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Scope

This document is the IU School of Nursing interpretation of campus and university policies concerning the appointment and review of academic appointees. This document is relevant for the Faculty Assembly which includes the IUPUI and Bloomington campuses core faculty. The guidelines included here are adjunctive and supplementary to rules, regulations, and information contained in the Indiana University Academic Handbook, IUPUI Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification, and the Indiana University School of Nursing Policies and Procedures. All individuals holding academic appointments are expected to familiarize themselves with information in these documents.

Reason for Policy

When an applicant for a faculty position is being offered rank above entry level, the APT Committee of the Faculty Assembly will conduct a review. The request for appointment review and for obtaining information to be used in the review is the responsibility of the Coordinator for Human Resources in the School of Nursing. Upon receiving a request from the Coordinator for Human Resources, the Chair of the Unit APT committees (primary APT committee and school APT committee) assigns a primary and secondary reviewer to review the candidate’s credentials. The reviewers are provided with the documentation for each rank as outlined above.
Policy Statement

IUSON observes the mandated university annual review policy for all faculty (see IUPUI Faculty Guide). IU Policy ACA-21 states that each faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor or below and each librarian at the rank of Associate Librarian or below shall be reviewed annually under procedures adopted by the faculty within the department, school, program or division or library unit in which the individual holds his or her appointment. This review is normally conducted by the department chairperson or the principal administrative officer of the unit in which the faculty member reports. The annual performance of each faculty member shall use a multidimensional approach that addresses teaching, research/scholarship, and service, as appropriate for appointment.

Each calendar year IUSON faculty members are required to complete and submit documents to facilitate the annual review.

Procedures

See Annual Review Policy See Annual Review Form

Review Process
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1. Introduction

This document is the IU School of Nursing interpretation of campus and university policies concerning the appointment and review of academic appointees. This document is relevant for the Faculty Assembly which includes the IUPUI and Bloomington campuses. The guidelines included here are adjunctive and supplementary to rules, regulations, and information contained in the Indiana University Academic Handbook, IUPUI Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, and the Indiana University School of Nursing Policies and Procedures. All individuals holding academic appointments are expected to familiarize themselves with information in these documents.

The following sections A to G provide context and background information for parts II and III of this document.

1. A Academic Appointments

Academic appointments at IUSON follow IU policy ACA14 Classification of Academic Appointments and the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification. This policy provides classification titles and definitions for all possible types of faculty appointments including tenure-track, non-tenure track, and specialist and non-specialist appointments. It also contains additional comments on acting, visiting, and adjunct appointments. Non-tenure track faculty are ineligible for tenure or tenure-probationary status.

1. B Review Types

Information from all reviews is used for faculty development and reappointment decisions. There are eight different types of reviews carried out at IUSON: (1) appointment, (2) annual, (3) third-year, (4) fourth-year (when recommended), (5) promotion, (6) tenure, (7) reappointment, and (8) dismissal. Annual reviews cover only the prior year and may take place in conjunction with other reviews such as third-year, fourth-year, promotion, tenure, and reappointment reviews.

Reviews differ for tenure and non-tenure track faculty as shown below:

| Table 1. Differences in Applicable Reviews for Tenure and Non-Tenure Track Faculty |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                        | Appointment                      | 3rd Year/pre-promotion | 4th Year | Promotion | Tenure | Reappointment | Dismissal |
| Tenure track                           |                                 |                    |          |           |        |               |           |
| Tenure probationary rank               | √                                 | √                  | √         | √         | √       | √               |           |
| Tenured ranks                          | √                                 |                    |           |           |        | √               |           |
| Non-tenure tracks                      |                                 |                    |          |           |        |               |           |
| Lecturer ranks                         | √                                 | √*                 |           |           |        | √               |           |
| Clinical ranks                         | √                                 | √*                 |           |           |        | √               |           |
*A pre-promotion review is recommended but not mandatory. The pre-promotion review should be conducted within two years prior to promotion review. There is no set timeline for promotion on non-tenure tracks and accordingly, the timing of the pre-promotion review will vary. The pre-promotion review follows the same process as the tenure track 3rd year review.

Academic qualifications for clinical teaching and service (professional and citizenship) in each rank of Lecturer through Professor closely parallel those set forth for tenured and tenure-probationary faculty in the School; thus, non-tenure track faculty are subject to the same policy and procedures for appointment review, annual administrative review, promotion review, and termination or reappointment review as tenured and tenure-probationary faculty.

A more detailed description of each of these reviews is contained in Section 2 of this document. An overview of responsibilities for candidates (appointees being reviewed) and reviewing units is described in Section 3 of this document.

I. C Reviewing Units

At IUSON, there are two administrative reviewing units and two peer reviewing units. Not all units participate in all reviews. When Bloomington faculty are mentioned, reviews will be carried out by both Department Chair and IUB or IUFW Associate Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Reviewing Units</th>
<th>Department Chair/ IUB Campus Administrator</th>
<th>IUPUI Candidates – this level of review is prepared by the Department Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IUB candidates – this level of review is jointly prepared by the Department Chair and the IUB Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IUFW candidates – this level of review is jointly prepared by the Department Chair and the IUFW Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Reviewing Units</td>
<td>Primary Committee</td>
<td>As elected by the Faculty Assembly (See Faculty Assembly Constitution &amp; Bylaws)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee</td>
<td>As elected by the Faculty Assembly (See Faculty Assembly Constitution &amp; Bylaws)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. D Confidentiality of Reviews

All material considered in all reviews, aspects of the review process, and outcomes of those reviews are confidential. Peer-reviewing units conduct all committee meetings for discussion and voting on candidate materials in person. All peer-reviewing unit committee meetings are scheduled in advance on the master calendar and held on the IUPUI campus. Virtual
attendance at committee meetings via telephone or videoconferencing does not meet campus standards and should be avoided. Under rare occasions and with the endorsement of the ADAO, telephone or videoconferencing may be allowed. MOVI has been confirmed as a confidential method. The standard for in person meetings is an expectation that is set by the IUPUI campus and reflects the need for careful consideration, quality deliberations, and confidential voting on these important matters of appointment and review.

During the review process dossiers are retained electronically in the office of the ADAO and only members of the primary and unit APT committees, the Department Chair and SON Dean will have access to the electronic dossier. The administrative support person for the ADAO will facilitate electronic access to those authorized to review the candidates for promotion and tenure.

Information from all reviews and recommendations are kept on file in limited access, electronic, confidential departmental and/or ADAO files.

I. E Reviewing Bodies Involved and Order of Multi-Stage Reviews
Of the eight different types of reviews carried out at IUSON, several occur in multiple stages including (1) appointment, (2) third-year, (3) fourth-year (when recommended), (4) promotion, (5) tenure, (6) reappointment, and (7) dismissal. The parties involved in these multi-stage reviews are outlined below in the order in which they complete the review.

| Table 3. Reviewing Bodies Involved and Order of Multi-Stage Reviews |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Appointment     | 3rd Year and    | 4th Year        | Promotion       | Tenure          | Reappointment   | Dismissal       |
| Primary Committee                          | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               |                 |
| Department Chair, IUB or IUFW Campus Administrator | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               |
| APT Committee                                | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               |                 |
| Dean                                         | ✓               |                 | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               |                 |
| IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee         |                 | ✓               | ✓               | ✓               |                 |                 |
| IUPUI Chief Academic Officer and IUPUI Chancellor | ✓¹            |                 |                 |                 | ✓²              |                 |
| University President                        | ✓               |                 | ✓               |                 |                 |                 |
| Board of Trustees                            | ✓               |                 | ✓               |                 |                 |                 |

¹IUPUI Chancellor and only reviews new appointments with tenure, does not review new appointments of research associates/scientists/scholars/postdocs.

²IUPUI Chancellor reviews all non-reappointments of tenure track, lecturer, clinical track and formal notice to the individual comes from Chancellor’s office (this is part of the reappointment cycle, and FAA handles the transmission of forms to the Chancellor).
1. F. Handoffs during Multi-Stage Reviews
The multi-stage review processes in Table 3 requires appropriate feedback to candidates and handoff of completed reviews from one reviewing unit to another. The handoff processes are described below.

