

Date: April 16, 2007  
To: KSB Faculty  
From: Faculty Review Committee  
Re: Dossier Preparation Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

This document is designed to help tenure and promotion candidates prepare dossiers to offer the best chance of achieving tenure and promotion. These recommendations do not replace the criteria for tenure and promotion, and should be considered only as helpful suggestions. Official University guidelines for tenure and promotion are published in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in more detail in the Bloomington Academic Guide and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement, and the policies of the Kelley School can be found in “Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure & Annual Pretenure Reviews”(April 28, 2006).

### **Research Program**

To evaluate the strength of a candidate’s research program, the FRC assesses the extent to which candidates are primary contributors to programmatic streams of research that address questions important to their disciplines. The research should have a significant and positive impact on the creation of knowledge in the discipline, and the candidate’s publication record should compare favorably with those of other faculty in the discipline. Candidates must target and be successful at publishing in the top journals in their and related disciplines, and it is important that the unique and incremental contribution of each article be highlighted. (e.g., simply re-packaging similar findings for multiple articles, and using similar data for more than one article can reduce the perceived contribution of subsequent articles in a sequence). Further, a candidate’s research program consists not only of published papers (e.g., journal articles, research monographs, research books), but also includes papers under publication consideration, working papers, works in process, funded grants, and grant applications. Those evaluating the research record (e.g., Department/Integrated Faculty, FRC, Deans, Campus Committees) are concerned about both the accomplishments of the candidate as well as the candidate’s potential to maintain a high-quality research program in the future. In promotion cases accomplishment is weighted more heavily than potential; in tenure cases both accomplishment and potential are important. Candidates who provide information helpful in assessing the strength and quality of the total research program increase the likelihood that their research programs will be evaluated highly. Below we offer some ideas about how to collect and present relevant information.

- **Primary Contributor.** Candidates should show that they are significant authors on their papers, and have established some level of independence from prior mentors and dissertation committee members. Information helpful in making this assessment includes: sole authored papers, high-level publications in which mentors are not co-authors, and letters from co-authors describing the role and importance of the candidate’s contributions to the research projects. In addition, in fields where it is not strictly alphabetical, order of authorship can also be an indication of a candidate’s contribution to the research. Therefore, candidates should clearly indicate the meaning of the order of authorship for each paper.

- **Programmatic Research Addressing Important Questions.** While the quality and quantity of individual research papers is important, it is crucial for the candidate's research statement to: (a) clearly describe how his/her papers build on each other to produce a programmatic stream of research; and (b) explain why this research stream is important to the discipline. These statements should summarize the relevant body of knowledge in the discipline and how the research program of the candidate contributes to it. Often charts and outlines that summarize and classify articles into research areas can help the FRC make this assessment. External reviewers, who can comment thoughtfully and knowledgeably about the programmatic nature of the research, should be chosen by the candidate and the candidate's department chair because the FRC expects external reviewers to comment on the candidate's research program and its impact on the body of knowledge in the area.
- **Significant and Positive Impact.** Evidence of the scholarly impact of a candidate's research may come from several sources including comments from the external reviewers, citation counts, and research awards. Although citation counts can be helpful in assessing the impact of the candidate's research program, we recognize that they are imperfect measures of research impact and that they may be more useful in promotion than in tenure cases (because a reasonable number of cites can only accumulate with the passage of time). In addition, because there are many ways to conduct citations analyses using any or all of several different data bases (e.g., Web of Science, Google Scholar, etc.) and there are few benchmarks available against which a given number of citations can be meaningfully compared, citation analyses must be thoughtfully executed and well documented to be useful.
- **Comparisons across Faculty.** To establish a strong research record the number and nature of the publications should compare favorably with faculty in the same discipline at peer institutions who have been conducting research for approximately the same time period. Consequently, candidates should prepare cohort comparisons that normally consist of a chart summarizing the publication records of the candidate and successful individuals at a similar career stage at comparable institutions. In addition, in those disciplines where previously published norms are available for use as a benchmark, candidates may also wish to comment on how their own publication rate compares to all others in their discipline at a similar career stage. Finally, external reviewers can also provide useful information by commenting on how they think the candidate's record compares to other faculty in the same discipline from the same graduating class.
- **Unpublished Research.** The status of papers under review, working papers, and work in progress should be clearly described. Reviewer and editor letters concerning papers under review can be helpful, and the stage of working papers and work in progress (e.g., idea stage, data collection stage, first draft, ready to submit, target journals, etc.) should be disclosed. This work should be discussed in the research statement and their contribution to the programmatic theme should be highlighted.

## Teaching Program

To evaluate the strength of a candidate's teaching program, the FRC assesses the nature and difficulty of the candidate's teaching assignments, the candidate's course performance, the level and quality of curriculum development required to complete the teaching assignments, and a number of other factors related to the education of students in the discipline outside the preparation and delivery of assigned courses. Candidates that provide information helpful in assessing the strength and quality of the total teaching program increase the likelihood that their teaching programs will be evaluated highly. Below we offer some ideas about how to collect and present relevant information.

