Faculty Organization Meeting
April 16, 2021
1-3 pm
Online via Zoom
Minutes

1. Called to order at 1:00 pm.

2. Approval of Minutes: March 19, 2021 – approved without amendment.

3. New Business

    a. Ways to Raise New Business (Mark Baer): There are three ways to raise new business items: the suggestion box on the Faculty Organization website, by contacting an Executive Committee Representative, and by turning on your camera and speaking up now.
    b. Harold Olivey: A friend is writing a new novel dealing with race and economics and is looking for scholars to read an advanced copy and write a blurb. Please contact Harold if you are interested.
    c. Doug Swartz: The Writing Across the Curriculum Committee has completed a draft of outcomes for Intensive Writing classes. We will be hosting a series of conversations about what Intensive Writing is and encouraging others to develop new Intensive Writing classes. Look for announcements in the summer and fall.
    d. Zoran Kilibarda: I attended sessions on sexual harassment training for supervisors but did not receive a certificate or any proof that I attended it. Can someone tell me why? Vicki: Carolyn is our liaison but this was an IU thing. I know they keep records. Let me see if there is some kind of recognition we can receive so we can say we did it already in case they make a mistake next year and ask us to do it again.
    e. Vesna Balac: What is the correct date for the auto-withdrawal? Is it April 25th? Beth: I think I heard Peter say it was May 2nd. Mark: Yes, it should be the final day of classes so that is May 2nd.
    f. Marshelia Harris: The Child Abuse and Neglect Forum started last Friday. Thanks to the IUN team. We have had some phenomenal speakers so far and we have been receiving some really great compliments.
    g. Vicki Roman-Lagunas: Shout out to Surekha Rao for her very hard work organizing an excellent conference for the Beyond Boundaries Symposium. Excellent work, we are so glad you represented us so well.

4. Promotion and Tenure – Chancellor Iwama

    a. I take special pleasure in announcing the recent promotion of faculty approved by the Board of Trustees last week: Kate Gustafson in the Department of English,

Sharon Pratt in the School of Education, Maureen Rutherford in the Department of Psychology, and Ian Taschner in the Department of Chemistry all were promoted to associate professor with tenure. Jon Becker and Stela Pudar-Hozo in the Department of Math were promoted to Teaching Professor. Congratulations!

5. President's Report – Mark Baer

    a. We rose to the occasion over this past year. Faculty partnerships with other areas of the university have borne fruit and you are leading and contributing to every aspect of campus governance. Somehow, against all odds, the challenges of 2020 seem to have brought out the best in us. I know it has been difficult and many, if not all of us, have paid a toll. We are all exhausted from a breakless semester. But today's packed agenda is reflective of the amazing collaboration between faculty and administration that has moved us forward and will see us through this crisis. Thank you for your work. I am optimistic that the next year will see successes for our school.
    b. I am happy to recognize some colleagues who have won awards. The 2020 Trustees Teaching Award goes to Alex Wang (Math), Anja Matwijkiw (Philosophy), Margaret Pollak (Anthropology), Frances Daniel (Psychology), Natasha Brown (Communication), Olatunde Abiona (CIS), EJ Kim (Education), Alicia Wright (Communication), and Melynie Durham (Radiological Sciences). The 2020/2021 Distinguished Research Award goes to Jack Bloom. The 2019/2020 Advising Award went to Maureen Rutherford. The 2020/2021 Advising Award goes to Sherry VerWey. The 2019/2020 Founder's Day Teaching Award went to Marie Eisenstein. The 2019/2020 Distinguished Research Award went to Tin-Chun Lin.
    c. Executive Committee Acknowledgement: Thank you to the members of the Executive Committee who will be stepping down after this year: Bill Allegrezza, Iztok Hozo, Surekha Rao, Vesna Balac, Linda Galocy, Jenny Fisher, and Monica Solinas-Saunders. Thank you for your hard work and support.
    d. Election Results: The results of our recent Faculty Organization election are: Crystal Shannon (Vice President), David Parnell (Secretary), Jon Becker (At Large), Maureen Rutherford (At Large), Carol Rozelle (UFC Rep), Harold Olivey (UFC Rep), Axel Schulze-Halberg (Tenure Rep), Nicole Anslover (Tenure Rep), Tin-Chun Lin (Graduate Faculty Council). Congratulations!
    e. UFC Technology Policy Committee: Many technology decisions used to be made here on our campus by our own IT department and technology committee. But more and more of those decisions are now being made downstate. Therefore, the UFC plans to create a UFC Technology Committee. Going forward I will ask the chair of our campus technology committee to be our representative to the UFC Technology Committee.
    f. UFC FAR Diversity Recommendations: The UFC is making a series of recommendations about the way our Faculty Annual Report (FAR) should

represent diversity. If you are interested in knowing more details about this, our current UFC representatives are Monica Solinas-Saunders and Harold Olivey, so please connect with them.

6. UFC Report – Monica Solinas-Saunders and Harold Olivey

    a. Report: The last UFC meeting was March 23rd. The Climate Action Plan Taskforce was introduced. There was also a discussion about the post-COVID regional campus. There was an important article shared titled "Regional Public Universities Don't Need Saving."
    b. There was discussion about a policy approved in the state House of Indiana which would allow licensed gun owners to carry guns on college campuses. It has not been approved by the Senate. But if it is, then IU cannot have its own rule banning guns on campus. Faculty Question: Will instructors have an ability to ban guns in their classroom? Monica: I do not believe instructors will have the ability to do that since the law refers to campus grounds overall. Faculty Comment: Faculty will not feel safe on campus. Monica: I think we should have a voice on this and perhaps a petition. I personally invite everyone to speak to the media about this. Chancellor: I am going to give a call to IU government relations after this meeting and inquire about the status of this proposal. Faculty Comment: It appears that this bill was defeated in 2015.
    c. The UFC is considering an amendment to undergraduate intercampus transfer rules. There is also an amendment to the rule on leave for academic appointees, that during family support leave the tenure clock stops automatically. The UFC is considering a change to the consolidated grading policy that would make invisible old grades of classes that are retaken for a better grade and that changes the language on courses taken for pass/fail. There was also a discussion on whether the A+ should remain 4.0 or should change to 4.3. There was also discussion over whether there should be a unified grade submission deadline. Faculty Question: Will departments have discretion on allowing classes to be retaken multiple times? Mark: It's explicit in the policy that departments do not have discretion, is that correct? Harold: I believe so. Right now the limit on extended X is three, but the proposed policy does not allow individual units to restrain things more. Please contact me if you want me to pass on feedback to the UFC.
    d. Policy on Consensual Relationships (AC-33): See Attachment #1. Current policy bans "amorous or sexual" relationships between faculty members and students in their class, and encourages faculty members to avoid relationships with students outside their classes. The proposed policy eliminates this distinction, and makes it a violation of the Code of Academic Ethics for faculty members to engage in such relationships with students and requires that faculty-student relationships be disclosed. The policy includes disclosure procedures – the faculty member must disclose.

7. Campus P&T Guidelines – Tia Walker, Faculty Affairs Super Committee

    a. See Attachment #2. This is a revision to the P&T Guidelines in response to feedback from discussion in February. We separated out information about promotion for senior lecture and teaching professor, and added information to the appendix on guidelines for writing recommendation letters. One of the concerns was who could serve on the review committee for Teaching Professors. We have added that only Full Professors can vote on Teaching Professor cases. Non-tenure track faculty can participate in reviews of other non-tenure track faculty in their department. We clarified that external review letters should be from individuals at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying. We provided a template letter for soliciting external reviewers for non-tenure track faculty. We provided some guidance about what direct evidence of student learning means for Teaching Professors. We changed the number of review letters for non-tenure track faculty to six. Faculty Question: When did service to teaching become its own path? Tia: Candidates can be excellent in teaching or service in support of teaching, but they also have to adequacy for service. Mark: The Teaching Professor allowed two paths to excellence: either teaching or service in support of teaching. That's new last year with these criteria. Faculty Question: So that letter template is for Teaching Professor, not all non-tenure track? Tia: That is correct. We were tasked with revising Teaching Professor guidelines. Vicki: This committee that worked on this did such an extraordinary job. I am grateful. This will help a whole lot in the next round. Thank you so very much.
    b. Mark: This item comes moved and seconded from the Executive Committee. The Faculty Organization voted 61-0-11 to accept this revision to the P&T Guidelines.

8. P&T Committee Procedures – Ranjan Kini, Faculty Affairs Super Committee

    a. See Attachment #3. This committee drafted a document that describes the procedures already in place for P&T processes. This documents the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved in this process. It starts with the Chair of the unit, then the Dean of the unit, then the committee members, then the chair of the P&T committee. The reasoning for this is there was a tradition that was followed on the procedures, but not everyone knew the tradition or procedure. We wanted to document what exactly is happening at each level. Next time anybody is part of any committee or chairs any committee, they will know what process to follow. We wanted to clarify the process and explain each role. Faculty Comment: When we were talking about the Teaching Professor, we made an important distinction that there are three levels for lecturer now. We need to clarify what the relevant ranks of each role is. Ranjan: Yes, that will be an important task for the overall revision of the goldenrod next year. Mark: One might ask why this is important to do right now. Vicki, can you speak to that? Vicki: Thank you to the committee for this extraordinary work. It is important to be able to point to a document and say

"this is how we do it." For this year, this is going to help us. We want everybody to have a really good picture of the process as it should happen throughout our entire campus. These two pieces are a great example of shared governance. We have had good conversations and the committees came up with great ideas. Mark: Can Teaching Professor or Full Clinical Professors serve on promotion committees for Full Professors? Ranjan: No, only tenure-track faculty can serve on tenure-track promotion and tenure committees. Mark: I want to encourage you all that our choice here is whether to clarify this process now, and make changes next year, or to have no clarification now, and do this all again next year. I encourage you to approve this so that our colleagues who begin the new tenure process this May will have something to look at.

b. Mark: This item is an addendum to the P&T Guidelines and comes moved and seconded from the Executive Committee. The Faculty Organization voted 57-1-15 to approve this addendum.

9. A motion was put forwarded and seconded to extend the meeting by 30 minutes. The meeting was extended.

10. Financial Crisis Policy – Subir Bandyopadhyay, Student and Campus Affairs Super Committee

    a. See Attachment #4. Mark: This policy is not referring to any current crisis on this campus or any other IU campus, but starting last year we realized there was no financial crisis policy to govern it should it occur. This was a chance to envision the faculty role in any potential financial crisis. Subir: Our committee came up with a draft of a financial exigency policy, but there is a difference. Financial exigency is for firing tenured faculty. Financial crisis is for eliminating or downsizing a unit and eliminating non-tenured employees, but not tenured faculty. Financial crisis on a campus can be declared for one year. A financial crisis committee will be formed with wide faculty representation. The Chancellor shall review recommendations from this committee before making a decision. This is shared governance. A university lawyer has reviewed this policy. Chancellor: I think this is largely in line with every other campus that is dealing with this issue. I would do this anyway, but it doesn't hurt to reassure everyone that decision making will be done in the name of the shared governance. Hopefully this is the last time we will ever have to look at this document. Faculty Question: So this committee does not have any control over the decision, it is just a recommendation committee and the final decision belongs to the Chancellor? Mark: That is correct. This gives the faculty a voice in the process. Faculty Question: Does the committee have any way to defend or protect themselves from any retaliation that may take place? Vicki: I think that is a separate process. Faculty Comment: The document does say tenured faculty. Mark: It is not possible for a campus to eliminate a tenured faculty member for financial reasons

without triggering an IU-wide financial exigency. Faculty Question: What about assistant professors who are tenure-track but not tenured yet? Vicki: Tenured faculty own their positions and that's why eliminating them has to require financial exigency. I am not sure that not-yet-tenured are protected in the same way that tenured faculty are. I don't know if it was considered in this document. Mark: I don't know the answer to that. Faculty Comment: I do not think that tenure-track faculty are protected in the same way that tenured faculty are. Where do tenured faculty have tenure? Department, college, or campus? Mark: It is on the campus. Faculty Question: Does that mean if a department is eliminated that tenured faculty in that department still have tenure? Mark: The university has to make reasonable attempts to place a tenured faculty member elsewhere. Faculty Question: Are tenure-track faculty then covered by the financial crisis policy? Mark: The policy covers all long-term contract faculty, which would include tenure-track assistant professors.

b. Mark: This policy comes moved and seconded from the Executive Committee. The Faculty Organization voted 58-1-10 to approve this policy.