1. F.1 Appointment Reviews
   1. The Dean requests an appointment review be completed by the APT Committee.
   2. The APT Committee Chair assigns two committee members of appropriate rank and track to review the candidate.
   3. The reviewers complete a written summary and return it to the APT Committee Chair who submits it and a summary form to the Dean.
   4. The Dean ensures all other levels of review receive the appropriate documentation.

1. F.2 Third-, Pre-promotion, and Fourth-Year Reviews
   **Primary Committee**
   1. Following committee review, the chair (or co-chair) presents the written summary to the candidate **in person** with the Department Chair also in attendance. For IUB and IUFW, the campus administrator (IUB or IUFW Associate Dean) is also present with the Department Chair and candidate.
   2. Once the review is signed by the candidate and committee chair (or co-chair), it is forwarded to the Associate Dean for Academic Operations (ADAO).
   3. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who makes it available to the next level of review.
   4. Department Chair/Campus Administrator (IUB or IUFW)
   5. Following review, the chair/administrator presents the written summary to the candidate **in person**.
   6. Once the review is signed by the candidate and administrator, it is forwarded to the ADAO.
   7. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who makes it available to the next level of review.

   **APT Committee**
   1. Following committee review, the chair (or co-chair) presents the written summary to the candidate **in person** with the Department Chair also in attendance. For IUB and IUFW, the campus administrator (IUB or IUFW Associate Dean) is also present with the Department Chair and candidate.
   2. Once the review is signed by the candidate and committee chair (or co-chair), it is forwarded to the ADAO.
   3. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who submits the materials to the IUPUI Executive Associate Dean of Faculty.

1. F.3 Promotion and Tenure Reviews
   **Primary Committee**
   1. Following committee review, the chair (or co-chair) presents the written summary to the candidate **in person** with the Department Chair also in attendance. For IUB and IUFW,
the campus administrator (IUB or IUFW Associate Dean) is also present with the
Department Chair and candidate.
2. Once the review is signed by the candidate and committee chair (or co-chair), it is
forwarded to the Associate Dean for Academic Operations (ADAO).
3. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who makes it available to the next level of
review.
4. Department Chair/Campus Administrator (IUB or IUFW Associate Dean)
   a. Following review, the chair/administrator presents the written summary to the
candidate in person.
   b. Once the review is signed by the candidate and administrator, it is forwarded to the
   ADAO.
   c. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who makes it available to the next level
   of review.

APT Committee

1. Following committee review, the chair (or co-chair) presents the written summary to the
candidate in person with the Department Chair also in attendance. For IUB and IUFW,
the campus administrator (IUB or IUFW Associate Dean) is also present with the
Department Chair and candidate.
   a. Once the review is signed by the candidate and committee chair (or co-chair), it is
forwarded to the ADAO
   b. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who makes it available to the next level
of review.
2. University Dean
   a. Following Dean review, the Dean presents the written summary to the candidate in
person. The signed review is forwarded to the ADAO who makes it available to the
next level of review.
3. IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee
4. IUPUI Dean of the Faculties and IUPUI Chancellor
5. University Vice President for Academic Affairs
6. University President
7. University Board of Trustees

I. F.4 Reappointments
The Department Chair provides written documentation to the Dean who works with the Chair to
ensure all other levels of review receive the appropriate documentation. For IUB and IUFW, the
campus administrator (IUB or IUFW Associate Dean) is also involved with the Department Chair
and candidate.

2. Overview of Review Types
Section II contains a summary of the timing, purpose, and persons and/or committees involved
in relation to all stages of the 8 review types introduced in section I.

2. A Appointment Review
Applications for entry level academic positions of either track (tenure or non-tenure) are
reviewed by the Search and Screen Committee and recommended to administration for
consideration. Entry-level applicants may be asked to interview with faculty, department chairs or administrators and may be requested to make an academic presentation to faculty. At the completion of the review process, entry-level faculty may be offered a position by administration upon the recommendation of the Search and Screen Committee.

When an applicant for a faculty position is being offered rank above entry level, the APT Committee of the Faculty Assembly will conduct a review. The request for appointment review and for obtaining information to be used in the review is the responsibility of the Coordinator for Human Resources in the School of Nursing. Upon receiving a request from the Coordinator for Human Resources, the Chair of the Unit APT committee assigns a primary and secondary reviewer to review the candidate’s credentials. The reviewers are provided with the documentation for each rank as outlined above.

The reviewers use the University APT criteria to write a short synopsis of their conclusions and recommend the appropriate rank and tenure status. If the documentation provided to the APT committee is not sufficient to make a recommendation, the APT committee may request that the Coordinator for Human Services request additional documentation. The requested information shall be limited to one additional page.

The reviewers forward their recommendations to the APT chair who completes the Appointment Recommendation Form and a short summary of the reviewers’ recommendations (See Appointment Review Form). The Appointment Recommendation Form is forwarded to the Coordinator of Human Services who forwards it to the Dean.

Consistent with campus policy on faculty appointments (see the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification), applicants submit the following materials for APT review. Cover sheets outlining the required documentation are available at the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification.

**Required Documentation for Tenure Track or Tenured Appointments**

A. Tenure Track Appointments:
   1. Curriculum vitae
   2. Three external letters of reference (waived for candidates who have been employed in faculty role involving teaching, research, and professional service, by a school on the IUPUI campus for a year or longer and whose initial appointment included review of external letters)
   3. A 2-page personal statement outlining achievements and goals in teaching, research, and service
   4. A minimum of two examples of scholarship (e.g., articles, manuscripts, book chapters)

B. Tenured Appointments:
   1. Items 1-4 from Section A
   2. Brief biographical sketch of referees and indication of relationship to Candidate
   3. An additional three (for a total of six) external letters or recommendations, all of which include evaluation of teaching and research achievements

**Required Documentation for Non-tenure Related or Probationary Appointments**

A. Clinical Appointments:
1. Curriculum vitae
2. Three internal or external letters of reference (waived for candidates who have been employed in faculty role involving teaching, research, and professional service, by a school on the IUPUI campus for a year or longer and whose initial appointment included review of external letters)
3. A 2-page personal statement outlining achievements and goals in teaching and service, including a description of teaching/service outcomes and impact
4. A minimum of two examples of scholarship (e.g., articles, manuscripts, book chapters)

B. Lecturer Appointments:
1. Items 1 and 2 from Section A
2. A 2-page statement of philosophy of teaching, including a description of teaching outcomes and impact
3. Peer review of teaching if not addressed by letters of reference

C. Research Professor or Scientist/Scholar Ranks:
1. Items 1 and 2 from Section A
2. A 2-page statement of research goals/plans
3. Peer review of research if not addressed by letters of reference.

D. Academic Specialist Appointments:
1. Items 1 and 2 from Section A
2. A 2-page statement of academic work
3. Peer review of capacity for proposed work, if not addressed by letters of reference

2. B Annual Reviews
IUSON observes the mandated university annual review policy for all faculty (see IUPUI Faculty Guide). IU Policy ACA-21 states that each faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor or below and each librarian at the rank of Associate Librarian or below shall be reviewed annually under procedures adopted by the faculty within the department, school, program or division or library unit in which the individual holds his or her appointment. This review is normally conducted by the Department Chair, IUB or iUFW Campus Administrator in which the faculty member holds an appointment. The annual performance of each faculty member shall use a multidimensional approach that addresses teaching, research/scholarship, and service, as appropriate for appointment.

The purpose of the annual review is to provide input on the faculty member’s progress in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, leading to tenure review, reappointment, or promotion decisions. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments. To be most beneficial to the faculty member, these reviews should be candid and critical appraisals of the faculty member’s work, and should call attention to weaknesses as well as strengths. (See Annual Review Form)

These annual reviews will provide feedback to faculty regarding his/her performance; facilitate faculty development; prevent difficulties; and if necessary, provide notice to faculty whose performance is below normal expectation for rank or future promotion and/or tenure.