- **Teaching Assignments.** Teaching assignments can range from a single course taught to multiple sections of undergraduate students requiring little curriculum development to multiple courses taught to students from various levels (undergraduate and graduate) requiring extensive curriculum development. *Ceteris Paribus*, teaching assignments that involve more different courses, more levels of the curriculum, higher levels of the curriculum, and more course development will be judged more highly. Candidates with relatively easy teaching assignments will be expected to perform higher on the various measures of teaching performance than candidates with more difficult teaching assignments.
- **Course Performance.** Student course evaluations represent an important measure of teaching performance. Candidates receiving high scores on questions involving both teaching effectiveness and course rigor will be evaluated higher than candidates with high scores on either dimension alone. An important benchmark in assessing whether candidates are receiving high scores is the distribution of scores for similar courses in the Kelley School of Business. Evaluators also pay close attention to the number of students who complete the course evaluation. Assessments may decline in cases where a large number of students registered for the course do not complete the evaluation. Course performance evaluations by faculty (peer reviews) and School of Business teaching support personnel can also provide helpful information, and innovative and creative course delivery techniques should also be described by the candidate. Teaching awards (department, school, university, and national) should be listed and clearly described.
- **Curriculum Development.** Evidence of extensive and innovative curriculum development will be viewed positively by evaluators. The creation of new courses, major revisions of existing courses, and the development of new programs represent examples.
- **Outside Evidence.** Developing a case for an "outstanding" record in teaching requires much more than good teaching evaluations. It requires that the candidate develop a national or international reputation as a high-quality educator in the discipline. Evidence of such a reputation can include textbook writing, educational research, case writing and publications, presentations dealing with educational issues at regional and national meetings, significant curriculum development (e.g., creation of a new program), successful introduction of new teaching pedagogy, developing teaching paradigms adopted by other universities, national teaching awards, and extensive involvement with doctoral students outside the classroom (e.g., dissertations) and in certain cases programs outside the normal teaching assignments.

Support for an “outstanding” teaching record should also appear in the letters from the external reviewers.

### **Service Program**

To evaluate the strength of a candidate’s service program, the FRC assesses the nature and level of the candidate’s contributions to the candidate’s department, the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University, the business community, and government as well as the candidate’s academic discipline and profession. Below we offer some ideas about how to collect and present relevant information.

- **Department Service.** Departmental administrative positions (e.g., department chair), service on departmental committees (especially as chairperson), participation in departmental research and education workshops, and providing collegial support to members of the department, all represent examples of departmental service.
- **Kelley School Service.** School-level administrative positions (e.g., program chair), service on school-level committees (especially as chairperson), directors of research centers and institutes and MBA academies as well as providing collegial support to members of the School outside the department represent examples of School-level service.
- **Indiana University Service.** University-level administrative positions (e.g., BFC), service on university-level committees, and providing collegial support to members of Indiana University outside the Kelley School represent examples of university-level service.
- **Business Community and Government Service.** Administrative positions in business community and local, state, and federal government service organizations, and service on community and government service committees represent examples of community service.
- **Academic Discipline Service.** Administrative positions in an Academic Association (e.g., American Accounting Association), service on association committees, and service as research journal editor and on editorial boards represent examples of academic discipline service.
- **Professional Organization Service.** Administrative positions in professional organizations (e.g., American Institute of CPAs), and service on professional organization committees represent examples of professional organization service. Membership on boards of directors is another example.

**KELLEY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR  
PROMOTION, TENURE,  
& ANNUAL PRETENURE REVIEWS**

**March, 1995**

**Revised: May 1, 2000**

**Revised: September 15, 2003**

**Revised: April 17, 2006**

## CONTENTS

Introduction . . . . .	1
General Criteria and Procedures for Promotion . . . . .	1
Promotion: Faculty Member with a Bloomington Appointment . . . . .	3
Promotion: Faculty Member with an Indianapolis Appointment. . . . .	5
Promotion: Faculty Member with a Joint (Indianapolis/Bloomington) Appointment. . . . .	7
General Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Pretenure Reviews. . . . .	9
Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with a Bloomington Appointment. . . . .	10
Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with an Indianapolis Appointment. . . . .	13
Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with a Joint (Indianapolis/Bloomington) Appointment. . . . .	16
Tabular <b>SUMMARY</b> : Promotion and Tenure Procedures. . . . .	20
Tabular <b>SUMMARY</b> : Pretenure Evaluation Process. . . . .	21

## INTRODUCTION

The two-campus (Bloomington/Indianapolis) organization of the Kelley School of Business requires that evaluation of professional competence for the purpose of recommending promotion or granting tenure be conducted in accordance with an explicit set of criteria and procedures.

The evaluation criteria of research, teaching, and service are common to all campuses of Indiana University. Judgments of competence and achievements are made after consideration of the combination of activities assigned to the individual during the period under evaluation. In the Kelley School of Business a common set of criteria apply to its faculty members at the Bloomington and Indianapolis locations. Applicable procedures, however, vary slightly by location. Department chairs and candidates for promotion or tenure are given documentation describing relevant campus procedures to guide preparation of dossiers. The dossiers prepared for the evaluations described in succeeding sections document the totality of duties assigned. Evaluations by the Kelley School of Business' Faculty Review Committee, the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Dean reflect whatever differences as might be found at either location. Specific procedures and timetables differ slightly as a function of the involved faculty member's appointment. Such appointments may take three forms: (1) the faculty member is based on the Bloomington campus; (2) the faculty member is based on the Indianapolis Campus; (3) the faculty member has a joint Bloomington/Indianapolis appointment. The general criteria for promotion, tenure, and pretenure reviews are described in the following section. Specific timetables and procedures relevant to candidates' appointment (Bloomington, Indianapolis, joint--Bloomington/Indianapolis) are then described in succeeding sections.

## GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

The criteria and procedures for promotion in the Kelley School of Business are set forth in general terms in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in more detail in the Bloomington Academic Guide and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement. As applied specifically to the Kelley School of Business, these criteria and procedures are as follows (see Table 1 for a summary of promotion procedures).

### Criteria

Promotion of tenure-track faculty members in the Kelley School of Business is recommended on the basis of three criteria: teaching, research, and service. For clinical ranks, promotion is on the basis of teaching and service. To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member is normally expected to excel in rank in at least one of these categories and to have performed in rank at least satisfactorily in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university over time. In all cases, the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank constitutes recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.

The criterion in regard to teaching is precisely as articulated in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement. Recognizing that effective documentation of excellence in teaching is difficult, faculty members are required to use and retain the Kelley School of Business teaching evaluation forms each semester. In addition, it is the responsibility of the chairperson to ensure that other measures of teaching quality or innovation in classroom work are acquired over time. Particularly valuable are periodic colleague evaluations resulting from class visitation and/or team teaching. Unsolicited student letters or other indications of excellence collected over several years add measurably to the credibility of performance on this dimension. Textbook writing, teaching cases, teaching publications, doctoral committee assignments, classroom simulations, computer classroom applications, and curricular development are also important. Other potential factors include evidence of teaching exposure across programs and courses, consistency across time, and external recognition for teaching excellence.

The criterion with regard to research and creative activity is normally applied in terms of the quality and quantity of pure and applied research reported in published articles, monographs, books, public testimonies, and other media. Creative work can take other forms such as creations of new forms of business organizations, new ways of measuring productive effectiveness, or other advances in the knowledge and practice of business. Even in these situations, however, the results of the creative activity are normally summarized in writing and published.

For clinical faculty, research cannot be included as a basic category of evaluation. However, research in support of teaching and service should be considered part of the teaching and service dossiers, and other forms of research may be considered as evidence of intellectual engagement in the professional field that is generally indicative of long-term intellectual contributions valuable in classroom settings and to the campus in general.

As used in the Kelley School of Business, the criterion in regard to service is fairly broad. Service by the faculty member to the University, to the business community, to government, and to professional organizations is considered. Being members of a faculty of a professional school, individuals recommended for promotion are expected to have exhibited a high level of professionalism in their service both to the University and to one or more of its external constituencies. Differentiation in the application of promotion criteria among academic ranks is as stated in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement.

It should also be noted that promotion of a faculty member to associate professor prior to the sixth year tenure decision point should be pursued only in especially meritorious cases. Promotion to associate professor is based on accomplishment and not on potential or promise. A faculty member needs to achieve a level of performance that meets the requirements for the associate professor level versus merely being "on track" for eventual tenure. In effect, the required evidence of accomplishment for such a promotion must be equivalent to that required for awarding associate rank to someone being hired from outside the University. Thus, the early promotion to associate professor is expected to be an unusual case. If a candidate wishes to be considered for promotion to associate professor prior to attaining six years toward tenure, the decision to proceed should be made in consultation and agreement among the candidate, the

department chairperson, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research before the preparation of a dossier. For candidates who have not been promoted to associate professor prior to the tenure decision, Indiana University policy provides that promotion to associate professor accompanies an award of tenure.

As previously noted, the exact procedures to which the Kelley School of Business adheres depend on the nature of a candidates' appointment. Each appointment with regard to promotion is discussed in turn.

### **Promotion: Faculty Member with a Bloomington Appointment**

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, or by the department chairperson after consultation with the tenured members of the department (or department tenure and promotion committee). Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

(1) In the late Spring or early summer, department chairpersons are asked to identify those faculty members who are likely to be considered for promotion in the following year. In addition, they are asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

Criteria for the selection of outside reviewers include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(2) Prior to the start of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to each department chairperson announcing when promotion dossiers are due in the Associate Dean's office. The deadline for promotion recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(3) Each department chairperson prepares a dossier for each promotion candidate. The dossier is prepared with the knowledge and with the active cooperation of the candidate. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and any other relevant materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person who is constructing the dossier. The chairperson is expected to consult with the Department Faculty Advisory Committee in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion. For tenure decisions and promotion decisions on tenure-track faculty, the Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenured faculty at that rank and above. For promotion decisions on clinical faculty, the Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenure-track and clinical faculty at that rank or above.

Outside letters will be requested by the Associate Dean's Office. Approximately half these names should be recommended by the candidate. In order to be sure that the return rate is high, department chairs are asked to contact potential reviewers in advance and not to submit their names unless they have agreed to write an evaluation. It is critically important that chairs and candidates for tenure and promotion select reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate's performance, have no past ties with the candidate or explicitly state what they are, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research selects names from these lists and solicits an evaluation, in writing, from each of the designated outside reviewers.