11. Campus Wide Survey Policy – Kevin McElmurry, Student and Campus Affairs Super Committee

    a. See Attachment #5. Kevin: We are all familiar with the concept of survey fatigue. This policy comes out of a conversation between the office of university research and Academic Affairs. This is a policy that offers some process and a little bit of protection against the challenges of having too many and overlapping surveys. This is a way of making sure our community members are not being asked to respond to too many surveys. This would apply to surveys that cover a significant portion of the campus community. It would not apply to instructors surveying their own classes, point of service surveys, or department-level surveys. Faculty Question: If I get IRB approval to survey the Business School students, do I need to go through this committee? Kevin: This isn't an approval body in the sense that IRB is, it is intended to provide centralized coordination. Faculty Question: Same procedure if it is the Business School or the whole campus? Kevin: Yes, it would be the same procedure, less about approval than about coordination. Faculty Question: What does unit apply to? Mark: Unit means college/school. Faculty Question: Is the FAQ about 10% of campus community in contradiction to this? Schools are sometimes larger than 10%. Mark: In spirit, the policy is not meant to prevent people from surveying their own students. Right now we are vulnerable to outside bodies surveying our students without our consent. Faculty Comment: I think this is an important policy. Faculty Comment: I agree with this policy. Kevin: This policy offers clarity on surveying our campus and coordination on how those surveys will be done. Faculty Question: Does this include outside entities contacting me to ask me to survey my students? Kevin: Yes, the external person would have to work with this committee. Faculty Question: I still do not

understand the difference between college and program. Kevin: The delineator is the 10% mark. Faculty Question: This does not apply to programs surveying their own students, correct? Kevin: That's correct. Vicki: This is going to help us but it is not going to fully solve the problem.

b. Mark: This policy comes moved and seconded from the Executive Committee. The Faculty Organization voted 56-0-11 to approve this policy.

12. Extension of Super-Committee Trial – Mark Baer

a. See Attachment #6. We are under a trial run of the Super Committee structure. Last year, I proposed grouping the 27 Faculty Organization Committees into three areas: Faculty, Academic, and Student/Campus Affairs. I am proposing we continue to iterate on the structure by splitting Student and Campus Affairs into two separate super committees. Diversity and Inclusion will have only one chair. Some committees will have standing proportional representation, and some committees will have standing normal representation. The remaining standing committees will only have chairs at first, and be staffed if business comes up. The Constitutional Review Committee will also be asked to draft a constitutional amendment that would enshrine the super committee structure. Faculty Comment: I think the amount of work that has been accomplished shows that this structure is working, so for that reason I would vote to continue it. Faculty Comment: I think you should be allowed to experiment and tweak things to make sure things are appropriately staffed. I was really dubious about this whole structure and I think it has worked out quite beautifully. Mark: There have been some moments of confusion this year, and I have to thank all the co-chairs: Alex and Diana, Ranjan and Tia, and Kevin and Subir. They have been wonderful colleagues.
b. The resolution was motioned and seconded. The Faculty Organization voted 55-1-6 to approve this resolution.

13. Chancellor's Report – Ken Iwama

a. This could have been a very bad year, and it was for some of us, and probably for all of us, but when I look back at this time period I am not going to remember the bad I am going to remember the inspiration that came out of this year, and that I owe all of you. Thank you for all that you have done. This is an incredible institution and I couldn't be happier to be here with you.
b. I want to acknowledge what is happening in our community and world, with mass shootings and other deaths, and encourage us that we are uniquely positioned to do great things together.
c. Pamela Whitten was announced today as our new IU President as of July 1. She comes from Kennesaw State. She is the first female IU President. She is extremely qualified.

d. Lauren Robel at IU Bloomington retired and John Applegate is moving to take up her position. This will result in IU Kokomo Chancellor Sue Sciame-Giesecke becoming Vice Chancellor for regional campuses. I am hoping that when the dust clears the energy that all these appointments bring will be good for IU and IU Northwest.
e. Last week I had the pleasure of reporting to the Trustees of IU about our campus. I bragged about the students, faculty and staff at IU Northwest. I regret that some of you might have missed the presentation because of a time change. We have sent out an email during this meeting with a recording of the presentation.
f. Commencement: May 13th at 10AM in the Savannah parking lot. Faculty participation will be represented from each unit.
g. A motion to extend the meeting by five more minutes was seconded and passed.
h. We hosted the FEMA region 5 meeting to discuss local government concerns about equity in access to vaccines. We also had some discussions about further collaborative roles of us and our students helping.
i. IU Day is coming April 21st.

14. EVCAA's Report – Vicki Roman-Lagunas

a. This item to be conducted via email due to a shortage of time.

15. Facilities Committee Update – Erin Argyilan

a. We are looking for people to participate in the Environmental Research Workshop.
b. We are doing a tree planting on IU Day from 9AM-12PM. Please register if you would like to help.

16. Old Business/Announcements

a. The next meeting is September 17th.

17. The meeting was adjourned at 3:33 pm.

Attachment 1:

UFC Policy on Consensual Relationships (ACA 33)

(See the following pages)

Report on Recommendations to Revise Policy on Consensual Relationships ACA 33

Spring 2021

UFC Taskforce

Selene Carter, (Associate Professor, IUB, Chair), Dakota Coates, (J.D. Candidate, GPSG President, IUB), Daniela Moloci (Undergraduate Student, IUSG, IUB), Jane McLeod, (Professor, IUB) Marc Mendonca, (Professor, IU School of Medicine), Chris Proctor, (MLS, IU Southeast), Peggy Stockdale, (Professor, IUPUI)

CURRENT POLICY

The current IU policy regarding consensual relationships, as laid out in the Code of Academic Ethics (ACA-33), reads as follows:

1. Relationships in the Instructional Context. A faculty member shall not have an amorous or sexual relationship, consensual or otherwise, with a student who is enrolled in a course being taught by the faculty member or whose performance is being supervised or evaluated by the faculty member.
2. Relationships outside the Instructional Context. A faculty member should be careful to distance himself or herself from any decisions that may reward or penalize a student with whom he or she has or has had an amorous or sexual relationship, even outside the instructional context, especially when the faculty member and student are in the same academic unit or in units that are allied academically.

TASK FORCE CHARGE

The Task Force charge was to:

1. Develop revised policy language for ACA-33, the Code of Academic Ethics.
2. Make a recommendation to the University Faculty Council Policy Committee about how to potentially integrate all members of the university (students, faculty, staff, administration) into a) the revisions proposed to ACA-33 OR b) a new standing policy that exists separately from and in addition to ACA-33.

TASK FORCE PROCESS

To inform our recommendations, members of the Task Force reviewed relevant policies from other Big Ten Alliance institutions. We also conducted a survey of faculty, students, and staff at IU campuses. The specific groups invited to the survey varied by campus based, in large part, on campus-level differences in access to listservs.

The survey included the following questions:

- Should there be an outright ban on all faculty-student relationships or a rigorous reporting process?

- Should the ban include relationships involving faculty members with other faculty, administrators, and staff members where there is an opportunity for the faculty member to exercise power over the other party (e.g., tenured faculty member and untenured faculty member; faculty member and staff member in the same unit)?
- Should there be exceptions to an outright ban, and if so, what should those be?
- If there is a reporting process to disclose such a relationship, what should the chain of reporting be?
- Should the policy distinguish undergraduate and graduate students?

Survey results (see appendix) revealed broad preferences for a rigorous reporting process over an outright ban, as well as a preference for incorporating specific exceptions to the ban.

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO THE CODE OF ACADEMIC ETHICS

Our recommended revisions to the Code appear below in *italics* and removal of current language is shown by a ~~strikethrough~~. Per the current Code UA-33(A)(1), the terms "faculty" and "faculty member" refer to all those who teach and/or do research at the University, including (but not limited to) tenured and tenure-track faculty, librarians, research faculty, lecturers, and clinical faculty at all ranks, graduate students with teaching responsibilities, visiting and part-time faculty, and other instructional personnel including coaches, advisors, and counselors.

Faculty members exercise power over students, whether in giving them praise or criticism, evaluating them, making recommendations for their further studies or their future employment, or conferring any other benefits on them. All amorous, *sexual, or inappropriately intimate*[1] relationships between faculty members and students are unacceptable when the faculty member has any professional responsibility for the student *unless properly disclosed and managed.* Such situations increase the chances that the faculty member *could* ~~will~~ abuse *their* his~~ or her~~ power and ~~sexually~~ exploit the student. ~~Voluntary consent by the student in such a relationship is suspect, given the fundamental asymmetric nature of the relationship.~~ *As a result of the power imbalance, the faculty may explicitly or implicitly make receiving benefits contingent on intimate, amorous, or sexual favors. (See quid pro quo sexual harassment in the Sexual Misconduct Policy, UA-03, definition of sexual harassment.)* Moreover, other ~~students and faculty~~ *people* may be affected by such ~~unprofessional behavior~~ *relationships* because ~~it places~~ *they place* the faculty member in a position to favor or advance one student's interest at the expense of others.~~and implicitly makes obtaining benefits contingent on amorous or sexual favors~~. *At a minimum, faculty-student relationships can raise questions about potential favoritism*, *which may disadvantage the student*.

Therefore, *unless properly disclosed and managed,* the University will view it as a violation of this Code of Academic Ethics if faculty members, engage in amorous*, sexual, or inappropriately intimate relations* with students for whom they have professional responsibility, ~~as defined in number 1 or 2 below~~ *including but not limited to supervisory, evaluative, or advisory*

[1]Recognizing that some relationships may be intimate, such as a mentoring relationship, without being sexual or amorous. An inappropriately intimate relationship is one that is sexual, amorous, or in other ways potentially exploitative of the student.

relationships, even when both parties have consented or appear to have consented to the relationship. ~~Such professional responsibility encompasses both~~ *The violation applies whether such supervisory, evaluative, and advisory relationships occur in instructional or non-instructional contexts.*

1. ~~Relationships in the Instructional Context. A faculty member shall not have an amorous or sexual relationship, consensual or otherwise, with a student who is enrolled in a course being taught by the faculty member or whose performance is being supervised or evaluated by the faculty member.~~
2. ~~Relationships outside the Instructional Context. A faculty member should be careful to distance himself or herself from any decisions that may reward or penalize a student with whom he or she has or has had an amorous or sexual relationship, even outside the instructional context, especially when the faculty member and student are in the same academic unit or in units that are allied academically.~~

All faculty-student relationships of an amorous, sexual, or intimate nature must be disclosed according to the procedures outlined below. Failure to disclose an amorous, sexual, or inappropriately intimate relationship(s) and/or to comply with the management plan shall be considered a violation of this policy.