- Tenure-track and tenured ranks are reviewed in 3 areas: teaching, research, and service. Tenured and tenure-probationary faculty should normally excel in at least one of
the areas and be at least satisfactory in the others. In exceptional cases, a faculty member may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University.

- Non-tenure track clinical and lecturer ranks are reviewed in 2 areas: teaching and service. Although faculty in these ranks may be involved in research or creative activities, their primary responsibilities are clinical teaching and service (professional and citizenship). Clinical rank faculty are not expected to do individual research. Non-tenure track faculty should normally excel in one of the areas and be at least satisfactory in the other.
- Non-tenure track Scientist rank faculty are reviewed in research only. They are not expected to do teaching unless negotiated with the Department Chair.

The department chair (jointly with IUB or IUFW Associate Dean) meets with each full-time faculty member annually to review progress.

2. B.1 Annual Review Procedures
   1. **Orientation:** The procedure for the annual Faculty Performance Review is provided and discussed with all new faculty at the time of orientation and a packet of review forms is distributed.

   2. **Submitting Documents:** In December the Dean’s Office sends an email to each faculty member outlining the materials required to be completed, submission deadlines, and to whom the materials need to be provided and number of copies. The requested documents include:

   a) **Faculty Annual Summary Report:** An electronic report is available to the faculty member throughout the year for updating and previous year’s reports.

   b) **Individual Development Plan:** Each faculty member should have an individual development plan that reflects their annual and long-term (3 & 5 year) goals with strategies for achieving them. A summary of accomplishments of the past year’s goals and goals for the upcoming years should be kept up to date by the faculty member and shared with the department chair.

      i) **Evaluation of Teaching:** See the current [Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](#).

      ii) **Evaluation of Research:** See the current [Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](#).

      iii) **Evaluation of Service:** See the current [Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](#).

   c) **Curriculum Vitae:** Faculty members need to use the current format identified in the current [Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](#).

3. **Chairperson/Administrator Role in the Review:** This review incorporates information from the above sources in order to provide a comprehensive profile of the faculty member’s efforts over the previous year.

   a) Guidance on relevant areas of the Annual Administrative Review Summary Form to be
completed for each individual may be found in the IUPUI Chief Academic Officers Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers. The table title Summary of Areas of Excellence and Expectations for Various Faculty Categories is particularly relevant.

b) Together, the chairperson/administrator and the faculty member summarize the progress towards goals, end-of-calendar-year evaluation of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, and set goals for next year.

c) At the annual review meeting, the chairperson/administrator and faculty complete the comments and both sign and retain a copy of the review.

2. C Third-Year Review (Tenure-probationary) and Pre-promotion review (Non-tenure track)
The third year review applies to tenure-probationary faculty. In addition to the annual review by the chair which covers only the previous year, a detailed review of all tenure-probationary faculty is conducted in the third year of a faculty member’s appointment. The purpose of the third-year review is to provide feedback from the school regarding the candidate’s cumulative progress in meeting the university standards for promotion and tenure. The third year review follows the IUPUI P&T Guidelines to include a written assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure. (See Third-Year Review Form)

The pre-promotion review applies to non-tenure track faculty. In addition to the annual review by the chair which covers only the previous year, a detailed review of all non-tenure track faculty in advance of their seeking promotion. The exact timing of this review varies but should be conducted no more than two years in advance of when the faculty candidate intends to seek promotion. The purpose of the pre-promotion review is to provide feedback from the school regarding the candidate’s cumulative progress in meeting the university standards for promotion. The pre-promotion review follows the format of the third year review.

The reviewing bodies and order of review were outlined in Section 1.E. If problems are identified at any level, the summary at that level must include specific suggestions for remedy aimed at helping the faculty member and the faculty member’s department or unit in their efforts to rectify the problems. If one or more areas of inadequate progress are identified at any level, the summary at that level must include recommendation for a fourth year review. These actions are consistent with the IUPUI Supplement to the Indiana University Academic Handbook (Approved May 4, 2010; updated yearly and archived on July 1st.)

2. D Fourth-Year Review (only when recommended or requested by faculty)
The fourth year review applies only to tenure-probationary faculty who were recommended for this level of review during their third-year review. The purpose of the fourth-year review is to provide feedback from the school regarding the candidate’s cumulative progress in meeting the university standards for promotion and tenure. The fourth year review follows the IUPUI P&T Guidelines to include a written assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure. Continuing faculty appointment may be influenced by the outcomes of the review and the resulting recommendations. (See Fourth-Year Review Form)
The reviewing bodies and order of review were outlined in Section 1.E. If the candidate declines the opportunity to participate in a fourth year review, the department chair would notify the ADAO.

2. E Tenure Review
The tenure review applies only to tenure-probationary faculty. The tenure review follows the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

IU policy ACA-37 Faculty and Librarian Tenure also governs tenure review (see Policy Statement and History). This policy discusses the principle of tenure, that only individuals who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents be appointed to tenured positions, the tenure-probationary period and lengths of tenure-probationary appointments, procedures for faculty to advance to tenured status, geographic limitations of tenure, and criteria for tenure. (See Tenure Review Form)

The IUPUI P&T Guidelines govern the reconsideration process for candidates who wish to seek reconsideration of tenure review decisions.

2. F Promotion Review
The promotion review applies to all faculty below the ‘full’ appointment level. The promotion review criteria, review process and responsibilities are governed by the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. (See Promotion Review Form). Additional campus criteria and review procedures are available for appointment as Chancellor’s Professor (IUPUI) or Distinguished Professor (IU).

For tenure-track academic appointments, the promotion process is also governed by IU policy ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions (see Scope and Policy Statement). This policy includes procedures for recommendations for promotion and criteria for promotion in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. Additional school specific criteria are used during all stages of promotion review. Please see Appendix E Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence – Tenure-track.

For non-tenure track academic appointments, the promotion process is also governed by IU policy ACA-18 Regulation of Clinical and Lecture. This policy governs the process for the promotion review of non-visiting, non-tenure track faculty. Additional school specific criteria are used during all stages of promotion review. Please see Appendix D Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence – Clinical Track.

IUPUI P&T Guidelines govern the reconsideration process for candidates who wish to seek reconsideration of promotion review decisions.

Time in rank: IUPUI P&T guidelines state: “In most instances, the work being assessed as the basis for promotion or tenure will have been completed since either the initial appointment or last promotion. In many cases, it is understood that national reputation depends, in part, on foundational work that may have occurred earlier in the candidate’s career.” Clarification from campus authorities is as follows: For promotion, any work completed in rank, for example, at an assistant level (visiting, clinical, tenure-track, and scientist) at a prior institution or at IUPUI is considered “in rank”. Promotion is recognition for in-rank achievement. For tenure, the candidate’s entire academic record is considered including any academic appointment/rank at other institution(s) and IUPUI; trajectory, productivity and contribution/achievement record are metrics used to determine the award of tenure. The candidate does need to recognize that
IUPUI is the institution that will be conferring promotion and tenure, so it is understandable that recent work and what has been accomplished/contributed here are important considerations in the decision-making process. The candidate certainly can address how their national reputation has evolved from earlier work and how they have continued to expand their lines of inquiry and scholarship in rank as well as from the beginning of their academic career. This is one of the challenges in crafting an effective statement and describing one’s academic journey.

2. G Reappointment Review
Non-tenure track and tenure-probationary faculty may have a contract for a specified period of time on the basis of excellence in their declared area. Non-tenure track faculty shall be considered for promotion review when they apply for promotion and their dossiers indicate they are eligible to meet the criteria for the desired rank.

The reappointment recommendation is a written form of review. After the period of initial appointment, reappointment is considered annually until the end of the probationary period, and thereafter, for non-tenured faculty, at intervals one year prior to the end of a multi-year appointment. Most schools base reappointment recommendations on the annual review, but faculty subject to annual reappointment should become familiar with the procedures followed in their respective units. (See Reappointment Review Form)

IU Policy ACA-22 Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period govern the process for all faculty (see Policy Statement and History). This policy includes information on terms of initial appointment, annual review, notice requirements, review of decisions of non-reappointment.