(4) If the department advisory committee and/or the department chairperson conclude that a particular faculty member should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the faculty member will be advised that he/she has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation. He/she is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable department or chairperson endorsements that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

(5) All promotion recommendations, including those initiated by faculty members themselves, are sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research forwards them to the Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. Members of the FRC must recuse themselves from voting in cases from their department (or the Indianapolis integrated faculty). However, they may vote at the departmental level. This Committee evaluates each tenure-track faculty dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service) and each clinical faculty dossier with regard to the two criteria (teaching and service). The Committee then prepares a written statement indicating in detail whether in its collective judgment the candidate should or should not be promoted. The Committee's statement is then sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(6) With respect to each promotion dossier receiving a favorable endorsement by a majority vote of the Faculty Review Committee, the Dean enters his/her own evaluation of the candidate, forwards the dossier to the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office, and notifies the relevant department chairperson to indicate the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee to the candidate. The forwarding of the dossier and notification of the candidate are accomplished on or before the published deadline for dossier submission established by the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office forwards the dossier to the Bloomington campus Promotions Committee which, after review of the dossier, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office then makes a recommendation to the Provost.

(7) Final approval of a promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(8) With respect to each promotion dossier reviewed but not favorably endorsed by the Faculty Review Committee, the candidate is advised by the Dean and/or the candidate's

department chairperson of the absence of favorable endorsement by the Faculty Review Committee. At that time, the candidate then decides whether he/she wishes to withdraw his/her recommendation (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee. If the latter, the Dean adds his/her personal evaluation to the dossier and it is forwarded to the appropriate Dean of the Faculties Office.

(9) The total process is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research in the Kelley School of Business, whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the dossiers are secure.

### **Promotion: Faculty Member with an Indianapolis Appointment**

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, or by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis after consultation with the tenured members of the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty. Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

(1) In the late Spring or early summer, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis is asked to identify those faculty members who are likely to be considered for promotion in the following year. In addition, he or she is asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(2) Prior to the start of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis announcing when promotion dossiers are due to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The deadline for promotion recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(3) The Associate Dean, Indianapolis prepares a dossier for each candidate for promotion. The dossier is prepared with the knowledge and with the active cooperation of the candidate. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and any other relevant materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person who is constructing the dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis is expected to consult with the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion. For tenure decisions and promotion decisions on tenure-track faculty, the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenured faculty at that rank and above. For promotion decisions on clinical faculty, the

Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenure-track and clinical faculty at that rank or above.

Outside letters will be requested by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research then selects names from these lists and solicits an evaluation, in writing, from each of the designated outside reviewers.

(4) If the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and/or the Associate Dean, Indianapolis concludes that a particular faculty member should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the faculty member will be advised that he/she has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation. He/she is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee or Associate Dean, Indianapolis endorsements that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

(5) All promotion recommendations, including those initiated by faculty members themselves, are sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. Such recommendations must be accompanied by a report from the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and a review by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research delivers these materials to the Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. Members of the FRC must recuse themselves from voting in cases from their department (or the Indianapolis integrated faculty). However, they may vote at the departmental level. This Committee evaluates each tenure-track dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service) and each clinical faculty dossier with regard to teaching and service. The Committee then prepares a written statement indicating in detail whether in its collective judgment the candidate should or should not be promoted. The Committee's statement is then sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(6) With respect to each promotion dossier receiving a favorable endorsement by a majority vote of the Faculty Review Committee, the Dean enters his/her own evaluation of the candidate, forwards the dossier to the Dean of the Faculties Office of the Indianapolis campus, and notifies the Associate Dean, Indianapolis to indicate the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee to the candidate. The forwarding of the dossier and notification of the candidate are accomplished on or before the published deadline for dossier submission established by the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office forwards the dossier to the Indianapolis Tenure and Promotion Committee which, after review of the dossier, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office then makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.

(7) Final approval of a promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(8) With respect to each promotion dossier reviewed but not favorably endorsed by the Faculty Review Committee, the candidate is advised by the Dean and/or the Associate Dean,

Indianapolis of the absence of favorable endorsement by the Faculty Review Committee. At that time, the candidate then decides whether he/she wishes to withdraw his/her recommendation (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee. If the latter, the Dean adds his/her personal evaluation to the dossier and forwards it to the Dean of the Faculties Office, Indianapolis.

(9) The total process is administered by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the dossiers are secure.

### **Promotion: Faculty Member with a Joint Indianapolis/Bloomington Appointment**

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, the department chairperson (after consultation with the Department Faculty Advisory Committee), or by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis (after consultation with the tenured members of the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee). Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

(1) In the late Spring or early summer, the department chairperson with the assistance of the Associate Dean, Indianapolis is asked to identify those faculty members with joint appointments who are likely to be considered for promotion in the following year. In addition, the chairperson is asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names who he or she would like to have included.

Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(2) Prior to the start of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to the respective faculties (Indianapolis, Bloomington) announcing when promotion dossiers are due. The deadline for promotion recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(3) The Associate Dean, Indianapolis has the responsibility for preparing the promotion dossier for faculty members with joint appointments. The dossier is prepared with the knowledge and with the active cooperation of the candidate. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and any other relevant materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person who is constructing the dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis is expected to consult with the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion.

Outside letters will be requested by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research then selects names from these lists and solicits an evaluation, in writing, from each of the designated outside reviewers.