The presumption of this policy is that all relationships covered by this policy require disclosure to the respective designee by the faculty member. If there is doubt about the potential need for disclosure, the faculty should presume that there is an obligation to disclose. If a faculty member becomes aware that an amorous, sexual, or inappropriately intimate relationship has occurred there is an obligation to disclose. If a faculty member becomes aware that an individual with whom they had an amorous, sexual, or inappropriately intimate relationship is a student, the faculty member should disclose that information even if the relationship is no longer on-going.

REQUIRED DISCLOSURE PROCEDURES

- *Faculty-student relationships must be disclosed to the faculty member's unit head(s) (e.g., department chair, dean, dean's designee). The responsibility to disclose rests with the faculty member. The faculty member must have this disclosure in written form placed in their personnel files. If the relationship involves the department chair or unit head, the relationship must be disclosed to the next higher-level administrator, typically a dean or associate dean.*
- *The person to whom the disclosure is made is responsible for developing a specific plan that resolves the conflict and potential for abuse of power and must maintain confidentiality to the fullest extent possible. At a minimum, the faculty member must recuse themselves from all future evaluative actions involving the student.*

A faculty member shall be considered in violation of the university's discrimination, harassment, and sexual misconduct policy (UA-03) if the relationship is not properly disclosed or the management plan is not properly followed.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Task Force considered incorporating variation in the policy for undergraduate and graduate students but decided against doing so. The age ranges and prior life experiences of undergraduate and graduate students differ significantly across IU campuses, blurring the distinctions between those groups. Management plans may still need to consider that relationships with younger students may be more suspect and thus should be subject to more scrutiny.

The Task Force does not recommend addressing faculty-faculty, faculty-staff, or staff-student relationships in the Code of Academic Ethics. There are existing policies regarding nepotism management, sexual misconduct, and (what on the HR side) address amorous, sexual, and intimate relationships among these members of the IU community.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force recommends that these revised sections of the Code of Academic Ethics be highlighted in all Sexual Misconduct & Title IX trainings and information for both faculty and students. Effort should be made to widely communicate this policy to students, staff, faculty, and any IU employees.

The Task Force recommends a policy, like the Sexual Misconduct Policy, that applies across all constituent groups (faculty, staff, students).

Attachment 2:

Proposed Revision of Campus P&T Guidelines

(See the following pages)

Indiana University Northwest

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Approved by the IUN Faculty Organization on April 15, 2011, April 10, 2020

FACULTY ORGANIZATION (2010-11)

Charles P. Gallmeier, President

Faculty Affairs Committee

Alan Barr, College of Arts and Sciences, Chair
George Bodmer, College of Arts and Sciences
Frank Caucci, College of Health and Human Services
Janice A. Grskovic, School of Education
Lou Ann Karabel, College of Arts and Sciences
Ranjan B. Kini, School of Business and Economics
Michael S. LaPointe, College of Arts and Sciences
Barbara J. Peat, College of Health and Human Services

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATION

William J. Lowe, Chancellor

David J. Malik, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Cynthia D. O'Dell, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor

Cover photo: Students at IUN Commencement at the Genesis Center, Gary

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR *PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*

Introduction

Promotion and tenure decisions are among the most important decisions that a university makes, determining the quality and character of the faculty and of the institution itself. It is essential that the process be as equitable, clear, and objective as possible. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure should be counseled from the time of arrival about the process and mentored through it. A perusal of this document and of their unit's more specific promotion and tenure guidelines should provide guidance and assistance for preparing dossiers and indicate the types of documentation that will be helpful. In addition, the Office of Academic Affairs can provide information on the process, timelines, and procedures for the promotion and tenure process**.** The Indiana University *Academic Handbook* also describes some aspects of the procedure, and, should they become necessary, faculty rights and responsibilities in any request for reconsideration.

Terms

The *unit committee* is ordinarily the school or college promotion and tenure committee. For those schools or colleges with departments, the department committee is the *primary committee*. In colleges containing schools or divisions, the school or division promotion and tenure committee is the *primary committee*. Chair shall here refer to the candidate's immediate administrative supervisor, whether chair, dean, or director.

Review Process and Dossier

The *Indiana University Northwest Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* indicate various kinds of supporting evidence and their relative merits. They also assist a candidate in preparing and organizing the dossier. While guidelines can indicate expectations and provide assistance in organizing a dossier, the importance of actively seeking advice from senior faculty in the creation, selection, and organization of dossier contents cannot be overstressed. Candidates are urged to seek input, formally and informally, from colleagues both within and beyond their units. In general, each candidate should contribute demonstrably to the University's mission, through teaching, research and creative activities, and service. It is the candidate's responsibility, with the assistance and advice of his or her academic unit, to understand the process and the standards of performance expected. Each dossier should reflect an appreciation of these standards and present a clear and concise argument of achievement, with supporting evidence. It should also identify whether teaching, research and creative activities, or service is the declared area of excellence**.**

The promotion and tenure process is a dynamic one, involving recommendations from a variety of faculty groups and administrators. It is difficult to generalize how assessments of such factors as significance or impact or substance collectively contribute to an overall recommendation. Candidates are well advised to make optimal use of routine evaluations of feedback and of pertinent experiences and to seek the counsel of peers on the most effective strategies in developing a strong case toward promotion and tenure. Clearly, it is best when the accumulated accomplishments present a compelling case. Dossiers with ambiguities or that invite a "close" decision are most vulnerable to the vagaries of a process that cannot be described with exactness.

According to the IU *Academic Handbook*, "the dossier is constructed in consultation with the candidate," usually with a chair assisting to ensure that guidelines are followed. The reviews and recommendations added at each

level are the responsibility of the relevant administrator or committee chair.

Peer Review Process

The University has a unique peer evaluation process to judge a candidate's academic record and achievement. Dossiers will be evaluated by a series of committees and administrators, and it should be clear to each successive level of review what the expectations, limitations, and special opportunities are that pertain to each candidate's discipline for achieving success. Each recommendation should not simply be for or against tenure or promotion, but should make clear its rationale; it should convey an awareness of the expectations and criteria, and its conclusion should be based on the evidence. The candidate will be provided with a copy of the recommendations made at each level—whether positive or negative.

Demonstration of Excellence

The candidate and all reviewers should be provided with the unit, department, or division criteria for tenure and promotion. Because these vary in specifics among academic units, it is important that the reviews closest to the candidate's discipline make clear the reasons for their recommendations—based on their expectations and criteria. The dossier should convincingly substantiate a case in accordance both with the criteria in the Indiana University *Academic Handbook* and with any approved unit promotion and tenure guidelines.

These *Guidelines* address in general the different levels of advancement. While no specific distinctions are made between being promoted to associate professor, to professor, or to senior lecturer, higher levels of promotion will expect greater demonstrated achievement—in merit and in impact. While the candidate's entire record is reviewed, any promotion will be based primarily on contributions made in rank (since the candidate's previous promotion or hire). **The paramount requirement is simply to demonstrate excellence in one area and a satisfactory record in the others**, as shown by progress since the last promotion.

However, what indicates excellence—for example, in research for a person seeking promotion to associate professor—is quantitatively and qualitatively different from what is expected of a person seeking promotion to professor. "Excellence" in research for the higher rank implies having an established, ongoing, nationally recognized body of scholarship; there should be clear evidence of substantial contributions, typically reflected in publications in high-quality, national-level peer-reviewed journals. There should be clear evidence of substantial contributions (as described later in this document). Parallel evidences apply to teaching and service for demonstrating an "excellent" or "satisfactory" level of achievement in the three areas. These *Guidelines* give examples (in *Suggested Documentation*) of different contributions and suggest their weight for establishing excellence. Each academic unit, in its own guidelines, should indicate what it expects for advancement at each level.

Balanced Cases

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 recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments, and a successful balanced case, like more customary dossiers, must indicate this.

Librarians

In its discussion of tenure and promotion, the *Academic Handbook* includes librarians along with faculty: "Full-time librarians are appointed in ranks analogous to and modeled on faculty ranks." The Indiana University Libraries *Library Faculty Handbook* describes the criteria (which differ from teaching faculty criteria), dossier preparation guidelines, and other P&T information pertinent to librarians. In the specific routing of dossiers for librarians, after being evaluated by the Library P&T Committee and the Director of Library Services, they will be reviewed by the IU Librarians' Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Ruth Lilly Dean of University Libraries, and then returned to IU Northwest's campus P&T Committee.

Negative Recommendations

The IU *Academic Handbook* stipulates: "The faculty member or librarian who believes that a recommendation or decision that he or she not be reappointed has resulted from inadequate consideration of professional competence or erroneous information may offer corrections and request reconsideration at the level at which the decision not to recommend reappointment was first made." On this campus, a candidate will be allowed to request two reconsiderations of negative reviews, one at the first level of the negative recommendation. The relevant committees or administrators will evaluate whether to reconsider its recommendation. If reconsideration is declined, the original recommendation stands. If reconsideration occurs, both the initial review and recommendation, the reconsideration documentation and the revised recommendation will be included in the eDossier by the appropriate committee or the administrator in their specific designated section of the eDossier. Although the *Academic Handbook* only stipulates that reconsideration is available for probationary faculty, at IU Northwest it will be available for all candidates for promotion or tenure. Candidates, then, will have the opportunity to request up to two reconsiderations, one at the first level of a negative recommendation and one additional reconsideration request for a subsequent negative recommendation.

Composition of Promotion and Tenure Committees

Every promotion and tenure committee, to the extent feasible, should be comprised of at least three senior faculty. If sufficient faculty members are not available, consultation between the dean and chair (or existing senior faculty) can add tenured faculty from another department or unit to the Committee. It must be stressed that no untenured faculty may participate at any level of the process**,** with the exception of non-tenure track who may participate in departmental reviews of other non-tenure track faculty**.** No faculty member may participate or vote in more than one level of the promotion and tenure process for any candidate. Every member of a promotion and tenure committee who is at or above the rank is expected to participate in every meeting and in all votes. Beyond the department level, only full professors can vote on the teaching professor rank. Faculty will only be able to vote if they have participated in the discussion, deliberations, and review of the candidate; absentee or proxy votes are not allowed.

Note: Each employment category has 3 ranks or tiers and are considered analogous across the categories.

Unit and Department Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Department, division, and unit guidelines for promotion and tenure must be vetted and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. This vetting process ensures that adequate compliance with University-wide expectations is met in the context of the *Academic Handbook*

and with the prevailing expectations of the IU Northwest *Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*.

Third Year Review

In the Spring Semester of the third year of a probationary faculty member's appointment, the candidate prepares a file for review. In this third-year file, he or she will assemble narratives on accomplishments in teaching, research or creative activities, and service to establish a pattern of developing scholarship and achievements. The purpose of this review step is to encourage an organization and structure that helps the candidate better understand the challenges of effective documentation and to provide input from the unit and department on his or her progress. Feedback should address weaknesses and recognize strengths in the candidate's performance.

eDossier Components

eDossier

The eDossier must contain:

- All reviews and recommendations (internal and external)
- Brief professional biographies of external reviewers
- Candidate narratives of teaching, research and creative activities, and service
- Candidate's curriculum vitae
- Approved department or unit promotion and tenure Guidelines.
- Copies of publications
- Proposals for external funding
- Other relevant supporting documentation of teaching
- Other relevant supporting documentation of service
- relevant supporting Other documentation of research

The Table of Contents of essential material in this principal dossier follows in these Guidelines.
Recommendations from primary and/or unit levels should reflect consideration of the evidence cited in the eDossier and serve as an assessment of the merits of contributions.