3. Overview of Responsibilities

3.1 Candidate Responsibilities
Faculty members being reviewed (candidates) responsibilities during the various review processes are delineated below.

3.1.1 Know the expectations
Faculty members should familiarize themselves with all materials related to promotion and tenure. At appointment, all faculty shall be given electronic access to receive the most recent policies in the copies of the Indiana University Academic Handbook, the School of Nursing Policies and Procedures, IUPUI P&T Guidelines, as well as this document (Guidelines for Appointment and Review of Tenure Track, Tenured, and Non-Tenured Faculty). It is important that the candidate read and follow all guidelines for the School of Nursing and the IUPUI campus.

3.1.2 Declare an area of excellence
Tenure-probationary and non-tenure track faculty are encouraged to make a tentative decision on area of excellence at time of appointment and a more definite decision in the first year of appointment. This decision should be made by faculty members in consultation with the department chair and the scholarly mentor assigned to tenure probationary faculty. Tenure-probationary faculty and research scientists are encouraged to meet with the Associate Dean.
for Research during the first year to discuss their future research plans. Research scientists will
need to declare excellence in research.

### 3.1.3 Assemble review materials
The candidate is responsible for maintaining a current curriculum vitae detailing all
accomplishments and following the IUPUI required format assembling materials or developing a
dossier for all reviews (see [IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Resources](#)). Candidates should work
with the department chair, or IUB or IUFW Associate Dean, or designee in the development of
materials for all reviews. The candidate should realize that incomplete or poorly prepared
materials or dossier can have a negative effect on reviewers. All faculty are strongly advised to
attend school and campus workshops on promotion and tenure.

When materials are submitted for review, the candidate signs the curriculum vitae to indicate
he/she is taking full responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of all materials.

During the promotion and/or tenure process, if there are any changes made to any materials in
the dossier or if any materials are added to the dossier, candidates and all previous reviewers
must be provided an opportunity to comment on or to respond to such additions. The added
information and the responses will then become a part of the dossier. The administrative
support person for the ADAO will assist with electronic submission of all materials for the
dossier following university/campus guidelines.

### 3.1.4 Participate fully in the review feedback
Candidates are expected to attend in-person all meetings where they will be receiving review
feedback. In addition, candidates must sign all written summary evaluations from all reviews
before the evaluation is filed. Signing an evaluation indicates only that the candidate has read
the evaluation. Signing does not indicate concurrence with the evaluation. Candidates will be
notified of any material or evaluations added to their dossier by the ADAO. The candidate may
respond in writing to the written evaluations by any reviewing unit; the written response shall
become a part of the candidate's permanent file or dossier. Furthermore, in all reviews, the
candidate has the responsibility to use the summary evaluations, advice, and recommendations
of the reviewing unit to improve or sustain his or her performance.

### 3.1.5 Pace Yourself
The candidate’s responsibilities in years 1 to 6 of the promotion and tenure process are outlined
in the [IUPUI P&T Guidelines](#).

**Tenure probationary faculty** must promote within the 7 year time frame or risk dismissal.
Tenure probationary candidate responsibilities by year are below.

1. First Year
   a. connects with faculty mentor and arranges for monthly meetings with the mentor
   b. obtains electronic access to [Indiana University School of Nursing Policies and
      Procedures](#)
   c. reads [Indiana University Academic Handbook](#) on policies and procedures for
      promotion and tenure
   d.
   e. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   f. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/campus administrator
2. Second Year
   a. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   b. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/campus administrator
   c. meets with Associate Dean for Research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   d. submits materials for annual review

3. Third Year
   a. consults with mentor, department chair/campus administrator in preparation of dossier for third-year review; submits third-year CV, personal statement and evidence of scholarship dossier; participates in receiving all levels of third-year review feedback
   b. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   c. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator
   d. meets with Associate Dean for Research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   e. submits materials for annual review

4. Fourth Year
   a. consults with mentor, department chair/ campus administrator in preparation of dossier for fourth-year review (when recommended); submits fourth-year CV, personal statement and evidence of scholarship dossier; participates in receiving all levels of fourth-year review feedback
   b. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   c. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator
   d. meets with Associate Dean for Research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   e. submits materials for annual review

5. Fifth Year
   a. consults with mentor, department chair/campus administrator in preparation of all dossier materials needed for promotion, Submits materials for external reviewers by Feb 1st
   b. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   c. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator
   d. meets with Associate Dean for Research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   e. submits materials for annual review

6. Sixth Year
   a. participates in receiving all levels of promotion review feedback
   b. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator
   c. meets with Associate Dean for Research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   d. submits materials for annual review

7. Seventh Year
   a. promotion, if granted, is effective 7/1 of the seventh year
b. tenure, if granted, is effective 7/1 of the eighth year

c. consults with mentor, department chair/campus administrator in preparation of first sabbatical application; submits sabbatical application

d. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator

e. meets with Associate Dean for Research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans

f. submits materials for annual review

Tenured faculty seeking promotion are not under any time constraints for promotion from tenured Associate to Full Professor. Candidate responsibilities by year are similar to those detailed below for non-tenure track faculty.

Non-tenure track faculty (e.g., clinical, lecturers, scientists) are not under time constraints for promotion. Candidate responsibilities by year are described below.

1. Two years prior to submission of promotion materials
   a. connects with faculty mentor and arranges for monthly meetings with the mentor
   b. obtains electronic access to Indiana University School of Nursing Policies and Procedures
   c. reads Indiana University Academic Handbook on policies and procedures for promotion and tenure
   d. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   e. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/campus administrator
   f. meets with Department Chair and/or Associate Dean for Research to discuss scholarship
   g. submits materials for annual review

2. One year prior to submission of promotion materials:
   a. consults with mentor, department chair/campus administrator in preparation of dossier for pre-promotion review; submits pre-promotion CV, personal statement and evidence of scholarship dossier; participates in receiving all levels of pre-promotion review feedback
   b. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   c. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator
   d. meets with Department Chair and/or Associate Dean for Research to discuss scholarship
   e. submits materials for annual review

3. Year name submitted to Department Chair as someone wanting to go up for promotion
   a. consults with mentor, department chair/campus administrator in preparation of all dossier materials needed for promotion, Submits names of external reviewers to Department Chair by Oct 1st, Submits materials for external reviewers by Feb 1st, submits dossier by July 1st.
   b. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   c. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ campus administrator
   d. submits materials for annual review
3.2 Associate Dean of Academic Operations’ (ADAO) Responsibilities

The ADAO is responsible for providing support and guidance for candidates, administrative reviewing units, and peer reviewing units and for administrative and procedural tasks at all levels of review except the annual reviews. To support all levels of review at IUSON, the ADAO will:

1. Ensure the most current written description of the SON’s expectations for excellence in each area (teaching, research, and service) for tenure or promotion to associate and full rank is on file with IUPUI FAA. These documents need to be approved by the Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs Committee via the faculty governance process and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for compliance with campus expectations.

2. Work with Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs Committee via the faculty governance process to ensure guidelines, policies, and procedures remain up to date and faculty are elected to peer-reviewing bodies consistent with Faculty Assembly Constitution & Bylaws.
   a. Annual review of school promotion criteria;
   b. Annual review of the guidelines contained in this document;
   c. Annual review of the protocol for soliciting external assessment letters including letters to reviewers tailored on the type of review being solicited;
   d. Annual review of timelines for third-year review, fourth-year review, promotion, and tenure reviews.

3. Distribute review timelines to administrative and peer reviewing units and candidates within IUSON by August 1 of each year.

4. Ensure compliance with all review requirements.

5. Ensure the candidate receives fair and equitable treatment during the review process.

6. Ensure that completed reviews are submitted to appropriate campus bodies as necessary.

7. Ensure that the database for tracking faculty through the various review processes is up to date at least twice yearly (and more often as needed).