(4) If the Department Faculty Advisory Committee, the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, the department chairperson, or the Associate Dean, Indianapolis or any subset of these parties concludes that a particular faculty member should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the faculty member will be advised that he/she has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation. He/she is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable Faculty Advisory Committee, Associate Dean, Indianapolis, department chairperson, or Faculty Review Committee endorsements that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

(5) All promotion recommendations, including those initiated by faculty members themselves, are sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. In the case of faculty members with joint appointments, there will be four such reports. These will be comprised of a report from the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and a review by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. Also, there will be a report from the Department Faculty Advisory Committee and the department chairperson. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research delivers these materials to the Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. Members of the FRC must recuse themselves from voting in cases from their department (or the Indianapolis integrated faculty). However, they may vote at the departmental level. This Committee evaluates each tenure-track dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service) and each clinical faculty dossier with regard to teaching and service. The Committee then prepares a written statement indicating in detail whether in its collective judgment the candidate should or should not be promoted. The Committee's statement is then sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(6) With respect to each promotion dossier receiving a favorable endorsement by a majority vote of the Faculty Review Committee, the Dean enters his/her own evaluation of the candidate, forwards the dossier to the Dean of the Faculties Office of the Indianapolis campus, and notifies the Associate Dean, Indianapolis to indicate the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee to the candidate. The forwarding of the dossier and notification of the candidate are accomplished on or before the published deadline for dossier submission established by the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office forwards the dossier to the Indianapolis Tenure and Promotion Committee which, after review of the dossier, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office then makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.

(7) Final approval of a promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(8) With respect to each promotion dossier reviewed but not favorably endorsed by the Faculty Review Committee, the candidate is advised by the Dean and/or the Associate Dean,

Indianapolis of the absence of favorable endorsement by the Faculty Review Committee. The candidate then decides whether he/she wishes to withdraw his/her recommendation (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee. If the latter, the Dean adds his/her personal evaluation to the dossier and forwards it to the Dean of the Faculties Office, Indianapolis.

(9) The total process is administered by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the dossiers are properly safeguarded.

### **GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PRETENURE REVIEWS**

The criteria and procedures relevant to tenure recommendations are generally comparable to those relating to promotion and are consistent with the provisions in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and the Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement (see Table 1 for a summary of tenure procedures, Table 2 for pretenure procedures). The major consideration in the tenure decision is the potential of the candidate to continue to develop professionally.

In all cases, Indiana University tenure policy provides that tenure shall be campus-specific. A candidate with a Bloomington appointment, then, is granted tenure for the Bloomington campus. A candidate with an Indianapolis appointment or a joint (Indianapolis/Bloomington) appointment is granted tenure for the Indianapolis campus.

#### Criteria

Teaching, research (or other creative work), and service are used in evaluating tenure eligibility of faculty members in the Kelley School of Business. Additionally, attention is given to the compatibility of the candidate's professional interests with the anticipated long-term needs of the School. Also, consideration is given to the needs of the institution for the kinds of professional talents possessed or capable of being developed by the faculty member whose tenure prospects are being evaluated.

Finally, the criterion of collegiality is also brought into the tenure evaluation. Since many faculty members believe that the long-run effectiveness of a faculty depends in part on the working rapport among the professors who comprise it, collegiality becomes an additional criterion against which to develop tenure recommendations.

#### Procedures

The procedures through which progress toward tenure and tenure recommendations are made are described in this section. In summary, the procedures call for an annual review of performance up to the sixth year of service during which the final decision is made. A candidate may be considered for tenure prior to his or her sixth year of service. Such a decision should be made only with the full concurrence of the candidate, the relevant chairperson, and Associate

Dean of Faculty and Research. It would also be expected that the decision for "early" tenure would be with the strong support of the department tenure and promotion committee or formally constituted department faculty advisory committee. All candidates considering a petition for tenure prior to the sixth year must be aware of the potential critical consequences of such a decision. Simply stated, a person may be considered for tenure once, and once only. There are no exceptions. Should a candidate be unsuccessful in an early petition for tenure, no further petition can be considered in subsequent years. Instead, a faculty member who was not successful in the early petition will be terminated from the University. This outcome is, of course, not different for anyone who will have been denied tenure.

As with promotion, the general tenure and pretenure processes vary slightly as a function of the candidates' appointment-- Bloomington, Indianapolis, Joint (Indianapolis/Bloomington). Each is described in turn.

### **Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Members with a Bloomington Appointment**

(1) Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to each department chairperson calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are nontenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Associate Dean's Office. All non-tenured faculty members are informed that the review is being undertaken and are notified of the procedures to be followed and the relevant deadlines. The deadline for tenure recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(2) For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted at the department level only. The review, conducted by the department tenure and promotion committee, includes the categories of research, teaching, and service. The department chairperson prepares a memorandum summarizing this review, provides a copy to the faculty member, and discusses the contents of the review with the faculty member. The department chairperson obtains the faculty member's signature as an indication of receipt of the copy. A faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. The memorandum is then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research where it is placed in the faculty member's pretenure file.

(3) In the third and fourth years of credit toward tenure, the procedure for department review of the candidate is identical to the preceding two years. At this point, however, a summary of the review along with supporting materials is sent forward through the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research for review by the Faculty Review Committee. These materials, along with the department's earlier pretenure memoranda, serve as the basis for the Committee's assessment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Committee will prepare a memorandum summarizing its review and distribute it to the faculty member, department chairperson, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. A copy is also retained in the faculty member's pretenure file. These reviews will be important inputs in determining whether the candidate will be reappointed during the pretenure period.

(4) During the fifth year of progress toward tenure (the "dress rehearsal" year) a complete dossier is prepared by the candidate and his/her department chairperson. The dossier contains all pertinent tenure material except the solicited outside letters. During the sixth year a complete dossier, including letters solicited from outside Indiana University, is prepared and submitted. The chairperson is expected to consult with colleagues and include in the dossiers for the fifth and sixth years information about colleague reaction which may include letters or memoranda from such colleagues.