Responsibility for Dossier Preparation

Both the chair and the candidate have responsibilities in preparing the dossier: the chair to assist in assembling it, to advise as necessary, and to ensure that guidelines are followed; the candidate to provide its contents. The administrator may assist the candidate with suggestions on the content and its organization. These Guidelines outline a schedule indicating when to assemble supporting evidence and when the dossier is due. They suggest the type of evidence that can indicate accomplishment in the three areas and include the process by which faculty, both within and outside the candidate's discipline, can evaluate his or her record. The Chair and the candidate should be attentive to the particular guidelines of their unit. The Chair or the School's Dean will be the checklist signoff person once the e-Dossier is submitted by the candidate.

eDossier Preparation

Candidates for promotion and tenure should be advised concerning the upcoming reviews and consult the Academic Calendar for Promotion and Tenure in the Appendix. Candidates will need to supply the information that will be important to this evaluation process in the Spring Semester preceding the year of review for tenure and/or promotion. In order to have the necessary documentation, all units should begin to accumulate information about the candidate's teaching, research and creative activities, and service contributions as soon as the candidate becomes a faculty member.

The chair should routinely gather the

information that will be appropriate for a tenure dossier. The compilers of a dossier should keep in mind that the objective evidence in the dossier should confirm the case for promotion or tenure. It is not sufficient for evaluators simply to state that the candidate is excellent, satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each area; they should elaborate how well they feel the candidate has made his or her case. Normally, the dossier should contain information that convincingly, objectively supports the contention that the candidate is excellent in one area and at least satisfactory in the others. All relevant evidence, both positive and negative, must be included in the dossier. A chair may not exclude material because of negative content. Review committees should be able to assume there is no pertinent evidence for or against the candidate beyond the documents in the dossier.

Candidates are responsible for presenting in an organized and effective way the evidence in their part of the dossier, the chairs likewise in their part. Candidates and all committees reviewing cases should be provided with the approved department or division criteria for promotion and tenure. Since these vary in some particulars from one academic unit to another, it is important that the reviewing committee know clearly the grounds upon which the case is being made and judged. The dossier should contain evidence for substantiating a case based on criteria in the Indiana University *Academic Handbook* and in any specific division and/or department promotion and tenure guidelines. Only evidence achieved within rank should be used to support a candidate's case for promotion.

Responsibilities of the Chair, Dean, or Director

The chair, dean or director is responsible for:

1. Notifying the faculty member of the due dates for the eDossier.
2. Providing clerical assistance and reproduction facilities.
3. Ascertaining that the faculty member has copies of the current *Academic Handbook* and of the unit guidelines, and informing him or her that these are the relevant documents to consider when building a case for promotion and tenure.
4. Soliciting names of potential external reviewers to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments and their impact. The candidate (as well as other faculty) can suggest potential reviewers; the chair will select a list of those from whom reviews will be solicited. The chair can also add additional names to the list of prospective reviewers. Typically, a chair will inquire if a person is willing to evaluate the dossier prior to sending a formal written request. The chair then invites evaluations from those agreeing to review the dossier, using the letter included in the Appendix. Each candidate should be apprised of those chosen to make an evaluation. Ordinarily, sufficient external reviewers should be identified so that six letters are received. Reviewers will receive the bulk of the material from eDossier: the CV; Teaching, Research and Creative Activities, and Service Narratives; samples of accomplishments; and the promotion and tenure guidelines of the candidate's unit. External reviewers are asked to comment on the quality and impact of the candidate's accomplishments, whether the area of excellence claimed is teaching, research and creative activities, or service. If not provided by the reviewer, the chair should create a brief professional biography from the reviewer's CV or other biographical material.
5. Arranging for the selection and functioning of department or division promotion and tenure committees.

6. Writing a letter to the next highest administrator, evaluating the candidate and recommending action.

Materials gathered by the chair and included in the dossier for purposes of promotion and tenure become the property of the Office of Academic Affairs for the permanent record following the completion of the promotion and tenure process. This includes confidential evaluations from various administrators, committees, outside referees, colleagues and the candidate's statements and list of activities.

Candidate's Narratives on Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service

Candidates should provide thoughtful narratives about their teaching, research and creative activities, and service. Each narrative should be three to five pages and should convey both the candidate's views of these areas and his or her accomplishments. The teaching narrative should reflect not only a pedagogical attitude, but should also discuss student and any relevant peer evaluations and how they have been integrated into subsequent practice, particular kinds of successes and even instructive missteps. A series of courses or a program successfully designed is useful. Noteworthy advising or mentoring could well figure into a person's philosophy of teaching.

The narrative on Research and Creative Activity should not simply recount what is already in the candidate's bibliography, but rather highlight particular achievements and ongoing projects or programs or funding, and endeavors that have been especially fruitful and where they might lead. The narrative about Service would ideally reflect the candidate's understanding that (and how) service to the University, the profession, and the region is an important part of a faculty member's commitment. The emphasis should be on significant undertakings and the breadth of their effect—not a list of token memberships. If pertinent, it is appropriate and useful to indicate how these areas may have overlapped and reinforced each other.

eDossier Content

The entire eDossier is forwarded beyond the campus to the Vice President's office.

The contents of eDossier provide the evidence and documentation that will enable the departmental committee, chair, dean, and the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee to make informed, persuasive recommendations. It should be as well-organized, clear, and concise as possible.

The dossier may include the following items for the years in rank:

- Student evaluations—both the numerical and the prose comments (under *Teaching*)
- Student letters, indicating how they were chosen (under *Teaching*)
- Grade Point Distributions (under *Teaching*)
- A copy of all published scholarship or other evidence of creative activities (under *Research and Creative Activity*)
- Description and documentation of any notable service to the unit, University, profession, or region (under *Service*)

Factors in the Documentation of Excellence

Types of documentation that would help to prove that the case for promotion and tenure is justified are indicated below. For the area of excellence, the evidence should include more compelling and extensive documentation, and should clearly and convincingly demonstrate superior performance. The areas that are deemed satisfactory should also be well documented, but fewer types of evidence need to be included; the relative level of performance expected is less than that for excellence.

Teaching

It is up to the candidate's academic unit to elaborate in its guidelines what its expectations for promotion and tenure are. Not all accomplishments are equally meritorious. While the list that follows is neither exhaustive nor fully inclusive, among the kinds of evidence that might show accomplishments in teaching are:

Substantive accomplishments (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Awards (local, University-wide, regional, or national)
- Consistently favorable student responses on evaluations, on both the prose comments and numerical results
- Pedagogically-oriented publications in peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly publications
- Funded external proposals for pedagogical innovation or systemic change in teaching
- Presentations on teaching innovation in professional meetings
- Peer-reviewed textbooks published
- Peer reviews (external and internal) attesting to impact and value of the candidate's work
- Major curricular innovations or new degree programs that are developed, approved and offered

Significant accomplishments (those that might further support the candidate's case)**:**

- Student letters (solicited or unsolicited) commenting on or analyzing the value and effectiveness of the teaching. If the letter is solicited, include a copy of the letter sent to students and indicate how the students were chosen.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Electronic formats developed for courses and used in teaching
- Course and program design or supervision
- Evidence of student learning or teacher effectiveness (results can be summarized in the Teaching Narrative)
- A list of courses taught reflecting impact on program
- Share of department's teaching responsibilities
- Other indications of teaching creativity or innovation
- Mentoring of students or other faculty, with feedback if available from affected individuals
- Effective student advising
- Innovative course materials developed and implemented, pedagogical presentations on campus
- Contributions on teaching committees

Research and Creative Activity

It is up to the candidate's academic unit to elaborate in its guidelines on what its expectations for promotion and tenure are. Again, items should be described on the basis of their substantive and significant contributions to their discipline, to make clear the merits of the contribution. While the list that follows is neither exhaustive nor fully inclusive, among the kinds of evidence that might show accomplishments in research and creative activities are:

Substantive accomplishments (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Peer-reviewed Publications: Books, monographs, scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, accepted manuscripts. Book contracts do not normally constitute substantial evidence until a manuscript is delivered and accepted by a publisher. The candidate should include a list of journals with a description of their status and rank (circulation, prestige, impact factor, acceptance rate, or other attributes that reflect the prestige of the journal). Publications in national level, peer-reviewed journals offer the

strongest indication of publication quality. Co-authored work should be accompanied by a clear statement of the candidate's contribution.
- Creative activities: Shows, exhibits, notable acquisitions, performances, literary publications. The quality and extent of shows, performances, etc. should be specified, including whether or not they are juried.
- Conference presentations in disciplines where this is highly regarded, indicating whether or not submissions are peer-reviewed
- Honors or awards for scholarly or creative activities
- Evidence of substantial, promising ongoing projects or programs
- Efforts to attract external funding to support students, scholars, and expenses of research if appropriate to the discipline
- Invited lectures at other colleges or universities on the candidate's research or creative activity

Significant accomplishments (those that might further support the candidate's case)**:**

- Involving students in research or creative activity
- Student presentations of the candidate's research or creative activity
- Non-peer reviewed articles or presentations in local, non-juried shows

Service

Service generally addresses service to the units or campus, professional service to the discipline, and public service to the community or region. All of these areas can have impact and be recognized as elements of a dossier for promotion and tenure. It is up to the candidate's academic unit to elaborate in its guidelines its expectations for promotion and tenure as to the extent and depth of these contributions. Among the kinds of evidence that might show accomplishments in service are (the list is neither exhaustive nor fully inclusive):

Substantive accomplishments (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Service to the profession: on academic boards, disciplinary and inter-disciplinary committees, editing, reviewing, evaluating, invited lectures
- Roles in reviewing departments or units in other colleges or universities
- Roles in national professional organizations, such as elected positions on boards
- Grants for service projects
- Peer-reviewed publications or presentations on service to the institution, unit, or discipline
- Organizing major, visible campus events impacting the discipline, unit or campus

Significant accomplishments (those that might further support the candidate's case)**:**

- Service to unit: on committees, designing programs, mentoring colleagues
- Administrative contributions that exceed the ordinary expectations of an administrative role
- Major roles in representing the discipline or unit to other forums or in the community
- Service to campus: on committees, as a representative or liaison
- Service to the community: public lectures and presentations, discipline-related community activities
- Local awards and honors for service
- Outreach and event organization
- Consulting in the discipline

External Review Letters

External review letters shall be from individuals at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying. A brief professional biography and possibly a CV of each external reviewer will be

included in the dossier. It is helpful when the fields of the reviewers enable them to address the impact and importance of the candidate's contributions.

Indiana University broadly expects that six external reviews are desirable in the assessment of the candidate's work. Note that the external review letters cannot be from the candidate's home campus, from previous mentors, thesis directors, former colleagues in prior institutions, significant collaborators, classmates, or from people with whom the candidate has a personal relationship. The candidate should list all reviewers and indicate his or her connection with them. It is University policy that all external reviewers receive the same packet of materials.

Internal Letters

Primary Committee

The department (or school within a college) committee's evaluation of the candidate's research and creative activities, teaching, and service should include factual and judgmental statements about each, assessing the area(s) to be judged excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. This letter should address the candidate's research and creative activities, teaching, and service attainments and anticipated contributions to the future development of the department, and it should summarize the confirming evidence. The written recommendations of the primary committee and of every subsequent level of review should be made available to the candidate at the conclusion of the committee's or the administrator's work. If the vote is not unanimous, both the majority and the minority positions must be explained in the committee's report.

