



Office of Academic Affairs

Margie Ferguson, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Rachel Applegate, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs

Chair Role in Promotion and Tenure

Agenda

Part I: Welcome and Thanks!

Part II: Flash review of Chair timeline

- Including the ROUTE button!

Part III: Critical challenges

- Managing external letters
- Assessing and explaining venues
- Constituting P&T committees
- When you are not at rank: candidates seeking promotion to full

Part IV: Writing the chair Letter, casting the chair vote



Chair resources:

Teams/Sharepoint: "Faculty Affairs Guidance."

A file of documents meant to answer FAQs, both general HR and PT-specific.

Academic Affairs website

The new P&T guidelines are posted, but there will be more revisions to the website in May to present new tools and resources (and clear out old ones).

The Guidelines have a nice bit on Chair responsibilities and timeline (p. 47).

Chairs' listserv

I manage this and push out items periodically. *It does NOT automatically include School of Medicine chairs, but can upon request.* Copies of past emails are in the Faculty Affairs Guidance folder.

IUPUI faculty HR listserv

This is mainly intended for your unit HR staff, but several chairs have asked to be included and I add anyone who wants. When issues overlap chairs and HR (e.g. rules about adjuncts) I notify both the chairs' listserv and the HR listserv.



Timeline

Sample Chair timeline: *Non-school of medicine**

1. Fall of preceding year:
 - Require all candidates to inform you of their intentions for the next cycle NO LATER THAN JANUARY!!!!
 - Begin identifying external reviewers—who? Where from? Who not to contact?
 - Make sure candidate shows candidate statements to multiple readers
2. January-February
 - Make sure candidate is on track to complete candidate statement, CV, and key materials
 - “Save the date” for external reviewers
3. March-April
 - Collect/assemble/review materials for external reviewers
 - Email external reviewers; ensure they have received materials. *Some will want to complete reviews before summer*
4. May-June-July
 - Write assessment of dissemination outlets
 - Receive external reviews
 - Remind external reviewers **AT LEAST SIX NEEDED**
5. August
 - Upload external review documentation and assessment of dissemination
 - Review candidate’s part of e-dossier
 - Hit SUBMIT button!
6. Sept-Oct:
 - Write chair review, addressing primary committee comments
 - Meet with candidate after each level

*SoM timelines vary by department. Some start in January.



Your reputation as an effective chair is highly affected by the quality of the dossier materials submitted!

Timeline cautions

Make sure you know your SCHOOL deadlines

OAA does not set any date except: last Friday in October.

You are responsible for approving candidate materials.

Leave enough time for them to revise if needed.

There are reviewers who will be late...that's reality

*Must be **no fewer than 6***

Must include all reviews that arrive in a timely way

Ideally, 6-10

Future level members *cannot look at materials* until each level is complete.

Don't delay them!

Candidates have 2 weeks to protest a negative tenure vote

Rare: 5% or less of cases



Candidate **Williams, Chivas**
Department **BL-COMS**
School **BL-MSCH**
Dossier Type **Tenure+Promotion**
Dossier Status **OPEN**
Rank Sought **Associate Professor**
*Area of Excellence **Balanced Case**
Dossier Status **Ready for submission.**
Submit your Dossier

This is what the candidate sees. You will get something similar.
Please double-check the "Area of Excellence" !

E-Dossier routing

Candidate uploads materials to e-dossier

- Candidate can have a delegate to help with this
- Each main section (research/creative activity; teaching; service) can be uploaded as ONE pdf (in initial folder), or as individual folders.
- Candidate needs a copy of dept and school P&T standards to upload *submits*

Chair reviews materials:

- Is CV in the required format?
- Does the candidate statement immediately state the type of case?
- Also:
 - Has the candidate had others read the statement?
 - Does the statement adequately express their individual accomplishments?
 - Are abbreviations explained?
- At the least in main dossier: evidence of teaching evaluations; affirmation by co-authors of role of candidate.

After the chair agrees, the e-dossier is LOCKED



Critical challenges

Managing external letters

- For every single type of case, **six letters** or more are required.
 - For promotion to senior lecturer, they may be at IUPUI/IU, but not from the same “unit” (not colleagues.)
- It **is okay** to choose one or two reviewers who are:
 - Not from IUPUI-or-higher institutions
 - Not from academia
 - Not tenured, if they are at an institution that does not have tenure at all
 - Retired/emeritus, as long as they have current knowledge of the field
 - From the same institution (two separate individuals from the same university)You **must explain** why they are appropriate
- It is **not okay** to violate these rules:
 - They must be at arms’ length. No co-authors (last 5 years), co-PIs (last 5 years), dissertation directors (ever).
 - They cannot be of the same or lower rank as the candidate now.

Co-authors:
see next slide



Arm's length?

“the two” means candidate and potential reviewer

Co-authors when there are lots of co-authors (e.g. 20-50?)

OKAY if the two did not actually work together.

Co-investigators, when the two were at different sites?

OKAY if they didn't work together.