(5) The procedure for soliciting outside letters for the formal tenure review is as follows. In the late Spring or early summer, the department chairpersons are asked to identify those faculty members who are to be considered for tenure in the following year. In addition, they are asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included. In order to ensure that there are at least six complete outside letters in the file, eight to ten names, with an associated "information sheet" should be submitted to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. Approximately half these names should be recommended by the candidate. In order to be sure that the return rate is high, department chairs are asked to contact potential reviewers in advance and not to submit their names unless they have agreed to write an evaluation.

It is critically important that chairs and candidates for tenure and promotion select reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate's performance, have no past ties with the candidate or explicitly state what they are, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, and relationships with the candidate. Persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(6) The dossier, as described in previous sections, of each nontenured faculty in his/her third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service is reviewed by the same Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. This Committee evaluates each dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service).

(7) Each year the Faculty Review Committee reviews each pretenture dossier submitted and prepares a written evaluation. Two copies of this evaluation are distributed to the respective department offices and the third to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. One department copy is returned to the chairperson's file, the other is delivered to the faculty member under review. This is usually accomplished early in the spring semester, the exact timing being dependent on the workload and schedule of the Faculty Review Committee.

(8) With respect to each individual who is completing three or four years toward tenure, the department chairperson delivers and discusses with the individual the content of the written evaluation prepared by the Faculty Review Committee and also discusses the individual's plans for future contributions. The department chairperson may invite the Dean and/or Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to participate in the discussion. The discussion should be completed as

soon as practical after the receipt of the evaluation from the Faculty Review Committee but in no event later than the end of the spring semester.

(9) The department chairperson then signs the evaluation and secures the individual's signature on the form provided, attesting that the individual has seen and discussed the evaluation; such a signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the department files; a copy is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research places the signed copy in the faculty member's pretenure file, to be used by the Faculty Review Committee in subsequent pretenure reviews. Pretenure reviews should not be included in the tenure dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate.

(10) For individuals who are in their fifth year toward tenure, a "dress rehearsal" review will be made on the basis of dossier materials that the faculty member under review submits to the committee and materials submitted by the department. Department chairpersons should urge individuals in their fifth year to present to the Associate Dean's Office a complete dossier which the Faculty Review Committee may use in its deliberations. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and other materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person preparing the dossier. The memorandum prepared by the Faculty Review Committee should be used by the department chairperson to provide a basis for a candid discussion with the individual faculty member regarding his or her future promise within the School. As in the case of third and fourth year reviews, the chairperson and candidate both sign the memorandum on the attached form. Three copies of the memorandum should be prepared and distributed, one to the faculty member, one to the department chairperson's file, and one to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(11) For each individual completing the sixth year toward tenure, the Faculty Review Committee reviews the dossier prepared by the candidate and the department chairperson. Also included in the Committee assessment are the letters of evaluation from reviewers outside Indiana University. After this review the Committee makes a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. As in the case of promotion recommendations, the recommendation is by majority vote.

(12) The written recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee is presented along with the dossier to the Dean, who then adds in writing his/her own specific recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research notifies the department chairperson of the recommendation of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee and asks him/her to indicate the progress at that point to the tenure candidate. Notification occurs at or before the deadline for tenure dossier submission published by the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office.

(13) The full dossier is then forwarded to the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office, which forwards it to the Bloomington tenure committee. After reviewing the recommendation of the tenure committee, the Dean of the Faculties Office forwards its recommendation to the Provost.

(14) Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(15) As with promotion recommendations, the tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(16) All notices of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty members are issued in strict conformity to the stipulations in the Academic Handbook and the Bloomington Academic Guide.

### **Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with an Indianapolis Appointment**

(1) Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are nontenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Associate Dean's Office. All non-tenured faculty members are informed that the review is being undertaken and are notified of the procedures to be followed and the relevant deadlines. The deadline for tenure recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(2) For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted by the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee only. The review includes the categories of research, teaching, and service. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis prepares a memorandum summarizing this review, provides a copy to the faculty member, and discusses the contents of the review with the faculty member. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis obtains the faculty member's signature as an indication of receipt of the copy. A faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. The memorandum is then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research where it is placed in the faculty member's pretenure file.

(3) In the third and fourth years of credit toward tenure, the procedure for review by the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty of the candidate is identical to the preceding two years. At this point, however, a summary of the review along with supporting materials is sent forward through the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research for review by the Faculty Review Committee. These materials, along with the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Review Committee's earlier pretenure memoranda, serve as the basis for the Committee's assessment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Committee will prepare a memorandum summarizing its review and distribute it to the faculty member, department chairperson, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. A copy is also retained in the faculty member's pretenure file. These reviews will be important inputs in determining whether the candidate will be reappointed during the pretenure period.

(4) During the fifth year of progress toward tenure (the "dress rehearsal" year) a complete dossier is prepared by the candidate and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. The dossier contains all pertinent tenure material except the solicited outside letters. During the sixth year a complete dossier, including letters solicited from outside Indiana University, is prepared and submitted.

The Associate Dean, Indianapolis is expected to consult with colleagues and include in the dossiers for the fifth and sixth years information about colleague reaction which may include letters or memoranda from such colleagues.