Chair, Dean or Director

If this recommendation is positive, it should contain an assessment of the candidate's contributions to the department (or unit). It should demonstrate that he or she will serve the needs of the department and has established a pattern of scholarly or artistic productivity, teaching, and service — a pattern that will benefit the University community in future years. If the recommendation is neutral or negative, this also should be justified. The recommendation of the chair will be provided to the candidate at the conclusion of the review.

Lecturer and Clinical Faculty

Indiana University has additional ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Teaching Professor, and clinical ranks with professorial designations. While these positions are not tenure track, they provide substantial value to our mission in teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

Lecturer Ranks

Senior Lecturer

Promotion to Senior Lecturer is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching or service, with at least satisfactory performance in the remaining area. Research or creative activity would be recognized when it strengthens the area of excellence. Candidates are ordinarily expected to provide leadership in teaching and to contribute to course and curriculum development. They may have organizational and oversight responsibilities for a course or program, participate in course and curriculum development, and, where appropriate, provide workshops for colleagues. They may oversee and provide mentoring for full and part-time non-tenure track faculty. Candidates may also make school and campus contributions beyond the classroom, such as campus service or other professional activities.

If a lecturer is hired with specific responsibilities beyond the normal teaching and service

expectations, the accomplishments and contributions in those areas should be assessed.

Teaching Professor

Excellence in Teaching

All faculty in the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Teaching Professor are expected to stay current in pedagogy and their academic discipline. Therefore, while the attainment of a terminal degree in their academic discipline is not sufficient alone for promotion to Teaching Professor, it should be weighted heavily in consideration of excellence in teaching. Other factors may individually or jointly establish excellence in teaching and qualification for promotion to Teaching Professor. The non-exhaustive list of factors includes:

Substantive accomplishments (those most likely to strengthen a case for excellence):

- Teaching Awards (local, University-wide, regional, or national)
- Consistently favorable student responses on evaluations, on both the prose comments and numerical results
- Pedagogically-oriented publications in peer-reviewed journals and other scholarly publications
- Efforts to attract external funding for pedagogical innovation or scholarship of teaching and learning
- Attainment of a terminal degree in their academic discipline
- Presentations on research on teaching and learning, innovations, and best practices at professional conferences or workshops
- Authored peer-reviewed articles, textbooks, textbook chapters, and e-texts
- Edited text books or other pedagogical publications
- Peer reviews (external and internal) attesting to impact and value of the candidate's work
- Participation in curriculum development and/or program development
- Development of and dissemination of quality teaching materials
- Applied research on teaching in the candidate's academic discipline, sharing pedagogical innovation, and disseminating best teaching practices.

Significant accomplishments (those that might further support the candidate's case):

- Student letters (solicited or unsolicited) commenting on or analyzing the value and effectiveness of the teaching. If the letter is solicited, include a copy of the letter sent to students and indicate how the students were chosen.
- Peer teaching evaluations
- Electronic formats developed for courses and used in teaching
- Course and program design or supervision
- Evidence of student learning or teacher effectiveness (results can be summarized in the Teaching Narrative)
- A list of courses taught reflecting impact on program
- Evidence of teaching creativity or innovation
- Mentored students or faculty, with feedback if available from affected individuals
- Effective student advising
- Innovative course materials developed and implemented, pedagogical presentations on campus

- Contributions on committees that deal with teaching, learning, or student success
- Authored non-peer-reviewed relevant publications (e.g. newsletters contributions)

Direct Evidence of Student Learning

There are many important indicators of commitment to teaching excellence (e.g., professional development, teaching-related service, scholarship, etc.), direct evidence of student learning should remain the ultimate criterion for identifying excellence in teaching. It is generally recognized that there is no perfect source of evidence.

Direct evidence of student learning requires that students have completed some work or product such as exams, papers, projects, or assignments that demonstrate achievement of specified learning outcomes. Other direct measures of student learning include course-specific standardized tests, student portfolios, and pre- and post- knowledge tests. Grades alone would not serve as direct evidence of student learning, nor would excellent (or poor) student end-of-course evaluations of teaching. However, a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is understood to be measured by student products and performances of their learning. An analysis and reflection of assessment results such as those from exams, papers, projects, assignments that align with student learning outcomes are necessary. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with "Identifying Pathways for Excellence in Teaching."

Excellence in Service in Support of Teaching and Learning

As faculty progress in their careers, their contributions will frequently change in nature spreading beyond the classroom. A non-exhaustive list of activities that indicate service in support of teaching includes:

- Peer review of others' teaching
- Mentoring of faculty
- Programmatic assessment of learning
- Writing student recommendations particularly for scholarships, graduate programs, and employment
- Supervising/leading student service, experiential, or practice-based learning
- Nominations of teachers and students to renowned awards, scholarships, and leadership positions
- Teaching-related committee work
- Student-facing campus service (e.g. sponsoring or advising clubs)
- Outward-facing service toward learning in the community
- Guest lectures
- Serving on teaching award committees
- Chairing and participating in Faculty Learning Communities
- Mentoring student-athletes
- Leadership in teaching-related societies or organizations
- Service awards related to teaching or learning
- Leadership activities at the department, school, campus, or university level
- Participation as a reviewer for teaching-related scholarly journals
- Service on a teaching-related journal's review board, or service as an editor for a teaching-related journal.
- Service on external pedagogical grant review boards

Review Letters for Non-Tenure Lecturer and Teaching Professor

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

It is expected that candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer have six review letters from outside their unit of appointment, allowing recommendations from faculty in other schools or colleges of IUN, as well as from other IU campuses or universities.

Promotion to Teaching Professor
It is expected that candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor would have six review letters with up to 2 reviewers from IUN outside of the unit of appointment and 4 reviewers from outside the IUN campus. Review letters should be from individuals at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying. A brief professional biography and possibly a CV of each reviewer will be included in the dossier. It is helpful when the reviewers address the impact and importance of the candidate's contributions.

All review letters should be solicited from the chair, dean or director (see Responsibilites of Chair, Dean or Director on page 8).

Note that the review letters cannot be from previous mentors, thesis directors, former colleagues in prior institutions, significant collaborators, classmates, or from people with whom the candidate has a personal relationship. The candidate should list all reviewers and indicate his or her connection with them. It is University policy that all reviewers receive the same packet of materials.

Clinical Ranks

Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor or from Clinical Associate Professor to a higher rank is based on continued improvement in and demonstration of excellence in teaching, research, or service. The candidate must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in the remaining area. Service can be identified as a primary focus for a clinical faculty member if considered a significant part of the faculty member's major responsibilities. Candidates are ordinarily expected to provide leadership in their primary area, but not to the extent and impact expected of tenure track candidates for promotion. Clinical faculty may have organizational and oversight responsibilities for a course or program, participate in course and curriculum development, and, where appropriate, provide workshops for colleagues. They may oversee and provide mentoring for other non-tenure track faculty. Clinical faculty are encouraged to make school and campus contributions and to pursue external professional activities.

Review Letters for Non-Tenure Clinical Track Faculty

It would normally be expected that candidates for promotion in non-tenured positions would have four review letters from outside their unit of appointment, allowing recommendations from faculty in other schools or colleges of IUN, as well as from other IU campuses or universities.

APPENDICES

A: TEMPLATE LETTER SOLICITING EXTERNAL REVIEWS FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Instructions: Replace bracketed data with appropriate information applicable to the candidate.

[Date]

[External reviewer's address]

Dear [External reviewer]:

[Candidate name] is under consideration for promotion to the rank of [proposed rank] in the Department of [name] within the [School/college name] at Indiana University Northwest. Indiana University Northwest continues to develop its academic excellence in scholarship in teaching, research and creative activities, and service. A critical step in advancing the mission of our campus is recognizing meritorious faculty in rank. Your input in a review of our candidate is important in assessing the impact and value of our candidate's work.

The primary area in which [candidate name] seeks advancement is in [teaching, research and creative activity, orservice; in the unusual instance of a "balanced case," this must be explained], with [the two areas claimed "satisfactory"] as the secondary areas. Within this context, we would appreciate your candid evaluation of [candidate's] academic work. We are particularly interested in your evaluation of the quality, significance and impact of [his/her] work, and the quality of the journals, publications, or other vehicles used for dissemination. To assist you in your evaluation we are enclosing Professor [candidate name]'s curriculum vitae, a summary dossier, and some representative contributions of the candidate. We would, of course, appreciate any other comments you would like to make regarding [candidate]'s teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service, and their overlap.

Since we are obligated to provide a short biographical sketch of you to promotion committee members, we would appreciate a brief biographical sketch, or your curriculum vitae, if more convenient. Please also clarify whether you have any personal or professional relationship with the candidate, and if so, the nature of that relationship.

We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and appreciate your assistance in this matter. Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in the campus's promotion and tenure process. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. If this in any way influences your ability to write a candid evaluation, please let us know as soon as possible.

To complete Professor [candidate name]'s dossier, we would appreciate receiving your comments by early to mid-August of this year.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely yours,

[Department Chair or designated administrator]

Enclosure(s)

B: Template Letter Soliciting Reviews For Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Instructions: Replace bracketed data with appropriate information applicable to the candidate.

[Date]

[reviewer's address]

Dear [reviewer]:

[Candidate name] is under consideration for promotion to the rank of [proposed rank] in the Department of [name] within the [School/college name] at Indiana University Northwest. Indiana University Northwest continues to develop its academic excellence in scholarship in teaching, research and creative activities, and service. A critical step in advancing the mission of our campus is recognizing meritorious faculty in rank. Your input in a review of our candidate is important in assessing the impact and value of our candidate's work.

The primary area in which [candidate name] seeks advancement is in [excellence in teaching, service to teaching or service], with one area claimed "satisfactory". Within this context, we would appreciate your candid evaluation of [candidate's] work. We are particularly interested in your evaluation of the quality, significance and impact of [his/her] work. To assist you in your evaluation we are enclosing [candidate name]'s curriculum vitae, a summary dossier, and some representative contributions of the candidate. We would, of course, appreciate any other comments you would like to make regarding [candidate]'s teaching, research and creative activity, and/or service, and their overlap. See Appendix C: Guideline for writing a review letter for teaching professor.

Since we are obligated to provide a short biographical sketch of you to promotion committee members, we would appreciate a brief biographical sketch, or your curriculum vitae, if more convenient. Please also clarify whether you have any personal or professional relationship with the candidate, and if so, the nature of that relationship.

We are keenly aware of the demands this request places on you, and appreciate your assistance in this matter. Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in the campus's promotion and tenure process. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. If this in any way influences your ability to write a candid evaluation, please let us know as soon as possible.

To complete [candidate name]'s dossier, we would appreciate receiving your comments by early to mid-August of this year.

Thank you for your assistance in this important process.

Sincerely yours,

[Department Chair or designated administrator]

Enclosure(s)

C: GUIDELINES FOR WRITING A LETTER OF REVIEW FOR TEACHING PROFESSOR

The guidelines are intended to enhance the review process by providing a general framework of best practices and relevant content for reviewers to follow. They are optional.

Guidelines

1. **Excellence in Teaching**: Based on your review, comment on the candidate's philosophy of teaching and how this philosophy relates to their identified teaching goals and student learning. Review and comment on the candidate's submitted course materials and other components of the dossier, including evidence of student learning. Where applicable, reviewer should comment on class observations. How would you summarize the candidate's strengths, especially in promoting learning?

2. **Service to Teaching**: Based on your review, comment on the candidate's past efforts to help others in teaching. Review and comment on the candidate's effort to continue to grow in teaching through peer mentoring, teaching scholarship, participation in professional development activities related to teaching, or demonstrated leadership in teaching.