8. Ensure that all tenure probationary candidates and candidates for promotion in the tenured and non-tenured ranks receive information about campus and school sponsored promotion and/or tenure workshops.

For promotion and/or tenure reviews, the ADAO at IUSON assumes some of the responsibilities delineated in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines as “Department Chair (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline” because IUSON is a core school. In addition to the above responsibilities, the ADAO will:

1. Obtain a list of external reviewers from the Department Chair and be responsible for soliciting letters from external, “arm’s length” reviewers as appropriate to the various levels of review (appointment, promotion, tenure) as outlined in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines including soliciting reviewers, distributing materials to reviewers, notifying reviewers of a change in the candidate’s area of excellence, instructing candidates not to contact external reviewers, collecting completed reviews, and uploading completed reviews into the dossier. (See sample letters for the initial contact making the request and the instruction letter sent to each reviewer with the dossiers.)
2. Solicit letters from IUSON, campus, and university colleagues on behalf of candidates as appropriate to the various levels of review.

3. In a tenure case, at the first level where there have been negative votes discuss the candidate’s right and process for reconsideration as outlined in the [IUPUI P&T Guidelines](#). This must be done in a timely manner and prior to the next level of review.

### 3.3 Department Chair Responsibilities

The Department Chair is responsible for providing support and guidance for faculty during all types of reviews. Pertinent to all levels of review, the Department Chair will:

1. Ensure compliance with all review requirements.
2. Ensure the candidate receives fair and equitable treatment during the review process.
3. Ensure that completed reviews are submitted to the ADAO as appropriate.
4. Inform the ADAO of candidates requiring various levels of review.
5. Assume primary responsibility for conducting the annual reviews ([Annual Review Form](#)). See section above.
6. Assume primary responsibility for conducting the reappointment reviews ([Reappointment Review Form](#)).
   a. Reappointment reviews take place in the clinical rank faculty’s last year of appointment term, which is determined in the letter of official appointment. The purpose of the review is: to evaluate (excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory or unsatisfactory) the candidate's current progress in clinical teaching and service (professional and citizenship);
   b. The candidate consults with the department chair and campus administrator (if IUB or IUFW) in the preparation of all materials to be considered in reappointment reviews. The candidate is responsible for submitting the materials to the department chair/campus administrator by the specified time. One copy of each reappointment review shall be sent by the department chair/campus administrator to the ADAO and the University Dean. The reappointment review summary shall be placed in a secure central academic administrative file and the department chair will complete campus reappointment forms and forward to the ADAO.
7. Assume primary responsibility for conducting the dismissal reviews ([Dismissal Review Form](#)).

For promotion and/or tenure reviews, the Department Chair assumes all other responsibilities not assigned above to the ADAO and as delineated in the [IUPUI P&T Guidelines](#) under the heading “Department Chair (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline”. The Chair may work with the IUB or IUFW Campus Administrator for IUB and IUFW candidates. An example form for evaluation journal stature/dissemination outlets is included in [Appendix I](#).

### 3.4 Primary Committee’s Responsibilities

The Primary Committee is involved in only a subset of reviews at IUSON: third-year or pre-promotion, fourth-year, tenure, and promotion. The responsibilities are delineated under the heading “Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committee Responsibilities” in the [IUPUI P&T Guidelines](#). Also in the guidelines are the responsibilities during the reconsideration process.
3.5 APT Committee’s Responsibilities

The APT Committee participates in appointment reviews for candidates seeking appointment above entry level. The committee responsibilities are delineated above in section 2.A.

The APT Committee is also involved in third-year or pre-promotion, fourth-year, tenure, and promotion reviews. The responsibilities are delineated under the heading “Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committee Responsibilities” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. Also in the guidelines are the responsibilities during the reconsideration process.

3.6 Dean’s Responsibilities

Appointment Reviews: Prior to appointment of all faculty (tenure-eligible and clinical rank) and research scientists, the University Dean seeks and receives a recommendation from the APT Committee regarding the candidate’s rank and tenure status. As noted in the Indiana University Academic Handbook (1997, p. 43) (ACA-12 General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments and ACA-14 Classification of Academic Appointments) academic faculty are appointed to the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Rank and tenure status are based on the experience and accomplishments of each individual faculty member. Tenure may be conferred at the time of appointment or the probationary period can be for a shorter period than seven years. During the probationary period, appointments are usually for a period of one to three years.

Reappointment Reviews: The Dean receives written summaries of all reviews of all tenured and tenure-probationary faculty, clinical faculty, and research scientists including second-year, third-year, fourth-year, tenure, promotion, reappointment, and dismissal reviews, as available. The University Dean uses information from all reviews in reappointment decisions.

Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews: The Dean prepares a written evaluation of all candidates that is added to the candidate’s dossier and forwarded to IUPUI Promotion and Tenure committee by the requested date. The Dean is required to submit a letter for the dossier that includes a summary evaluation of the candidate’s professional activities. If the candidate holds a joint appointment in another school the Dean of the secondary school will provide a signed and dated letter of evaluation for the dossier. The Dean may request a letter of evaluation from the Dean of schools in which the candidate holds an adjunct appointment. Specific responsibilities for the Dean of a school are found in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines under the heading “Dean (and Libraries Personnel Officer) Responsibilities”.

Dismissal Reviews: The Dean requests the APT Committee to evaluate faculty performance prior to dismissal (see Section 1).

1. Annual Reviews-The purpose of the annual review is to provide input on the faculty member’s progress in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, and service, leading to tenure review, reappointment, or promotion decisions. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments. To be most beneficial to the faculty member, these reviews should be candid and critical appraisals of the faculty member’s work, and should call attention to weaknesses as well as strengths.

2. Tenure Review-The tenure review applies only to tenure-probationary faculty. The tenure review follows the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. IU policy ACA-37 Faculty and Librarian Tenure also governs tenure review (see Policy Statement and History). This policy discusses the principle of tenure, that only individuals who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents be
appointed to tenured positions, the tenure-probationary period and lengths of tenure-probationary appointments, procedures for faculty to advance to tenured status, geographic limitations of tenure, and criteria for tenure. (See Tenure Review Form). The IUPUI P&T Guidelines govern the reconsideration process for candidates who wish to seek reconsideration of tenure review decisions.

3. **Promotion Review** - The promotion review applies to all faculty below the ‘full’ appointment level. The promotion review criteria, review process and responsibilities are governed by the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. (See Promotion Review Form).

**Forms and Links**

1. View Appendices A-I below

**History**

Approved by Faculty Assembly 3/27/17
Approved by Faculty Council 4/9/18
Appendix A: Appointment Review Form

To be completed by the Search & Screen Committee Chair or Hiring Administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>SNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Rank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current Rank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Institution:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Tenure Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______________________________________  ___________________
Search & Screen Chair/Hiring Administrator   Date

To be completed by the Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Committee Chair

Summary of Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank:</th>
<th>Tenured:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Towards Tenure:</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_______________________________________  ___________________
APT Committee Chair Signature   Date
### Appendix B: Annual, Reappointment, and/or Dismissal Review Summary Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Department: □ CHS □ SNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Excellence:</td>
<td>Date of Rank:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Review:</td>
<td>Date of Tenure:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assigned Time Allocation (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/Creative Activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Type of review: □ Annual □ Reappointment □ Dismissal |

Complete a narrative justification and rate each on the following scale: Excellent, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Not Applicable (NA).