(5) The procedure for soliciting outside letters for the formal tenure review is as follows. In the late Spring or early summer, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis is asked to identify those faculty members who are to be considered for tenure in the following year. In addition, he or she is asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate's dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis will also have invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(6) The dossier, as described in previous sections, of each nontenured faculty in his/her third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service is reviewed by the same Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. This Committee evaluates each dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service).

(7) Each year the Faculty Review Committee reviews each pretenure dossier submitted and prepares a written evaluation in three copies, with two copies to be distributed to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the third to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. One copy is returned to Associate Dean, Indianapolis' file, the other is delivered to the faculty member under review. This is usually accomplished early in the spring semester, the exact timing being dependent on the workload and schedule of the Faculty Review Committee.

(8) With respect to each individual who is completing three or four years toward tenure, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis delivers and discusses with the individual the content of the written evaluation prepared by the Faculty Review Committee and also discusses the individual's plans for future accomplishments. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis may invite the Dean and/or Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to participate in the discussion. The discussion should be completed as soon as practical after the receipt of the evaluation from the Faculty Review Committee but in no event later than the end of the spring semester.

(9) The Associate Dean, Indianapolis then signs the evaluation and secures the faculty member's signature on the form provided, attesting to the fact that the individual has seen and discussed the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the Associate Dean, Indianapolis' files; and a copy is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research places the signed copy in the faculty member's pretenure file, to be used by the Faculty Review Committee in subsequent pretenure reviews. Pretenure reviews should not be included in the tenure dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate.

(10) For individuals who are in their fifth year toward tenure, a "dress rehearsal" review will be made on the basis of dossier materials that the faculty member under review submits to the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and materials submitted by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis should urge individuals in their fifth year to present a complete dossier which the Faculty Review Committee may use in its deliberations. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and other materials not known to or generally available to the person preparing the dossier. The memorandum prepared by the Faculty Review Committee should be used by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis to provide a basis for discussing with the individual faculty member his or her prospective position within the School. As in the case of third and fourth year reviews, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the candidate both sign the memorandum on the attached form. Three copies of the memorandum should be prepared. The distribution of these memoranda is as follows: one to the faculty member, one to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis' file, and one to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(11) For each individual completing the sixth year toward tenure, the Faculty Review Committee reviews the dossier prepared by the candidate and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. Also included in the Committee assessment are the letters of evaluation from reviewers outside Indiana University. After this review the Committee makes a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. As in the case of promotion recommendations, the recommendation is by majority vote.

(12) The written recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee is presented along with the dossier to the Dean, who then adds in writing his/her own specific recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research notifies the Associate Dean, Indianapolis of the recommendation of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee and asks him/her to indicate the progress at that point to the candidate for tenure. Notification occurs at or before the deadline for tenure dossier submission published by the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office.

(13) The full dossier is then forwarded to the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office, which forwards it to the Indianapolis tenure and promotion committee. After reviewing the recommendation of the tenure committee, the Dean of the Faculties Office forwards its recommendation to the Chancellor.

(14) Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(15) As with promotion recommendations, the tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis.

(16) All notices of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty members are issued in strict conformity to the stipulations in the Academic Handbook and the Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement.

## **Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with a Joint Appointment (Indianapolis/Bloomington)**

(1) Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to each department chairperson calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are nontenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Associate Dean's Office. All non-tenured faculty members are informed that the review is being undertaken and are notified of the procedures to be followed and the relevant deadlines. The deadline for tenure recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(2) For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted by the department and the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee only. These reviews include the categories of research, teaching, and service. The department chairperson and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis prepare memoranda summarizing these reviews, copies of which are provided to the faculty member. The department chairperson and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis discuss the respective contents of these reviews with the faculty member. The department chairperson and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis obtain the faculty member's signature on these reviews as an indication of receipt of the copies. A faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with these evaluations. The memoranda are then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research where they are placed in the faculty member's pretenure file.

(3) In the third and fourth years of credit toward tenure, the procedure for department and Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee review of the candidate is identical to the preceding two years. At this point, however, a summary of these reviews along with supporting materials is sent forward through the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research for initial review by the Faculty Review Committee. These materials, along with the department's and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis' earlier pretenure memoranda, serve as the basis for the Committee's assessment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Committee will prepare a memorandum summarizing its review and distribute it to the faculty member, department chairperson, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. A copy is also retained in the faculty member's pretenure file. These reviews will be important inputs in determining whether the candidate will be reappointed during the pretenure period.

(4) During the fifth year of progress toward tenure (the "dress rehearsal" year) a complete dossier is prepared by the candidate and his/her department chairperson. The dossier contains all pertinent tenure material except the solicited outside letters. During the sixth year a complete dossier, including letters solicited from outside Indiana University, is prepared and submitted. The chairperson is expected to consult with colleagues and include in the dossiers for the fifth and sixth years information about colleague reaction which may include letters or memoranda from such colleagues.

(5) The procedure for soliciting outside letters for the formal tenure review is as follows. In the late Spring or early summer, the department chairpersons are asked to identify those

faculty members who are to be considered for tenure in the following year. In addition, they are asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included. In order to ensure that there are at least six complete outside letters in the file, eight to ten names, with an associated "information sheet" should be submitted to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

It is critically important that chairs and candidates for tenure and promotion select reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate's performance, have no past ties with the candidate or explicitly state what they are, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(6) The dossier, as described in previous sections, of each nontenured faculty in his/her third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service is reviewed by the same Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. This Committee evaluates each dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service).