D: ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR THE PROMOTION, TENURE, AND SABBATICAL LEAVES PROCESSES

April	1st Monday	Office of Academic Affairs notifies units of candidates that must be considered for a promotion and tenure recommendation in following year. Units contemporaneously notify candidates.
May	1st Monday	Candidates notify chair, director, or dean of intent to pursue promotion and/or tenure or sabbatical leave. P&T candidates submit names of suggested external reviewers to responsible administrator.
May	**2nd Monday**	**Unit informs Office of Academic Affairs, in writing, of all intended candidates under consideration for promotion and/or tenure.**
May – June		Candidate dossiers are sent to external reviewers by chair, director, or dean as appropriate.
June	1st Monday	Promotion and Tenure Committees constituted.
September	**2nd Monday**	**Both principal and supplemental dossiers for promotion and/or tenure candidates due in department or unit office** Sabbatical leave applications are also due. All external reviews should be received prior to this date. Reviews of dossiers progress from primary area (department or school) to unit committees and dean.
October	2nd Friday	Reappointment recommendations due in Office of Academic Affairs, for tenure track faculty in the second year of their appointment (for third year appointment only), and for lecturers in the first year of their appointment (for second year appointment only).
October	**3rd Monday**	**Dossiers have been reviewed completely in schools and colleges, and are due in the Office of Academic Affairs.**
October - December		Dossiers reviewed by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, and sabbatical applications reviewed.
January	2nd Monday	Reviews of the Campus P&T Committee are transmitted to the EVC.

February	mid-month	Recommendations of the EVC to the Chancellor.
February	end	Complete campus recommendations/principal dossiers are transmitted to the Office of the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs. Supplemental dossier may be requested.
March	early	Candidates notified by EVC that their dossiers are undergoing Executive Review. If applicable, candidates may elect to withdraw their applications at this time.
March – April		Executive Review in consultation with Chancellor.
April	early	President recommendation communicated to campus, followed by Chancellor or EVC notification to candidate whether a favorable recommendation will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees.
April	mid-month	Board of Trustees action, followed by candidate notification from the President.
April	**3rd Friday**	**Reappointment recommendations due in Office of Academic Affairs, for tenure track faculty in second year and later, lecturers, and senior lecturers in their second year of three-year term.**

Office of Academic Affairs, revised July, 2016. Dates may change from time to time. Current dates are available from the Office.

E: eDossier Promotion and Tenure Mapping Guide

(General guideline: do not put multiple copies of the same file/letter in eDossier; rather place a link or a file with a link pointing to the other copy!)

IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	*eDossier Outline*	*Action Needed*
P & T Routing and Action Summary Form		*Not used in the eDossier system*
Recommendation from the Executive Vice Chancellor		*Uploaded by Academic Affairs*
Recommendation of Campus P & T Committee		*Uploaded by Chair/delegate of Campus P & T Committee including vote tally*
Recommendation from the Dean		*Uploaded by Dean/delegate*
Recommendation from College/School P & T Committee		*Uploaded by Chair/delegate of the College/School P & T Committee including vote tally*
Recommendation from the Chair/Director (if applicable)*		*Uploaded by Chair of the Department*
Recommendation of the primary committee (if applicable)		*Uploaded by Chair/delegate of the committee including vote tally*
	Assign a Candidate Delegate	*Candidate has option*
	Assign a Guest	*Candidate has option*
	Dossier (Candidate's Name)	

Principal dossier component	***External Letters*** *(Outside reviewers solicited by the Chair/Director/Dean)*	*Uploaded by the Chair/Director/Dean*
Principal dossier component (if any)	***Solicited Letters***	
	Teaching (Student letters solicited by the Chair/Director/Dean) *Naming Convention for student letters: Student#.pdf*	*Uploaded by the Chair/Director/Dean indicating how they were chosen. This section also includes Grade Point Distribution.*
IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	***eDossier Outline***	***Action Needed***
	Research (Confidential letters written by IUN colleagues and solicited by the Chair/Director/Dean) *Naming Convention for external and internal reviewers:* *LastName.FirstName-Candidate Name.pdf*	*Uploaded by the Chair/Director/Dean*
	Service (Confidential letters written by IUN colleagues	*Uploaded by the Chair/Director/Dean*

	and solicited by the Chair/Director/Dean) *Naming Convention for external and internal reviewers:* *LastName.FirstName-Candidate Name.pdf*	
Principal dossier component	***General***	
	Department and School Criteria	*Uploaded by candidate (departmental and school promotion and tenure guidelines)*
	Candidate's Curriculum Vitae	*Uploaded by candidate*
	Candidate's Statements	*Three (3) statements: Research/Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service/Engagement statements uploaded by candidate—each with 5- page limit*
	Department (School) List of Prospective Referees	*Final list of external reviewers composed by the Chair/Director/Dean (list also includes brief bio**)*

Not used in IUN Guidelines	*Candidate's List of Prospective Referees*	*List provided by candidate to Chair/Director/Dean*
IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	***eDossier Outline***	***Action Needed***
Research Indicated by Substantive and Significant	***Research/Creative Activity***	
• Scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals (**substantive**) • Shows, exhibits, notable acquisitions, performances, literary publications (**substantive**) • Peer-reviewed books, chapters, monographs—only include title pages and table of contents in eDossier entry (**substantive**) • Non-peer-reviewed articles or presentations in local, non-juried shows (**significant**)	*Copies of Publications and/or Evidence of Creative Work*	*Uploaded by candidate*
[Candidate option: not required in IUN Guidelines] If candidate's Area of Excellence is Research/Creative Activity, letters from colleagues should be uploaded here.	*Reviews of Candidate's Books, Creative Performances and Exhibitions*	*Uploaded by candidate*

If the letter makes additional comments in the areas of Teaching or Service, it should be indicated within the respective areas providing the link to the area it is uploaded (see Help tab in eDossier under Embedded URLs). Confidential letters solicited from colleagues by a Chair/Dean should be uploaded within the *Solicited Letters* **section of principal dossier by the administrator**.		
• Efforts to attract external funding to support students, scholars, and expenses of research if appropriate to the discipline (**substantive**)	*List of Grants Applied for/Received*	*Uploaded by candidate*
IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	***eDossier Outline***	***Action Needed***
• Evidence of substantial, promising ongoing projects or programs (**substantive**) • Student presentations of the candidate's research or creative activity (**significant**)	*Copies of Manuscripts or Creative Works in Progress*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Conference presentations when highly regarded (**substantive**) • Invited lectures at other colleges or universities on the candidate's research or creative activity (**substantive**)	*Evidence for the Impact/Influence of Publications or Creative Works*	*Uploaded by candidate*

• Peer-reviewed publications: list of journals/publishers with a description of their status and rank (circulation, prestige, impact factor, acceptance rate, or other journal attributes) (**substantive**)	*Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Honors or awards for scholarly or creative activities (**substantive**)	*Awards and Honors for Research/Creative Activity*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Co-authored work should be accompanied by a clear statement of the candidate's contribution (**substantive**)	*Candidate's Contributions to Collaborative Projects*	*Uploaded by candidate*
Teaching Indicated by Substantive and Significant	***Teaching***	
• List of courses taught reflecting impact on program (**significant**)	*List of Courses Taught*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Other indications of teaching creativity or innovation appropriate to this category (**significant**)	*Sample of Course Materials*	*Uploaded by candidate*
IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	***eDossier Outline***	***Action Needed***
[Candidate option: not required in IUN Guidelines]	*Graduate Training*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Other indications of teaching creativity or innovation appropriate to this category (**significant**)	*Student Awards, Honors, Collaborative* *Publications, Achievements*	*Uploaded by candidate*

• Involving students in research or creative activity (**significant**) • Mentoring of students or other faculty, with feedback if available from affected individuals (**significant**) • Effective student advising (**significant**)	*Undergraduate Research Experiences and Mentoring*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Consistently favorable student responses on evaluation-prose comments and numerical results (**substantive**)	*Student Course Evaluations*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Student letters commenting on or analyzing the value and effectiveness of teaching (**significant**)	*Unsolicited Letters from Former Students*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Evidence of student learning or teacher effectiveness (**significant**)	*Evidence of Learning Outcomes*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Peer reviews (external and internal) attesting to impact and value of the candidate's work (**substantive**) • Peer class teaching evaluations (**significant**)	*Peer Evaluations (Solicited by candidates)*	*Uploaded by candidate*

IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	*eDossier Outline*	*Action Needed*
• If candidate's Area of Excellence is Teaching, letters from colleagues should be uploaded here. If the letter makes additional comments in the areas of Research/Creative Activity or Service, it should be indicated within the respective areas providing the link to the area it is uploaded (see Help tab in eDossier under Embedded URLs). Confidential letters solicited from colleagues by a Chair/Dean should be uploaded within the *Solicited Letters* section of principal dossier.	*Peer Evaluations (continued)*	
• Major curricular innovations or new degree programs developed, approved and offered (**substantive**) • Electronic formats developed for courses and used in teaching (**significant**) • Course and program design or supervision (**significant**) • Innovative course materials developed and implemented, pedagogical	*Curricular Development*	*Uploaded by candidate*

presentations on campus (**significant**)		
• Funded external proposals for pedagogical innovation or systemic change in teaching (**substantive**) • Contributions on teaching committees (**significant**)	*Professional Pedagogical Development*	*Uploaded by candidate*
• Pedagogically-oriented publications in peer-reviewed journals (**substantive**) • Peer-reviewed textbooks published (**substantive**) • Presentations on teaching innovation in professional meetings (**substantive**)	*Teaching Publications*	*Uploaded by candidate*
IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	***eDossier Outline***	***Action Needed***
• Awards: local, university-wide, regional or national (**substantive**) • Funded external proposals for pedagogical innovation or systemic change in teaching (**substantive**)	*Teaching Awards, Honors, Grants, Fellowships*	*Uploaded by candidate*
Service indicated by Substantive and Significant***	***Service/Engagement***	
• Roles in reviewing departments or units in other colleges or	*Evidence of Service to the University, School and Department****	*Uploaded by candidate*

universities (**substantive**) • Organizing major, visible campus events impacting the discipline, unit or campus (**substantive**) • Service to unit on committees, designing programs, mentoring colleagues (**significant**) • Service to campus on committees, as a representative or liaison (**significant**) • Administrative contributions that exceed the ordinary expectations of an administrative role (**significant**)		
• Peer-reviewed publications or presentations on service to the institution, unit, or discipline (**substantive**) • Grants for service projects (**substantive**) • Service to the profession: on academic boards, disciplinary and interdisciplinary committees, editing, reviewing, evaluating, invited lectures (**substantive**) • Roles in national professional organizations, such as	*Evidence of Service to the Profession****	*Uploaded by candidate*

elected positions on boards (**substantive**) • Local awards and honors for service (**significant**)		
IU Northwest P & T Guidelines	***eDossier Outline***	***Action Needed***
• Major roles in representing the discipline or unit to other forums or in the community (**significant**) • Public lectures and presentations, discipline-related community activities (**significant**) • Outreach and event organization (**significant**) • Consulting in the discipline (**significant**)	*Evidence of Engagement with Non-Academic Communities and Agencies****	*Uploaded by candidate*

**For Social Work, the Director uploads the IUSSW Dean's Recommendation*

***Biographical Summary of Professor X*

Professor X received his BS from XXX University, MS in Statistics from University of Waterloo, Canada and his Ph.D. from XXX University. He joined the Department of XX, YY University in 1991 and became Full Professor of Statistics in 2001.