**TEACHING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Excellent</th>
<th>□ Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory</th>
<th>□ Needs Improvement</th>
<th>□ NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

**RESEARCH/CREATIVe ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Excellent</th>
<th>□ Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory</th>
<th>□ Needs Improvement</th>
<th>□ NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

**SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Excellent</th>
<th>□ Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>□ Satisfactory</th>
<th>□ Needs Improvement</th>
<th>□ NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

**CONCLUSIONS ABOUT CUMULATIVE PROGRESS (CHECK ONE IN EACH ROW):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Creative Activities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Comments:

SIGNATURES

___________________________________   ____________________
Candidate       Date

___________________________________   ____________________
Chair/Campus Administrator     Date
Appendix C.1: Third-Year and Pre-Promotion, Review Form

Candidate: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________  
Area of Excellence: ___________________________ Date of Rank: ___________________________

**REVIEW TYPE:**

- [ ] Third-Year or Pre-promotion review

**Reviewer:**
- [ ] Primary Committee
- [ ] Dept. Chair, IUB or IUFW Assoc Dean
- [ ] APT Committee

**Fourth-Year Review?**
- [ ] Recommended
- [ ] Not Recommended
- [ ] Not applicable

**Vote:**
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Abstain

**TEACHING (MAY NOT BE APPLICABLE FOR SCIENTISTS)**

**RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (NOT APPLICABLE FOR CLINICAL TRACK AND LECTURER FACULTY)**

**SERVICE (MAY NOT BE APPLICABLE FOR SCIENTISTS)**

**CONCLUSIONS ABOUT PROGRESS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### SIGNATURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/Creative Activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

______________________________   ____________________
Candidate       Date

______________________________   ____________________
Chair/Campus Administrator     Date
Appendix C.2: Fourth-Year Review Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>SNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Excellence:</td>
<td>Date of Rank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVIEW TYPE:**

- [ ] Fourth-Year

**Reviewer:**

- [ ] Primary Committee
- [ ] Dept. Chair, IUB or IUFW Assoc Dean
- [ ] APT Committee

**Vote:**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Abstain

**TEACHING (MAY NOT BE APPLICABLE FOR SCIENTISTS)**

**RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES**

**SERVICE (MAY NOT BE APPLICABLE FOR SCIENTISTS)**

**CONCLUSIONS ABOUT PROGRESS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Creative Activities</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SIGNATURES**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Campus Administrator</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C.3: Promotion/Tenure Review Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>SNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Excellence:</td>
<td>Date of Rank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### REVIEW TYPE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] Promotion
- [ ] Tenure
- [ ] Tenure not applicable check here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer:</th>
<th>Reviewer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Primary Committee</td>
<td>[ ] Primary Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Dept. Chair, IUB or IUFW Assoc Dean</td>
<td>[ ] Dept. Chair, IUB or IUFW Assoc Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] APT Committee</td>
<td>[ ] APT Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Dean</td>
<td>[ ] Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Recommended</td>
<td>[ ] Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Do Not Recommended</td>
<td>[ ] Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion Vote:</th>
<th>Tenure Vote:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td>[ ] No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Abstain</td>
<td>[ ] Abstain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Teaching (May not be applicable for scientists)

#### Research/Creative Activities (Not applicable for Clinical Track and Lecturer Faculty)

#### Service (May not be applicable for scientists)

#### Signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence for Advancement – Clinical Track Faculty

Promotion from Clinical assistant professor to Clinical associate professor:

With teaching as declared area of excellence:

1) Demonstrates internal and external recognition of outstanding teaching practice grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory;
2) Submits evidence of excellent teaching and teaching/learning outcomes such as course evaluations, peer reviews, student evaluations, and teaching awards;
3) Submits a body of work reflecting accomplishments related to teaching in the discipline and reflecting integration and application of teaching/learning research and evidence to the transfer of knowledge, skill and professional behavior to students in the pursuit of professional competence. Evidence may include grants, publications, presentations, consultations, curricular products or student outcomes.

Examples of Evidence for meeting criteria a, b, and c while in rank include:
(Please note, reviewers will look at work while in rank)

1) Record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed and retrievable scholarship in teaching as follows:
2) A minimum of 5 publicly disseminated, peer reviewed, and retrievable publications; (examples might be journal articles, papers, book chapters, or monographs).
3) A minimum of 3 scholarly presentations at competitive regional or national conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance
4) Demonstrated impact of teaching through school or local competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), funding, invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, curricular products, and/or evidence of contributions to the knowledge base in the field.

With professional service* as a declared area of excellence:

1) Demonstrates community and/or professional recognition of professional service benefiting communities (local, national, or international communities); clients; and/or patients) or the profession/discipline. Service is characterized by activities conducted on behalf of the university/school applying the faculty member's specialty practice expertise and knowledge and is directly linked to the university/school mission;
2) Submits a body of work reflecting accomplishments in the integration and application of research and evidence to clinical practice for the purpose of achieving health-related outcomes for individuals, families, groups or communities consistent with the civic engagement mission of the university. Evidence may include grants, publications, presentations, consultations, program evaluations or health outcomes of the service target population.

Examples of Evidence for meeting criteria a and b while in rank include:
(Please note reviewers will be looking at work that is done while in rank)

1) A minimum of 5 publicly disseminated, peer reviewed, and retrievable publications; (examples might be journal articles, papers, book chapters, case reports/case series, leadership materials/workshops)
2) A minimum of 3 scholarly presentations at competitive regional or national conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
3) Demonstrated impact of teaching through school or local competitive awards, invited published works (i.e. papers, books, book chapters), funding, invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, curricular products, and/or evidence of contributions to the knowledge base in the field.

For promotion from Clinical associate professor to Clinical full professor:

With teaching as declared area of excellence:
1) Demonstrates sustained internal and external recognition of outstanding teaching practice grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory;
2) Submits evidence of sustained excellence in teaching and teaching/learning outcomes such as course evaluations, peer reviews, student evaluations, and teaching awards;
3) Submits a body of work reflecting sustained and focused accomplishments produced after promotion related to teaching in the discipline and reflecting integration and application of teaching/learning research and evidence to the transfer of knowledge, skill and professional behavior to students in the pursuit of professional competence. Evidence may include grants, publications, presentations, consultations, curricular products or student outcomes.

Examples of evidence for meeting criteria a, b, and c while in rank that include the following (Please note reviewers will be looking a work that is done while in rank)
Record of sustained and nationally or internationally disseminated, peer-reviewed, and retrievable scholarship in teaching excellence
1) A minimum of 10 refereed publications (5 while in rank) and the majority show prominence as first, co or last (senior) author (examples might be journal articles, papers, book chapters, or monographs). See appendix?
2) A minimum of a total of 6 total scholarly presentations (3 while in rank) at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
3) Demonstrated impact of service through national/international competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, web-based training modules), funding, invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, development of new technologies or care delivery systems, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field).

With Professional service* as declared area of excellence:
1) Demonstrates sustained community and/or professional recognition of professional service benefiting communities (local, national, or international communities); clients; and/or patients) or the profession/discipline. Service is characterized by activities conducted on behalf of the university/school applying the faculty member's specialty practice expertise and knowledge and is directly linked to the university/school mission;
2) Submits evidence of sustained service reflecting sustained and focused accomplishments produced after promotion related to the integration and application of research and evidence to clinical practice for the purpose of achieving health-related
outcomes for individuals, families, groups or communities consistent with the civic engagement mission of the university. Evidence may include grants, publications, presentations, consultations, program evaluations or health outcomes of the service target population.

Examples of evidence for meeting criteria a and b while in rank that may include a combination of the following: (Please note reviewers will be looking a work that is done while in rank)

1) Record of sustained and nationally or internationally disseminated, peer-reviewed, and retrievable scholarship in service excellence

2) A minimum of a total of 10 peer-reviewed publications (5 while in rank) with the majority showing prominence as first or last (senior) author (examples might be journal articles, papers, book chapters, case reports/case series, leadership materials/workshops.

3) A minimum of 6 total scholarly presentations (3 while in rank) at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.

4) Demonstrated impact of service through national/international competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs or other demonstrations of impact), funding, invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, development of new technologies or care delivery systems, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field.

**Balanced Case**

Faculty members determine their area of excellence within the academic norms and context of their primary unit. Within the School of Nursing, Clinical Track Faculty are expected to declare a single area of excellence with satisfactory performance in the other.

