given a written annual review of her/his performance to date and an assessment of prospects for promotion and/or tenure. One of the options of the Personnel Committee is to recommend to the Chair non-reappointment of faculty at the end of the initial three year appointment, or at the time of subsequent annual reappointments. The Departmental expectation guiding reappointments of lecturers is that the dissertation will be completed by the end of the first year.

To provide this review, a process similar to those used in tenure and promotion decisions is employed. At the beginning of the spring semester, non-tenured members of the faculty and tenured associate professors are asked to provide a vita and supporting materials, as well as to update their research, teaching, and service files which are then reviewed by the Personnel Committee. (Faculty members being reviewed for tenure or promotion do not participate in this process, and the tenure and promotion reviews replace this normal annual review process.) The review process is similar to that described for other decisions and employs the same criteria. In the spring, on the basis of the Committee's and her/his own reviews, the Chair provides these members of the faculty with written evaluations of their performance and prospects.

The procedures for annual review are also used by the Chair as a basis for the annual reappointment of non-tenured faculty recommendations that are made to the Dean of the Faculties, usually about March 1.

#### Tenure

The most important decision is that concerning tenure, which must be made no later than the end of the faculty member's sixth year of tenure-countable service. (Early tenure decisions are possible only in extraordinary circumstances.) The Departmental process begins during the

spring of the fifth year of service when the candidate is requested to provide an up-to-date vita and all other material deemed appropriate. A checklist of items normally desirable for this process, drafted by the Dean of Faculties, is supplied to the candidate at this time. In addition, the candidate is asked to supply a list of five and the Department a list of five names of outside scholars familiar with her/his work, along with sufficient copies of representative publications. The Chair writes to four of these persons over the summer – two from the candidate’s list and two from the Department’s list – for evaluations that are made available to the Personnel Committee and later become part of the dossier forwarded to the deans. The Dean of the College will write for additional confidential assessments to the other six outside evaluators. (The latter letters, when received, are not available to the Department.) All relevant materials go into files which are reviewed by the Personnel Committee. (See section on files below.)

During the spring of the fifth year, as part of the annual review process, the Personnel Committee reviews all available and relevant materials and makes a preliminary assessment of the strength of the case for tenure. This is communicated to the candidate, along with any additional information that may bear on the decision required to be made early in the following fall semester. Over the summer, the tenure files are available to tenured members of the faculty, who are invited to review them and communicate their views to the Personnel Committee through the Chair. During the early weeks of the fall semester the Personnel Committee reviews the tenure file makes a final recommendation which it conveys in its report to the Chair and the entire faculty. The faculty meets collectively to discuss the case, and each tenured faculty member has the opportunity to vote for or against tenure.

The Chair issues her/his report and recommendation based on the file, the Personnel Committee report, and the faculty's deliberation. Regardless of whether the recommendation is positive or negative, all these materials are forwarded to the College Tenure Committee on or about September 15. The Chair's report provides a detailed statement, rating each candidate on the research, teaching, and service dimensions. The statement summarizes the materials in the file, presents supporting evidence, and specifies the criteria on which the tenure case stands or falls. The tenured faculty’s vote and the Personnel Committee's report accompany the Chair's statement. The tenure decision is both retrospective and prospective. Not only is the candidate judged on his past accomplishments, but she/he is also rated about future prospects, though this prediction is usually a projection of past performance.

For both promotion and tenure, additional materials which update a submitted dossier (new publications, teaching evaluations, professional recognition, etc.) are conveyed by the Chair to the higher administrative levels up to around February of the decision year. The candidate is expected to cooperate in making such materials available quickly.

### Promotion

If a faculty member has not yet been promoted to the rank of associate professor, the tenure process occurs simultaneously with the promotion process. For faculty members who are already tenured, the process for promotion to the rank of full professor follows a calendar and procedure that closely parallel those previously described for the tenure process. The promotion process normally begins during the spring semester of the year preceding submission to the

College Promotion Committee based on the recommendation of the Department's Personnel Committee. Candidates build a file based on a checklist of items from the Dean of Faculties, and outside letters are solicited in a manner parallel to that previously discussed for the tenure process.

The Department's Personnel Committee evaluates the candidate's file at the beginning of the fall semester and makes a recommendation to the faculty. On the basis of both the file and the Committee's recommendation, the faculty meets to discuss the case. Subsequent to this meeting, each tenured faculty member has the opportunity to vote on the case. Finally, based on the file, the Personnel Committee report, and the faculty's deliberation, the Chair issues her/his own recommendation. These materials are added to the file, and they are forwarded to the College early in the fall term.

Each member of the faculty has the right to nominate her/himself directly to the College of Arts and Sciences for promotion. In such cases the Departmental Chair will help the candidate prepare the dossiers for submission to the Dean. Only research and publications produced in rank are considered in promotion to full professor.

#### Faculty Files

The general file of each faculty member, as well as a file of materials bearing on her/his teaching and research, are located in the Chair's office. Although certain materials are added to these files as a matter of course (such as each semester's standard teaching evaluations), the principal responsibility for organizing the file and for providing relevant material on research, professional activities, service, special teaching developments, etc., rests with the faculty member. As a general principle, it is important that the faculty member supply a current Curriculum Vitae by October 1 of each academic year and as much up-to-date information as possible which will document her/his performance in the three main areas evaluated. The right of an employee to inspect his or her personnel file shall not be restricted in any way except for statements of evaluation solicited by the University under an explicit or implicit promise of confidentiality prior to January 1, 1984, or statements of evaluation written under an explicit or implicit promise of confidentiality by Departmental or school administrators or faculty review committees before November 1, 1983. The faculty file can be inspected by the faculty member on request to the Chair.

The attached checklist from the Dean of Faculties should be consulted periodically as one kind of guideline for appropriate file materials. All faculty members are encouraged to supply the following items for their files on a regular basis:

1. Vita, revised annually (models available)
2. Annual Faculty Report
3. Research: publications (two copies); referee evaluations; when available, correspondence indicating acceptance and/or collegial interest; book reviews; important citations or references in the literature; unpublished manuscripts and other evidence of work in progress; etc.

4. Awards, documented
5. Grants, documented (proposals, reviews, award announcement)
6. Inquiries or offers of positions elsewhere, with disposition
7. Activities in professional associations and meetings
8. Counseling and lecture activities
9. Teaching evaluations by students and colleagues

For purposes of review by the Personnel Committee, two files are assembled for use by the Committee and others involved in the process:

The research file contains copies of all publications and any unpublished manuscripts, published reviews of work in print, commentary on unpublished work solicited by publishers or the Departmental Chair, the outside letters of evaluation, evaluations by Departmental colleagues, other evidence of professional recognition (awards, grants, etc.), and any material the candidate believes relevant.

The teaching and service file contains the student evaluation data, both the numerical ratings and a summary of the responses to the open-ended questions on the evaluation form; evaluations from individual students, both present and former; colleagues' evaluations where available; associate instructors' evaluations; evidence of innovative curricular or course developments; syllabi, examinations, and/or other course handouts; and any materials the candidate wants in the file. Also considered are the number of different courses taught; the number of students taught; the number of readings courses offered; number of student committees on which the candidate serves; and participation in the programs of the IMP, Honors Division, or Experimental Curriculum Committee. The professional attainment of former graduate students are also taken into account. The service portion of this file consists of a summary of the candidate's work on Departmental, University, and professional committees and whatever evaluation of her/his performance in such activities may be available.