We propose to replace the text that appears on pp. 10-11 of the Indiana University Bloomington *Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion* with the text that appears below.

Evaluative Categories

A candidate's proficiency in the performance areas of **Research/Creative Activity** and **Service** is rated in accordance with four categories: *Excellent*, *Very Good*, *Satisfactory*, and *Unsatisfactory*. In assessing competence in **Teaching**, the categories are: *Excellent*, *Very Good*, *Effective*, and *Ineffective*.

Tenure, Promotion and Performance Areas

Campus policy offers four paths a candidate may select for tenure and promotion or for promotion to full professor. Candidates may present a case based on excellence in research/creative activity, excellence in teaching, or excellence in service. In exceptional circumstances, the candidate may pursue the fourth path by presenting a case of overall excellence based on a balance of distinguished contributions across all three areas (described below as the "balanced case").

Regardless of the basis of the case, tenure decisions are forward-looking: candidates are expected to provide evidence that they are well on their way to becoming an intellectual (scientific, artistic) leader in their chosen field. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to provide evidence that they have, in fact, achieved a position of intellectual leadership in a field. Granting tenure and/or promotion is a recognition that the faculty member will continue to achieve truly significant professional work in future years – original, innovative, influential, and consequential.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion who opt to demonstrate evidence to support a rating of *Excellent* in one performance area must also provide evidence of a rating of at least *Satisfactory/Effective* in the other two areas of evaluation. Candidates are required to choose a single performance area on which to predicate an application for tenure or promotion (although this decision does not rule out the possibility that performance in one or both of the other areas will also be rated as *Very Good* or *Excellent*). Prior to executive review, the dossier materials (including external letters) should be evaluated on the basis of the case chosen by the candidate.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion who opt for the balanced case must present evidence of balanced strengths in overall performance that is of comparable benefit to the University as excellent performance in a single evaluation area. Such candidates must demonstrate evidence to support a rating of at least *Very Good* in all three performance areas. As in instances where a candidate has selected a single performance area for tenure or promotion purposes, prior to executive review, in balanced cases, dossier materials (including external letters) should be evaluated on this basis.

Once a candidate has selected the type of case upon which tenure and/or promotion will be predicated, the candidate must provide evidence of having met the minimum criteria in each of the three performance areas in accordance with that choice. An effective dossier will provide multiple, independent measures collectively indicating sustained contributions and demonstrating impact of appropriate depth and breadth. Key considerations in each of the performance areas are the quality of each contribution and the quantity of contributions as a whole, as well as the demonstrable benefit of those contributions to the welfare of a candidate's

home unit, the university, the candidate's academic field(s), and communities beyond. Regardless of the basis for promotion, the extension and impact of a candidate's contributions across all three performance areas is expected to increase over the course of a career, such that expectations for promotion to full professor are greater than the forward-looking decision related to the grant of tenure. Likewise, a candidate who wishes to demonstrate achievement that meets the criteria for a particular rating will have also met the criteria for each lower rating in that performance area (i.e., a demonstration of *excellent* requires, by its nature, demonstration of the criteria meeting *very good* and *satisfactory/effective*).

Research or Creative Activity

For tenure, a candidate's **research/creative activity** meets the standard of *excellent* if the faculty member is demonstrably well on the way toward achieving a national and/or international reputation for excellence in research or creative work in the candidate's field, or across fields and disciplines. In addition, a comprehensive plan of future research of high merit should be evident. The candidate should provide evidence of original contributions to the chosen field(s) as well as consistent evidence of achievement and recognition from multiple independent sources of evaluation. Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work or project of considerable importance or a series of smaller studies or projects that collectively make a contribution of equal magnitude. The candidate should provide evidence of a continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works.

For promotion to full professor, a rating of *excellent* on the basis of research/creative activity requires that a candidate has achieved a position of national and/or international leadership and prominence in the field(s), with a documented and robust record of achievement and distinction. Again, quantity of research, scholarship, and creative output is less pertinent than quality and impact, though it is expected that research/creative accomplishments since achieving the rank of associate professor will be exemplary enough in character and breadth to justify promotion at a university of top rank.

A rating of *very good* indicates evidence of high-quality contributions to the field or across fields and disciplines, even if those contributions have not resulted in the same progress toward establishing a national and/or international reputation that is required for a rating of *excellent*. For example, the candidate may have produced a set of high-quality contributions that are not yet numerous enough to support that reputation or that are numerous enough but speak to a narrower disciplinary audience. The candidate should provide multiple sources of evidence of the impact and recognition of this work, although at a somewhat lower expectation than necessary for a rating of excellent. These criteria for a rating of very good in research/creative activity apply to candidates for tenure and promotion as well as cases for promotion to full professor.

A rating of *satisfactory* indicates a candidate's sustained activity over the time in rank, which has led to the creation of scholarly or creative output that is positively evaluated within that candidate's field(s). These criteria for a rating of satisfactory in research/creative activity apply to candidates for tenure and promotion as well as cases for promotion to full professor.