His current research interest is in Time Series Modeling. His research interests include stochastic process, state space modeling and methods of moments in time series

modeling. Professor X published over 35 articles and his research has been published in many of the leading statistics and time series journals. In addition, he serves as a member of the editorial board for the Journal of Stochastic Processes of Dynamic States. Professor X met the candidate in professional meetings and has only had professional associations.

**** If the candidate's Area of Excellence is Service, letters from colleagues should be uploaded within the service area.*

If the letter makes additional comments in the areas of Teaching or Research/Creative Activity, it should be indicated within the respective areas providing the link to the area it is uploaded (see Help tab in eDossier under Embedded URLs).

Confidential letters solicited from colleagues by a Chair/Dean should be uploaded within the Solicited Letters section of principal dossier.

List of Changes Made

1. **On the promotion committee for Teaching Professors, who can serve?**

   Refer to composition of promotion and tenure committee page 6

   - Only full professors can vote on the teaching professor (as that is the current practice) this is clarified in the statement "Beyond the department level, only full processors can vote on the teaching professor rank". If the future committee takes this on in the full review, it should be clarified with clinical
   - We clarified that non-tenure track can participate in departmental reviews of other non-tenure track faculty
   - We clarified: who is at or above the rank in the statement "that every member of a promotion and tenure committee is expected to participate and vote"
   - Note was made that each category has three ranks
     Top tier: Full professor, Full Non-tenure track clinical and Teaching Professor

     Middle tier: Associate professor, Associate non-tenure clinical and senior lecturer
     Bottom tier: Assistant professor, assistant non-tenure clinical and lecturer

2. **What is the real purpose of the letters? They make full sense for research…but…could we use several observations by several peers? And from what ranks?**

   - Page 11 under External Review Letters we stated "External review letters shall be from individuals at or above the rank to which the candidate is applying.
   - We added a new template (B:) for soliciting reviews on teaching professors on page 17. This was copied from (A:) but slightly modified to fit non-tenure track. Future committee may want to consider adding a 3rd for clinical.
   - We added a new appendix (C:) Guideline for writing a review letter for teaching professor on page 18.
   - On page 15 under Review Letters for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, we restated that all review letters should be solicited from chair, dean or director based on "Responsibilities of Chair, Dean or Director on page 8"
   - On page 14 we inserted Review Letters for Non-Tenure Lecturer and Teaching Professor as we are not charged with modifications to clinical ranks. Future P&T committee should revise the clinical rank as necessary. We followed IUB and IUPUI recommendations on 6 review letters with 2 from IUN and 4 from outside IUN.

3. **We need to make explicit that only materials from the last promotion should be considered…and included in the edossier**

   On page 8 of P&T guidelines we added the statement "Only evidence achieved within rank should be used to support a candidate's case for promotion" although, it is already stated on page 5 (Demonstration of Excellence)

4. **We need some language around what we mean by direct evidence of student learning outcomes…even if that is included parenthetically…AND we need to clarify if this direct**

evidence is required of both the folks "going up" for excellence in teaching, and for those "going up" for excellence in service.

- On page 14 We added a section based on https://www.iun.edu/academic-affairs/docs/identifying-pathways-for-excellence-in-teaching.pdf to clarify evidence of student learning under the title "Direct Evidence of Student Learning"

There are many important indicators of commitment to teaching excellence (e.g., professional development, teaching-related service, scholarship, etc.), direct evidence of student learning should remain the ultimate criterion for identifying excellence in teaching. It is generally recognized that there is no perfect source of evidence.

Direct evidence of student learning requires that students have completed some work or product such as exams, papers, projects, or assignments that demonstrate achievement of specified learning outcomes. Other direct measures of student learning include course-specific standardized tests, student portfolios, and pre- and post- knowledge tests. Grades alone would not serve as direct evidence of student learning, nor would excellent (or poor) student end-of-course evaluations of teaching. However, a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is understood to be measured by student products and performances of their learning. An analysis and reflection of assessment results such as those from exams, papers, projects, assignments that align with student learning outcomes are necessary. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with "Identifying Pathways for Excellence in Teaching."

- Additionally, we placed this under excellence in teaching, not excellence in service in support of teaching and learning to clarify student outcome requirement.

5. **Formatting or other changes regarding Teaching Professor**
   Page changes were double checked and corrected in TOC where applicable and appendices B for Template Letter Soliciting Reviews for Non-Tenure Track Faculty and guidelines for writing a letter of review for teaching professor was added.

6. **Recommendations for Future P&T Committee for 21/22:**
   - Our committee was only charged with modifying the Teaching Professor portions within the non-tenure track. While the term "unit" is defined, the future committee should provide a clearer statement.
   - Page 8 Under Responsibilities of the Chair, Dean, or Director, this should be reworded to include on tiers (Tenure Track, Clinical and Lecturers/Teaching Professor)
   - Page 9 Under Candidate's Narratives on Teaching, Research and Creative Activity and Service, this should be updated to include all ranks
   - On page 14 Future P&T committee should revise the clinical rank for letters as necessary
   - Committee recommends grammatical review on entire document
   - Committee recommends changing 4 to 6 review letters for clinical appointments. This will then align with all of the promotion categories.

Attachment 3:

Proposed P&T Committee Procedures

IUN Tenure Process Roles and Responsibilities

1. Chairperson or unit head:
    a. Advises the faculty member (Candidate) about the timeline for the review;
    b. Tracks the review process and informs the Candidate of progress through each stage;
    c. Arranges outside referees based on the list compiled in conjunction with the faculty member (Candidate):
        i. Referees must be at or above the rank to which the Candidate is applying, so for promotion to associate, the referees must already be associate professors,
        ii. Referees for Clinical ranks and Teaching ranks must be at or above the rank to which the Candidate is applying;
    d. Checks the final edossier for completeness;
    e. Constitutes a department Promotion & Tenure (P & T) Committee, otherwise known as the Primary Committee. The Chair may consult with the unit faculty members regarding the membership of the Primary Committee;
    f. May attend the first meeting of the Primary committee and review the charge;
    g. Communicates with the Primary Committee regarding questions about the Candidate's edossier;
    h. Receives the Primary committee recommendation sent by the committee after they vote by voice vote or hand sign (to remain anonymous outside of the committee meeting):
        i. The Department/Unit Chair is not involved in the committee's recommendation;
    i. Writes their own recommendation and forwards it to the Dean and the Candidate in accordance with the IUN/IU P & T guidelines.

2. The Dean of the school/college:
    a. Constitutes a School/College Promotion & Tenure Committee. The Dean may consult with the school/college faculty members regarding the membership of the school/college P & T committee.
    b. May attend the first meeting of the School/College P&T committee and review the charge;
    c. Receives the School/College P & T committee recommendation sent by the committee after the vote;
        i. The Dean is not involved in the committee's recommendation;
    d. Writes their own recommendation and forwards it to the Office of Academic Affairs and the Candidate in accordance with the IUN/IU P & T guidelines;

e. Transmits the department/unit committee, Chair, the school committee, and the Dean's recommendation to the Executive Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

3. Committees (Department/Program, School/College, University):

   a. Elect a committee chair;
   b. Review the Candidate's edossier materials in full before the designated meeting time;
   c. Participate in a full and fair discussion of the Candidate's qualifications;
   d. Vote and record that vote;
   e. Hold the committee deliberations and vote at the highest level of confidentiality;
   f. Must be present for all the discussions;
   g. Must be independent of administrative evaluators, such as the Department/Unit Chair, Dean, or EVCAA;
   h. Must keep the discussion confidential;
      i. A committee member does not communicate about the process or ask questions related to the Candidate outside the committee;
   i. Have appropriate members vote on each level;
      i. At each level of promotion, a faculty member who is one level above the Candidate must be on the committee;
         1. Only faculty members at or above the rank to which the Candidate is applying may vote (unless barred by a conflict of interest);
         2. For the teaching professor rank the voting committee members must be at the full professor rank;
   j. Must be aware of conflicts of interest. If a committee member has written a letter about the Candidate, that member is allowed to vote but should refrain from the discussion. If the committee member has written a promotion review letter solicited by the unit chair in the non-tenure track category, then the committee member should recuse themselves from the committee;
   k. Votes by voice vote or hand sign (to remain anonymous) at the conclusion of discussion.
   l. Participates in review and finalization of the Committee Recommendation Letter;
   m. Signs the Committee Recommendation Letter when finalized.

4. Chairperson of various P & T committees:

   a. Is elected by the committee members and retains all duties of membership;
   b. Meets with the Dean and EVCAA to determine if there are any instances of real or perceived conflicts of interests before the committee members are given access to edossier;
   c. Determines the meeting times;
   d. Leads a full and fair discussion of the Candidate's qualifications;

e. Conducts and records the vote tally at the conclusion of all discussion (names to remain anonymous);
f. Handles all information and questions related to the Candidate outside the committee;
g. Drafts or designates a committee member to draft the Committee Recommendation Letter. The letter should express the nature of the committee discussion and justification for the recommendation. If the vote was split, it is appropriate to include a section in the letter expressing the minority opinion and justification. All members must have the opportunity to read, suggest changes, and approve the draft before it is finalized;
h. Forwards a hard copy of the signed Committee Recommendation Letter to the next level and the Candidate in accordance with the IUN/IU P & T guidelines.

5. The Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:

a. Informs the Chair of the Campus P & T Committee, the Deans, and the chairs of other P & T committees of the relevant deadlines with regards to the IUN/IU P & T guidelines;
b. Determines if there are any instances of real or perceived conflicts of interests before committee members are given access to the edossier;
c. Writes a recommendation;
d. Asks the Chancellor for recommendations (optional);
e. Transmits the edossier to the President and Board of Trustees;
f. Tracks the Candidate's edossier through the process.

Faculty Affairs Committee (4-12-2021)

Attachment 4:

Proposed Financial Crisis Policy

Faculty Role Regarding Campus Financial Crisis

[Local Policy Number]

Scope

A. This policy defines the role of the faculty in the determination by a campus of whether a campus-wide financial crisis exists that may result in the closing or permanent downsizing of a unit or program **and** the involuntary dismissal of certain academic appointees governed by ACA-18 (Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments), ACA-19 (Regulation of Professors of Practice), and ACA-20 (Regulation of Research Appointments) ("associated faculty").

B. This policy does not apply to a determination that a university financial exigency exists that may result in the involuntary dismissal of faculty with tenure, which is controlled by ACA-41 and ACA-52.

C. This policy is campus-specific. The campus and the faculty recognize the primacy of the university's policy on financial exigency (ACA-41, Faculty Role Regarding University Financial Exigency). If ACA-41 is invoked by the President, any on-going activities under this policy shall terminate.

Policy Statement

1. In order to invoke financial crisis as a reason to close or permanently downsize a unit or program and dismiss associated faculty, the campus must be facing a severe and imminent financial crisis that threatens the survival of the campus in its present form, that jeopardizes its academic integrity, and that cannot be resolved by means less drastic than the closure or permanently downsizing of a unit or program and the elimination of such academic appointments ("campus financial crisis").
2. A decision by the campus to shift resources away from teaching or research, or away from a unit or program, does not constitute a financial crisis.
3. A financial crisis within one unit or program is not grounds to invoke this policy unless its immediate ramifications threaten the survival and academic integrity of the campus as a whole.
4. The merger, elimination, or re-organization of an academic unit by itself is not grounds to invoke this policy.
5. The determination that a campus financial crisis exists must be arrived at transparently, with participation by affected constituencies, and documented through generally accepted financial principles.
6. The ultimate decision to declare a condition of campus financial crisis and decide how to resolve it lies with the Board of Trustees and the President in consultation with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs, and the university's Vice President and CFO. However, because a campus financial crisis will directly affect its teaching and research missions, the rights and prerogatives of the faculty entitle them to participation in this process.