**References**

* For definition and documentation of service please refer to: Service at Indiana University: Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating (1999). Indianapolis, IN: Center for Public Service and Leadership. [www.iucat.iu.edu/iuk/5311438](http://www.iucat.iu.edu/iuk/5311438)
Appendix E: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence for Advancement – Tenure Track Faculty

Promotion from Tenure track assistant professor to associate professor (with tenure):

With research as declared area of excellence:

a. Demonstrates an emerging national recognition in a field of scholarship through peer review and external evaluation;

b. Submits a body of work reflecting scholarly accomplishments in the field including grants, publications, presentations, consultations and other evidence. If one of the publications is a scholarly book, a monograph, or a textbook, evidence of significant contribution to the field and national recognition of quality should be provided.

Evidence for meeting criteria a and b includes:

1) Clearly identifiable focused program of research
2) A minimum of 10 peer reviewed, full-length publications or an average of 2 per year, the majority are data-based, and majority show prominence as first or last (senior) author.
3) A minimum of 6 research presentations at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
4) Demonstrates significant activity in receiving internal funding support from competitive sources to fund research
5) Demonstrates activity in submitting funding applications to external competitive sources for research
6) Demonstrated impact of research through national competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

With teaching as declared area of excellence:

a. Demonstrates internal and external recognition of outstanding teaching practice grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory;

b. Submits evidence of excellent teaching and teaching/learning outcomes such as course evaluations, peer reviews, student evaluations, and teaching awards;

c. Submits a body of work reflecting scholarly accomplishments related to teaching in the discipline including grants, publications, presentations, consultations, curricular products and other evidence. If one of the publications is a scholarly book, a monograph, or a textbook, evidence of significant contribution to the field and national recognition of quality should be provided.

Evidence for meeting criteria a, b and c includes

1) Clearly identifiable focused area of teaching excellence
2) A minimum of 10 peer-reviewed publications or an average of 2 per year, the majority are data-based, and majority show prominence as first or last (senior) author.
3) A minimum of 6 scholarly presentations at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
4) Demonstrates significant activity in receiving internal funding support from competitive sources to fund teaching or curriculum innovation
5) Demonstrates activity in submitting funding applications to external competitive sources. Related to education.
6) Demonstrated impact of scholarship through national competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, curricular products, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

With professional service* as declared area of excellence:

a. Demonstrates community and/or professional recognition of professional service to communities (local, national, or international communities; clients; and/or patients) or the profession/discipline. It is characterized by activities conducted on behalf of the university/school applying the faculty member's specialty practice expertise and knowledge and is directly linked to the university/school mission;
b. Submits evidence of excellence in service, including grants, publications, presentations, consultations, and program evaluations, characterized by command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contributions to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact.

Evidence for meeting criteria a and b includes:

1) Clearly identifiable focused area of service excellence
2) A minimum of 10 peer reviewed publications or an average of 2 per year, the majority are data-based, and majority show prominence as first or last (senior) author.
3) A minimum of 6 scholarly presentations at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
4) Demonstrates significant activity in submitting internal and/or external funding applications to external competitive sources to fund service innovation or program of service
5) Demonstrated impact of service through national competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, development of new technologies or care delivery systems, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

For promotion from Tenure track / tenured associate professor to full professor:

With research as declared area of excellence:

a. Demonstrates national/international recognition in a sustained and focused field of scholarship through peer review and external evaluation;
b. Submits a body of work reflecting scholarly accomplishments produced after promotion contributing to the field or scholarship including grants, publications, presentations, consultations, awards, and other evidence. If one of the publications is a scholarly book, a monograph, or a textbook, evidence of significant contribution to the field and national recognition of quality should be provided.
Evidence for meeting criteria a and b while in rank includes:

1) Clearly identifiable, focused, sustained, and cumulative area of research
2) A minimum of 20 total peer reviewed (10 in rank) publications, the majority are data-based, and the majority show prominence as first or last (senior) author.
3) A minimum of 12 (6 while in rank) total research presentations at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
4) Demonstrates receipt of funding from external competitive sources for research
5) Demonstrated impact of research through national/international competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

With teaching as declared area of excellence:

a. Demonstrates sustained internal and external recognition of outstanding teaching practice grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory;
b. Submits evidence of sustained excellence in teaching and teaching/learning outcomes such as course evaluations, peer reviews, student evaluations, and teaching awards;
c. Submits a body of work reflecting scholarly sustained and focused accomplishments produced after promotion related to teaching in the discipline including grants, publications, presentations, consultations, curricular products and other evidence. If one of the publications is a scholarly book, a monograph, or a textbook, evidence of significant contribution to the field and national recognition of quality should be provided.

evidence for meeting criteria a, b, and c includes:

1) Clearly identifiable, focused, sustained, and cumulative area of teaching excellence
2) A minimum of 20 peer reviewed publications (10 in rank), the majority are data-based, and majority show prominence as first or last (senior) author.
3) A minimum of 12 (6 while in rank) scholarly presentations at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
4) Demonstrates receipt of significant funding from external competitive sources related to education.
5) Demonstrated impact of scholarship through national/international competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, curricular products, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

With professional service* as declared area of excellence:

a. Demonstrates sustained community and/or professional recognition of professional service to communities (local, national, or international communities; clients; and/or patients) or the profession/discipline. It is characterized by activities conducted on behalf of the university/school applying the faculty member’s specialty practice expertise and knowledge and is directly linked to the university/school mission;
b. Submits evidence of continuing excellence in sustained and focused service produced after promotion, including grants, publications, presentations, consultations, and
program evaluations, characterized by command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contributions to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact.

Evidence for meeting criteria a and b includes while in rank:

1) Clearly identifiable, focused, sustained, and cumulative area of service excellence
2) A minimum of 20 peer reviewed publications (10 in rank), the majority are data-based, and majority show prominence as first or last (senior) author.
3) A minimum of 12 (6 while in rank) scholarly presentations at competitive national or international conferences. Podium or poster presentations carry equal weight of importance.
4) Demonstrates receipt of significant funding as lead or co-investigator from external competitive sources to fund service innovation or program of service
5) Demonstrated impact of service through national/international competitive awards, invited published works (papers, books, book chapters, monographs), invited presentations, consultations, citations, journal quality, development of new technologies or care delivery systems, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

Balanced Case

Faculty members determine their area of excellence within the academic norms and context of their primary unit. Within the School of Nursing, Tenure Track Faculty advancing from assistant to associate professor are expected to declare a single area of excellence with satisfactory performance in the other. Tenured faculty advancing from associate to full professor may declare a balanced case.

References

* For definition and documentation of service please refer to: Service at Indiana University: Defining, Documenting, and Evaluating (1999). Indianapolis, IN: Center for Public Service and Leadership. www.iucat.iu.edu/iuk/5311438
Appendix F: Minimal Advancement Expectations for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

1) Demonstrates internal recognition of outstanding teaching practice grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory;
2) Submits evidence of excellent teaching and teaching/learning outcomes such as course evaluations, peer reviews, student evaluations, and teaching awards;
3) Shows evidence of scholarship in teaching such as publications or presentations at local or national meetings.
Appendix G: Sample Letters for Soliciting External Reviewers

First Contact/Invitation

Dear Dr. _____,

Your name has been provided to me as a potential external reviewer for <insert faculty name>, who is applying for promotion to <insert rank> of Nursing at Indiana University School of Nursing. She has identified <teaching/research/service> as her area of excellence. The external review is due in my office by _____.

The Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case.

I appreciate the time and effort it takes to perform this important service. Please let me know whether or not you will be able to meet this request. If you are interested in doing the review, we will forward the candidate’s materials to you immediately. Thank you very much for your consideration of this request and I look forward to hearing from you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Letter Sent with Dossier Materials

Dear Dr. _____,

Dr. <insert faculty name> is being considered for promotion at the rank of <insert rank> in the Department of <insert department name> within the Indiana University School of Nursing at Indiana University Purdue University – Indianapolis (IUPUI). Dr. <insert faculty name> has identified <teaching/research/service> as the area of excellence and thus the area where the evaluation by peers is most important. In considering her candidacy, we would appreciate your evaluation of the professional activities (i.e., teaching or creative activity, or professional service) for which you have sufficient knowledge regarding the performance of Dr. <insert faculty name>. We would be particularly grateful for your comments on the significance of this work and the ways it has been executed relative to other work in your field.