A candidate who does not meet the criteria for a rating of satisfactory in research should receive a rating of unsatisfactory.

Teaching

In cases of consideration for tenure, a candidate's **teaching** meets the standard of *excellent* when the candidate demonstrates excellence in classroom instruction and when the candidate's impact as an instructor and/or scholar of teaching extends beyond the campus. The faculty member should also be demonstrably well on the way toward achieving a national and/or international reputation for broad instructional impact. Indicators of excellence and impact could include direct evidence of exemplary student learning; mentoring and advising that results in high quality achievements by students and advisees; development of instructional/curricular materials that are used or referenced by instructors in the candidate's field; pedagogical publications (e.g., textbooks and/or scholarship of teaching and learning) and presentations; teaching-related participation in national or international conferences; regular participation in workshops in innovative teaching practices; and student and/or peer recognition of excellent pedagogical practices and impact (e.g., peer reviews of teaching, teaching awards, teaching titles, and/or formal evaluations of teaching). While a rating of *excellent* does not require that the candidate demonstrate excellence through each item in the foregoing list, the overall body of evidence must demonstrate outstanding classroom instruction, as well as leadership, innovation, and achievement beyond the campus.

For promotion to full professor based on teaching, a candidate's achievements should entail exceptional pedagogical, curricular, and instructional innovations while in rank as an associate professor. In addition to the indicators of broad instructional impact listed above, indicators of exceptional achievement could also include invitations to serve on panels, or to deliver keynotes or other professional presentations on teaching and pedagogy; and demonstrated ability to direct the studies of advanced graduate and undergraduate students. Moreover, the faculty member seeking promotion to full professor based on excellence in teaching should have a national and/or international reputation as a leader in the practice and study of teaching. For both tenure and promotion to full professor, a rating of *excellent* should be awarded if and only if the candidate has also met the criteria for ratings of both *very good* and *effective*.

For both tenure and promotion to full professor, a rating of *very good* in teaching requires that the candidate demonstrate excellence in classroom instruction and provide evidence of sustained contributions and impact beyond the candidate's classroom, through some or all of the modes of evidence listed above.

To support a rating of *effective* in teaching a candidate must provide evidence of quality instruction in the candidate's own classes and commitment to mentoring students. Such evidence should demonstrate that students benefit from the candidate's instructional style, methods, and feedback, and that the candidate is responsive to student needs and advancement. Effective teaching also requires that candidates make informed, well-reasoned decisions about all aspects of their courses, as well as continually work to better understand and improve them. These criteria for a rating of effective in teaching apply to candidates for tenure and promotion as well as cases for promotion to full professor.

A candidate who does not meet the criteria for a rating of effective in teaching should receive a rating of ineffective.

Service

Service consists of useful contributions to an academic unit, the campus, the university (that are relevant to the broad academic mission of the university), and public, private, professional, and civic organizations and institutions. For tenure, to achieve a rating of *excellent* in service requires a candidate to demonstrate evidence they are well on their way to achieving a position of leadership at the highest levels that is nationally or internationally recognized and makes a material contribution to the advancement of organizational structure, knowledge, or culture. Service to the university, no matter how significant, does not by itself demonstrate excellence. The service must have relevance beyond the university, be sustained and influential, and be demonstrated by objective criteria, such as receiving a significant award, recognition, distinction or holding a senior and/or influential key leadership position. The evaluation of the service should be in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed and its relation to the general welfare of the university or the discipline. Given the limited time in rank prior to a tenure review and the standard of leadership and impact described in this paragraph, a grant of tenure based on a rating of excellent in service is expected to be extraordinarily rare.

Candidates seeking promotion to full professor on the basis of a rating of *excellent* in service must provide evidence of national and/or international visibility and stature resulting from service activities (leadership or significant work on campus can be sufficient only if it is the basis from which the broader national or international impact and stature is gained). Such distinguished contributions could be administrative and institutional in nature, or demonstrated through superlative work in a (inter)disciplinary endeavor, governmental organization, or some other entity or cause with national and/or international reach and relevance. For both tenure and promotion to full professor, a rating of *excellent* will be awarded if and only if the candidate has also met the criteria for ratings of both *very good* and *satisfactory*.

For both tenure and promotion to full professor, *very good* service may be demonstrated through sustained leadership roles that have a positive impact on the university or the discipline. Demonstrating very good service requires a showing of accomplishments in more than one service context and should involve impact beyond the candidate's home unit.

Satisfactory service is achieved if a candidate's activities meet the general expectation that all faculty perform meaningful service continuously throughout their careers, including during the tenure-probationary period. That is, a candidate for tenure or promotion must achieve individual research and teaching goals while also contributing equitably within the candidate's unit and, as appropriate, the discipline. Demonstrating satisfactory service requires evidence that a candidate has made a positive and meaningful contribution to the service activities undertaken. For promotion to full professor, satisfactory service also entails having expanded one's contribution to the effective operations of one's unit, one's school, the university and the discipline over time.

A candidate who does not meet the criteria for a rating of satisfactory in service should receive a rating of unsatisfactory.