7. A campus financial crisis is an immediate crisis driven by external events. As such, a declaration of campus financial crisis should be limited to a maximum of one year from the time the Chancellor first informs the campus faculty governance organization of the crisis unless the Chancellor and the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs deems a longer period necessary and the Chancellor consults with the campus faculty governance organization about the need for a longer time.

Reason For Policy

This policy articulates the faculty's role in declaring a campus-specific financial crisis and establishes a procedure for faculty participation.

Procedure

1. When the Chancellor becomes aware that the campus faces a financial crisis so severe that it may require the closure or permanent downsizing of units or programs and dismissal of associated faculty, and following consultation with the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs, the Chancellor shall inform the campus faculty governance organization, the unit(s) or program(s) likely to be affected, and the faculty of the campus in general.
2. In order that the faculty may evaluate the situation for themselves, the Chancellor shall provide the campus faculty governance organization with budgetary, financial, and other documentation and supporting evidence that is being used to guide the decision whether a campus financial crisis exists. It is expected that such information will be provided at least 30 days prior to any decisions being made that may result in the closure or permanent downsizing of units or programs and dismissal of associated faculty. The Chancellor shall keep the campus faculty governance organization informed of the campus's decision-making process, the timetable for any decisions involving the closure or permanent downsizing of units or programs and dismissal of associated faculty, and shall supply additional relevant information on an ongoing basis.
3. The campus faculty governance organization shall form an ad-hoc Financial Crisis Committee to represent faculty interests during the financial crisis.
    a. The Committee shall include the officers of the campus faculty governance organization.
    b. The Committee shall include other faculty as needed so that the final committee includes:
        1. At least one member of the campus Budgetary Affairs Committee;
        2. Faculty competent to evaluate any units threatened with permanent downsizing or closure;
        3. Both tenure-track and non-tenure-track appointees; and
        4. One or more member(s) of the appropriate academic or faculty affairs committee.
    c. Additional faculty may be added to the Financial Crisis Committee as the financial situation and the campus's response to it develops.
4. The Financial Crisis Committee is charged with providing analysis of the academic impact of the financial crisis. It shall assess the impact of closure or permanent downsizing of units or programs and dismissal of associated faculty on the overall mission of the campus, as well as these units' places in the larger landscape of intellectual and professional endeavors. The Committee will explore

alternative cost-saving measures that may partially or fully alleviate the situation. The Committee will report these findings to the Chancellor and the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs for consideration as part of the decision-making process. In the spirit of shared governance, the Chancellor shall provide a response, which should include a summary report, to the Financial Crisis Committee and the campus faculty governance organization prior to action being taken. The Chancellor may choose the format of the summary report (e.g., at a meeting of the campus faculty governance organization, via formal memo or power point, or other mechanism).

Attachment 5:

Proposed Campus-Wide Survey Policy

Policy Name: Campus-Wide Survey Policy

Context

The ease and relative low-cost of conducting web-based surveys has contributed to a climate of over-surveying at many higher education institutions. One adverse consequence of "survey fatigue" induced by the proliferation of online survey requests is diminished response rates. Because findings from low-response rate surveys are susceptible to bias, their value as evidence for institutional decision making may be limited.

In an effort to foster survey climates that yield high-quality data, a number of universities have adopted policies to coordinate and govern the administration, quality, and timing of student, staff, faculty and alumni surveys. IUN wishes to join other institutions in taking proactive steps to manage campus survey activity through better coordination and scheduling, as well as consultation on survey design and administration procedures.

Policy

Convinced of a pressing need to formalize campus survey coordination and support processes, the Campus Affairs Supercommittee recommends creating and charging an IUN Campus Survey Committee (CSC) with three main activities aimed at fostering a healthy campus survey climate:

1. Coordinate a campus-wide process of registering proposed online surveys and make recommendations on timing and logistics among online surveys to minimize survey conflicts and maximize response rates.
2. Review proposed online surveys and provide recommendations and support for implementing survey research best practices.
3. Maintain the existing IU system online calendar of scheduled surveys and develop and maintain an archive of surveys conducted on our campus.

The Campus-Wide Committee will be housed in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research and chaired by the Assistant VC Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research.

I. Scope of this Policy

The Campus-Wide Survey Policy applies to all of the following:

- Online surveys used for College/School, Vice Chancellor Unit, or campus-wide planning, assessment, or improvement (including surveys conducted by consultants).
- Online surveys administered to the entire IUN community or a significant portion[1] thereof.
- Online surveys administered to University primary population or demographic sub-population – whether a sample or all -- (e.g. faculty, transfer students, students in a College, first-year students, etc.).

The policy does not apply to the following:

- Instructors' surveys of students in their courses.
- Point-of-service satisfaction or evaluation surveys for users of specific services or attendees of specific events.
- Registered Student Organization (RSO) endorsed surveys of their own members.
- Department- or Program- endorsed surveys of their own students, faculty, staff, or alumni.
- Surveys of a finite set of participants in small scale research projects.

If the survey is being conducted by a member of the university system (IUB, IUSB, IUPUI, Etc.) as part of his or her administrative duties, as part of a research project, or as part of a thesis or class assignment, refer to Section II. Surveys conducted by parties external to the System are covered in Section III.

II. Surveys Originating Internally

A. Policies

Campus-wide surveys will be conducted in a manner consistent with ethical considerations and security best practices. Since IUN students, faculty, alumni, and staff will be surveyed, the results will be considered the property of IUN with the expectation that they will be shared appropriately with the campus community. Reasons for not sharing the results of a survey require explanation, which must be submitted to the IUN Campus Survey Committee for review.

Respondent survey data must be kept confidential. Thus, data shared must not include personally identifiable information such as social security number or name and reports using the data must not identify individual respondents (paper, electronic or verbal).

Summary data with small cell sizes must not be reported if it could potentially reveal data about an individual person. In general, at a minimum cell sizes of nine or fewer must not be reported, but depending on the summary report, it may be necessary to set a higher threshold in some cases.

B. Procedures

Following approval of the Institutional Review Board (if applicable), requests to survey a significant portion of IUN students, faculty, alumni, and staff shall be submitted to the CSC for coordination, using the appropriate form. The CSC will maintain a calendar of campus-wide surveys and advise potential surveyors of scheduling conflicts. In addition, the CSC will maintain a database of existing campus-wide surveys. In the case of duplicate efforts, the CSC will provide guidance on the use of currently available data sets.

III. Surveys Originating Externally

A. Policies

The IUN community maintains its rights to privacy, within the limits of the Freedom of Information Act and FERPA. Therefore, surveys of IUN students, faculty, alumni, and staff by external parties will be denied except in cases where a member of the university community is a research collaborator. In those cases, the policies and procedures of Section II will apply.

B. Procedures

In the case of an IUN student, faculty, or staff member receiving a request from an external party to share a survey link with the rest of the campus, they should refer the inquirer to this policy and refuse to forward the survey invitation. If the IUN community member thinks that the survey is valuable, they may request to take part in the survey themselves, or can request to participate as a collaborator. Collaborative research involving campus-wide survey data is encouraged with the understanding that the results will be shared with the campus community. If the external surveyor is in collaboration with a member of the IUN community, then the survey will be considered of internal origin and Section II of this Policy will apply.

Requests for exceptions to this Policy may be made in writing to the CSC for review.

IV. Implementation

Under current IUN email policies the ability to send emails to large portions of the IUN community are granted to a limited number of managers who are responsible for email lists. Additionally, the IUN Daily Redhawk email is monitored by staff in the Office of Marketing and Communications. Therefore, these persons will be trained in this Policy. When they receive a request to send a survey to one of their email lists, they will refer the inquirer to this policy. The requestor can then apply to the CSC, before the committee review deadlines posted on the Institutional Effectiveness webpage, in order to coordinate their survey of the campus.

Survey Approval Timeline

- For fall administration: July 1
- For spring administration: November 1
- For summer administration: March 1

Committee recommendations should be made within a month of the submission deadline. For late submissions or special cases, exceptions to this timeline can be made on a case-by-case basis.

The Office of University Advancement and External Affairs maintains the official list of alumni and their contact information, so units must contact them in order to survey alumni. This office will coordinate survey requests with the Campus Survey Committee, following the procedures described in this Policy.

Questions related to this Policy may be addressed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research.

Appendix: FAQs

What is a “campus-wide” survey?

A survey of any group or unit within the IUN community which represents a significant portion (at least 10%) of the population or goes beyond the unit level (e.g. “all first year students” would include undergraduate freshmen from all units, and so this Policy would apply).

What is “cell size”?

A reporting cell is the sub-group of a particular identifier, such as academic major. If only 9 students respond to your survey from a particular major, then reporting those responses at the level of major could jeopardize the privacy of those respondents' answers. Standard practice is to only report cell sizes of 10 or greater.

What is the difference between "anonymity" and "confidentiality"?

Anonymity means that you will not be able to identify the source of the response to your survey, which is desirable when dealing with sensitive subjects. But even a supposedly anonymous online survey could be traced to an individual through their IP address, thus compromising the anonymity. Most survey data should be viewed as confidential, meaning that the results will be guarded. Raw results should not be made public.

What is a "data management plan?"

In order to maintain the confidentiality of your research subjects, raw data needs to be stored in a secure manner. Additionally, you need a plan for how the data will be archived at the completion of the project. If you have questions about best practices for data management, contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research. For questions related to the technical aspects of data security (servers, software, passwords, etc.) please contact UITS.

Attachment 6:

Resolution for Extension of Super-Committee Trial Period

(See the following pages)

Resolution Re:Extension of Super-Committee Trial

Background

Whereas the Faculty Organization voted in April of 2020 to engage in a trial reorganization of its standing committees for the 20/21 academic year.

Rationale

And whereas the trial reorganization into 3 super-committees (Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Student and Campus Affairs) has yielded some benefits in service coordination and productivity but has also met with some challenges such as difficulty staffing some committees..

Resolution

The Faculty Organization extends the trial reorganization through the 21/22 academic year with the following stipulations:

- Based on feedback from this year's co-chairs, The Student and Campus Affairs Super Committee shall be divided into the Student Affairs Super-Committee (Admissions, Retention, Scholarship, International Affairs) and the Campus Affairs Super-Committee (Budget, Facilities, Security, Administrative Review).
- Based on feedback from this year's co-chairs, the Diversity and Inclusion Committee shall be assigned a single chair and be seated in the Faculty Affairs Super-committee.
- Based on feedback from this year's chairs, these committees shall be assigned proportional representation (3 COAS, 2 CHHS, 1 all other units) by the President at the beginning of the academic year:
    - All-Campus Survey and Curriculum (AA)
    - Assessment (AA)
    - Grants (FA)
    - Scholarship (SA)
- Based on feedback from this year's chairs, these committees shall be assigned normal membership (1 member per unit) by the President
    - Budget (CA)
    - Community Engagement (FA)
    - Constitutional Review (FA)
    - Diversity and Inclusion (FA)
    - Facilities (CA)
    - Library (AA)
    - Writing Across Curriculum (AA)
- All other committees will be assigned a chair and will be assigned additional members as needed.
- The Constitutional Review Committee will draft a constitutional amendment that would formalize the Super-Committee structure for consideration by the faculty before the end of the 21/22 academic year.

- The President will work with the Super-Committee co-chairs to create a Super-Committee handbook to support smooth governance moving forward.

Approval Path

Drafted by Mark Baer, President
Exec Com - approved with feedback, April 2, 2021
Fac Org - For Consideration April 16, 2021