As you comment on Dr. <insert faculty name> scholarly work, we would welcome comments on the quality of the publications and journals that have been listed as well as other creative work and exhibition media. Comments on Dr. <insert faculty name> teaching might include your evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, other teaching materials, and publications on teaching as well as any personal experience you may have of her teaching. If you are aware of Dr. <insert faculty name> contributions to professional organizations or the discipline through her professional service activities or publications in this area, we would welcome your comments in this area as well. To assist you in your evaluation, I am enclosing a curriculum vitae, the candidate’s statement, and copies of recent publications and teaching materials.

Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate’s work. We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive
promotion at your institution. IUPUI has developed a set of standards for assessing the scholarly work of colleagues in teaching and professional service. A copy of the standards is enclosed for your reference. While we encourage you to respond to this request in whatever form best reflects your ability to assess the candidate, we will take these points into consideration when making a decision on advancement.

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vita or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with context for your comments.

We hope you understand how much we appreciate your assistance as we consider Dr. <insert faculty name> candidacy. It is important to understand her contributions from a perspective beyond our campus. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes, and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

Your letter will be seen by a group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. We can appreciate concerns you might have about writing a candid assessment under this condition, but we sincerely hope you will agree to assist us. If upon reflection you feel that you cannot be completely candid, however, we will respect your decision not to write an evaluation.

In order to complete Dr. <insert faculty name> dossier for University review, we would appreciate receiving your comments by <insert date>. I hope you will be able to assist us.

---

**Thank You Letter to External Reviewer – Sent with small IUSON swag gift**

Dear Dr. _____,

I am writing to thank you for the external letter of review that you provided for Dr. <insert faculty name> application for promotion to clinical associate professor at Indiana University School of Nursing.

I want to express my appreciation for your contribution to this process. I know this is a time consuming task and thank you for your willingness to provide a review.
Appendix H: Comments Regarding External Reviews, Peer Review, and External Assessment

Peer Review

1. The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, and service is the bedrock on which promotion and/or tenure decisions are based.
2. This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
3. At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed.
4. These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research and creative activity, or service, and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

Ongoing Review

1. Traditionally, peer review of research and creative activity has been a standard feature of faculty work.
2. Evaluation of work submitted to journals, juried shows, or other outlets for dissemination is considered the routine way to document the quality of this work.
3. Expectations for peer review of the quality and impact of teaching and professional service are now well established at IUPUI.
4. Peer evaluation of teaching or professional service is expected for all candidates with teaching or professional service as an area of performance and it is required for those whose advancement is based on excellence in teaching or professional service or on a balanced case. In the absence of a clear reason for the omission, dossiers without peer evaluations may be returned as incomplete. Ongoing peer review need not occur every year, but there should be a record of sustained peer review over the interval since appointment or last promotion.
5. Ongoing peer review may be provided by local, national, or international peers.
6. To be credible, peer reviewers must be identified according to their expertise or competence to comment.
7. These peer reviews should be requested at intervals by the department chair as part of the department’s peer review policies and procedures, and conducted in the standard way specified by the academic unit.

External Assessment

External assessment is essential to provide the committees evaluating each candidate for promotion and/or tenure an objective evaluation of the value and impact of the candidate’s work within the discipline, and to demonstrate that each candidate for associate professor has achieved an emerging national reputation and that each candidate for full professor has achieved a sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered. External assessment is a summative evaluation process with associated rank requirements.
As IUPUI grows in complexity and as the nature of faculty and librarian work evolves, expectations for the form of independent, external assessment of the overall record appropriate to each type of faculty appointment continues to be refined.

1. **External assessment** (ordinarily in the form of a letter or verified email note) is expected of all candidates at all ranks. To provide each candidate maximal opportunity for success, **at least six assessment letters are required. Cases that come to the campus level without six acceptable “arm’s-length” letters will be returned to the school.**

2. If a candidate is reapplying for promotion within three years of a previous dossier submission (whether as a result of denial of promotion or withdrawal of the case prior to final decision), all original external letter writers must be contacted with a request to update their letter with the new dossier information. If provided, the new letter is substituted in the dossier. If not, the original letter must be retained in the dossier. Three additional new letters should be sought at the time of resubmission.

3. The candidate should not be involved in the selection of external reviewers, with two exceptions: 1) the candidate should be allowed to list those he or she would definitely not want to serve as an external reviewer, and 2) the candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the chair or the chair’s designee. The candidate must discuss this list with their academic administrator and should indicate clearly on the list that each meets the “arm’s length” or independent criteria outlined below. Chairs or deans are not required to use the external reviewers identified by candidates.

4. Chairs/Deans may seek additional guidance to identify potential external reviewers, for example, from chairs of similar departments in other universities, from senior faculty in the department in the same or related specialty, or from the scholars quoted in the candidate’s publications. Reviewers do not have to be scholars in the identical sub-specialty as the candidate. Chairs should not inform candidates about the identities of the final external reviewers. Biographic summaries of external reviewer should be provided by the department chair, and are not to be written by the candidate.

5. **Criteria Defining “Arm’s Length” or Independence of External Reviewers:** The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be as independent as possible. To qualify as “arm’s length” or independent, reviewers providing external assessment should have no personal, professional or academic relationship with the candidate that would cause them to be invested in the candidate’s promotion. Specific examples of reviewers to avoid include (but are not limited to): 1) former or current mentors, 2) co-authors or scholarly collaborators in the last five years. Exceptions can be made in the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research or service panels. The department chair needs to specifically make the case for including such a reviewer. If in doubt, please contact the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that referees are objective and credible; persons closely associated with the candidate may not be as objective as those who are not personally associated. Reviews deemed to not comply with the “arm’s length” criteria will not count toward the six needed reviews.

6. **Academic external reviewers must be at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate,** and at a peer (or higher) institution. When there are highly qualified
academic reviewers who are considered top experts in the field but they do not meet the rank or peer institution guidelines, the chair must provide sufficient explanation as to why they have been selected as an appropriate reviewer.

7. **Non-academic external reviewers** may be included when a clear explanation of the relevance of such a review is presented by the Chair. It is always in the best interest of the candidate to select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible.

8. Unit/school practices may vary in regard to who solicits external assessment letters, but the candidate should not solicit or receive his or her own letters. Chairs should indicate how the external reviewers were selected and a sample of the letter sent from the unit/school to external reviewers should be included in the dossier of each candidate. Make sure the External Referee Form is completed and returned by the reviewers (see Appendices).

Appendix I: Chair’s and Campus Dean’s Assessment of Dissemination Outlets in the Candidate’s Area of Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Department Options:</th>
<th>CHS</th>
<th>SNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Excellence:</td>
<td>Current Rank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Journal Publications**

The dossier does/does not provide evidence of dissemination in the area of excellence. Specifically, in rank, the candidate has published a total of _____ peer-reviewed journal articles (_____ as first author) and has _____ additional papers in press.

The candidate’s scholar metrics as reported in her dossier / or as identified via (Google Scholar or Scholar Works or AltMetrics or ResearchGate or Other) are based on _____ publications generating _____ citations while in rank (total career citations = _____), an h-index of _____ and an i10 index of _____.

**Stature/Quality of Journals and Journal Articles**

List each journal on a separate line and in parentheses indicate # of articles published in that journal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>1-year impact factor</th>
<th>5-year impact factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Dissemination Venues**

The CV reflects a total of _____ peer-reviewed presentations including _____ local, _____ regional, _____ national, and _____ international. Some of the venues and their stature include:

**Grants (for tenure, tenure probationary, and scientist ranks only)**

The candidate submitted _____ grants to internal agencies and _____ to external agencies while in rank. All grant submissions were validated by the Associate Dean for Research (see internal support letter for details.

**Funded Research as PI (Provide a summary of the grants)**
**Funded Research as CoI** *(Provide a summary of the grants)*

**Unfunded Research** *(Provide a summary of the grants)*