(7) Each year the Faculty Review Committee reviews each pretenure dossier submitted and prepares a written evaluation. Two copies of this evaluation are distributed to the respective department offices and the third to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. One department copy is returned to the chairperson's file, the other is delivered to the faculty member under review. This is usually accomplished early in the spring semester, the exact timing being dependent on the workload and schedule of the Faculty Review Committee.

(8) With respect to each individual who is completing three or four years toward tenure, the department chairperson delivers and discusses with the individual the content of the written evaluation prepared by the Faculty Review Committee and also discusses the individual's plans for future contributions. The department chairperson may invite the Dean and/or Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to participate in the discussion. The discussion should be completed as soon as practical after the receipt of the evaluation from the Faculty Review Committee but in no event later than the end of the spring semester.

(9) The department chairperson then signs the evaluation and secures the individual's signature on the form provided on the back of the evaluation, attesting that the individual has seen and discussed the evaluation; such a signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the department files; a copy is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research places the signed copy in the faculty member's pretenure file, to be used by

the Faculty Review Committee in subsequent pretenure reviews. Pretenure reviews should not be included in the tenure dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate.

(10) For individuals who are in their fifth year toward tenure, a "dress rehearsal" review will be made on the basis of dossier materials that the faculty member under review submits to the committee and materials submitted by the department. Department chairpersons should urge individuals in their fifth year to present to the Associate Dean's Office a complete dossier which the Faculty Review Committee may use in its deliberations. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and other materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person preparing the dossier. The memorandum prepared by the Faculty Review Committee should be used by the department chairperson to provide a basis for a candid discussion with the individual faculty member regarding his or her future promise within the School. As in the case of third and fourth year reviews, the chairperson and candidate both sign the memorandum on the attached form. Three copies of the memorandum should be prepared and distributed, one to the faculty member, one to the department chairperson's file, and one to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(11) For each individual completing the sixth year toward tenure, the Faculty Review Committee reviews the dossier prepared by the candidate and the department chairperson. Also included in the Committee assessment are the letters of evaluation from outside Indiana University. After this review the Committee makes a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. As in the case of promotion recommendations, the recommendation is by majority vote.

(12) The written recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee is presented along with the dossier to the Dean, who then adds in writing his/her own specific recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research notifies the department chairperson of the recommendation of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee and asks him/her to indicate the progress at that point to the tenure candidate. Notification occurs at or before the deadline for tenure dossier submission published by the appropriate Dean of the Faculties Office.

(13) The full dossier is then forwarded to the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office, which forwards it to the campus promotion and tenure committee. After reviewing the recommendation of the tenure committee, the Dean of the Faculties Office forwards its recommendation to the Chancellor.

(14) Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(15) As with promotion recommendations, the tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis.

(16) All notices of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty members are issued in strict conformity to the stipulations in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and the Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement.

Table 1: Summary of Promotion and Tenure Procedures

## PROMOTION & TENURE

Faculty Appointment			
	Bloomington	Indianapolis	Joint Indianapolis/ Bloomington
Outside Letter Recommendations	List of potential outside reviewers prepared by the department chairperson.  Candidate also provides list of potential outside reviewers.	List of potential outside reviewers prepared by Associate Dean, Indianapolis with the cooperation of the Bloomington department chairperson.  Candidate also provides list of potential outside reviewers.	List of potential outside reviewers prepared by the department chairperson.  Candidate also provides list of potential outside reviewers.
Solicitation of Outside Letters	Associate Dean of Faculty and Research selects outside reviewers from the lists and solicits evaluations, in writing, from each designated outside reviewer.		
Administrative Advising and Responsibility for Dossier Preparation	Department Chairperson	Associate Dean, Indianapolis	Department Chairperson
Dossier Evaluation (Department level)	(1) Department promotion and tenure committee; (2) department chairperson	(1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee; (2) Associate Dean, Indianapolis	(1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee; (2) Associate Dean, Indianapolis; (3) Department promotion and tenure committee; (4) department chairperson
Dossier Evaluation (School level)	(1) Faculty Review Committee; (2) Dean	(1) Faculty Review Committee; (2) Dean	(1) Faculty Review Committee; (2) Dean
Dossier Evaluation (Campus Level)	(1) Bloomington Tenure and/or Promotion Committee; (2) Bloomington Dean of Faculties; (3) Provost	(1) Indianapolis Tenure & Promotion Committee; (2) Indianapolis Dean of Faculties; (3) Chancellor	(1) Indianapolis Promotion and Tenure Committee; (2) Indianapolis Dean of Faculties; (3) Chancellor
Final Evaluation	(1) President; (2) Board of Trustees		

Table 2: Summary of Pretenure Evaluation Process

## PRETENURE EVALUATIONS

Faculty Appointment			
Years on Tenure 'Clock'	Bloomington	Indianapolis	Joint Indianapolis/Bloomington
1 <sup>st</sup> Year 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	Review by department promotion and tenure committee	Review by Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee	Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and (2) department promotion and tenure committee
3 <sup>rd</sup> Year 4 <sup>th</sup> Year	Review by (1) department promotion and tenure committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee	Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee	Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, (2) department promotion and tenure committee, and (3) Faculty Review Committee
5 <sup>th</sup> Year 'Dress Rehearsal'	Review by (1) department promotion and tenure committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee	Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee	Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, (2) department promotion and tenure committee, and (3) Faculty Review Committee