Editor of, contributor to:

A journal? OKAY

A special issue? IFFY

A book/chapters? IFFY

For specialized books, special topic issues, or one-off conferences, the relationship becomes more of a co-author one. Try to avoid unless there was a relatively large team involved.

Conference panel? OKAY

Conference organizers? IFFY if the conference is small with few organizers—in that case it is really like a co-authorship relationship.

Grant review panel? OKAY

Conference committee? OKAY unless one was the chair/selected the other as member

Assessing and explaining dissemination venues

First, explain what is generically true for faculty in that discipline:

- Author order in articles
- The relative value of articles, presentations, conference papers, exhibits, book chapters, special journal issues, books, textbooks, digital media.

Then, comment on venues specific to that particular person and relevant to their particular work:

- New topics may only be disseminated in conferences for now.
- Narrow topic journals may have low impact factors.
- Interdisciplinary topics may land in journals that are not the top journals in any individual field.
- Especially for clinical faculty, venues targeting professional audiences and with professional editors and reviewers may have the greatest influence.

Especially for *books* and for *professional magazines* document or affirm that the items are peer-reviewed.



Constituting P&T committees

Special circumstances require the department chair to help create a reasonable committee:

- Interdisciplinary work of any kind (joint appointments, community-engaged, new transdisciplinary fields.)
- Lack of four voters at each level.
 - Delete regular members who vote at another level
 - Delete anyone with serious conflicts of interest

The department chair recommends **people to add to the committee**, in conjunction with the existing P&T committee chair.



Committee member sources:

At the **department committee** level, the most critical need is for disciplinary expertise. All other levels are necessarily multi-disciplinary already.

- If the person has an adjunct appointment in another department, use that.
- Use a comparable Bloomington or West Lafayette department, if they understand IUPUI mission and circumstances.
- Emeriti faculty who have remained in touch with the field are okay.
- With permission, newly-promoted / tenured faculty (prior to tenure going into effect.)

You cannot use:

- People not at the right rank
- Non-IU or Purdue faculty

For **promotion to full**, it is more important to have *knowledgeable voters than two levels*. Having a single committee is usually better than having two committees most of whose members have little knowledge of the area.



Associate-rank Chairs: candidates seeking full rank

In IUPUI P&T Guidelines, chairs who do not have full rank do not write the chair's letter and do not vote.

For teaching-professor candidates, associate professor chairs WILL write a letter AND vote (until 2024).

For clinical-full and tenure-track-full, associate professor chairs WILL NOT vote.

Follow school guidelines / practice in how your input is included. Sometimes this is a 'solicited' letter (solicited by the Dean).

It is best to focus such a letter on those areas which the chair is best positioned to observe, such as collaboration with other department members, representing the department to outsiders, and other informal activities which are not represented in the CV.



Writing the chair letter

Critical elements of the chair letter

Like other levels:

- Summary of the main elements of the case

Unique to this level:

- Track record on grants (if applicable), clarifying nuances known to those in the discipline.
- Perspective on unit citizenship ('invisible' service).
- Perspective on teaching contributions (especially for research cases where the candidate may not discuss it in any detail.)
- **Translating** disciplinary accomplishments for future levels (who will NOT be from the same department.)
- **Responding** to any questions or concerns from the department committee.



Candidate
statement

Department
Committee letter
And vote

Chair letter
And vote

School
committee

Dean's letter

Campus
committee

The chair's letter is a summary and an evaluation but it also *reacts to* the department committee letter and to the external letter writers, *and fills in anything that the candidate neglected to explain.*



More about the chair letter and role in department meeting

- Check third-year reviews in your department and school to see what the style is.
- In your own letter *do not refer* to any external letter writer by name or institution. Every legitimate reviewer WILL have access to the actual letters, so you can say, “reviewer # 1 [in the packet] commented on the future possibilities...”
- In some departments/schools, the chair sits in on the department meeting, in others they do not.
 - Chairs are NOT ‘advocates’ for candidates.
 - Chairs should not influence the discussion in any way.
 - If chairs hear members of the committee express any opinions, *if those opinions are NOT in the actual letter, do NOT address them in yours*. The dossier MUST contain all relevant information. No ‘discussion’ or outside information that is not part of the dossier is legitimate in judging the case.
 - I know it’s hard to be perfect, but try to help the candidate anticipate questions. Often what the chair is asked, is basic information that the candidate ought to have included.



Promotions

Promotions are lower stakes than tenure decisions, but can be more difficult.

The chair is the primary person advising faculty as to when they are or are not “ready” to be promoted.

When a promotion case moves through the levels, the chair will share the review letters with the candidate.

If there are *some but very few* negative votes, please advise the candidate NOT to write a response.

If there are significant negative votes, the candidate CAN upload a counter-argument. The most effective counters point to new evidence or lay out the specific points which the candidate disagrees with, referencing both their accomplishments *and specific written P&T criteria*.



Administrator's Update
July 12

*primarily focuses on
items that are new*

Thank you!

Rachel Applegate
rapplega@iupui.edu

Margie Ferguson
mferguso@iupui.edu



IUPUI

FULFILLING *the* PROMISE