IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Program

Excellence in Teaching

Tuesday, January 12, 2016
Campus Center 405
9:00 – 11:00 am

Agenda

9:00 a.m. Welcome and Opening Remarks – Margie Ferguson, Interim Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Office of Academic Affairs

9:10 a.m. Overview of Criteria to Demonstrate Excellence in Teaching – Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Office of Academic Affairs

9:25 a.m. Operationalizing the Criteria for Excellence in Teaching – Pratibha Varma-Nelson, Professor of Chemistry, Executive Director, Center for Teaching and Learning

9:45 a.m. Comparing Notes: Peer-to-Peer Exchange – Program Attendees

10:00 a.m. Perspectives on Excellence in Teaching

Jeffrey Watt, Professor and Chair of Mathematics Education, School of Science
Carolyn Gentle-Genitty, Associate Professor, Director of the BSW Program, School of Social Work
Natasha Flowers, Clinical Associate Professor, Teacher Education, School of Education
Floyd Robison, Associate Professor, Counselor Education School of Education, Campus P&T Committee Member

10:45 a.m. Question and Answer Session

10:55 a.m. Evaluation and Announcements - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Office of Academic Affairs

11:00 a.m. Adjourn

This event is sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs
Excellence in Teaching

Margaret Ferguson, Interim Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Academic Affairs
AGENDA

Welcome
Criteria for Demonstrating Excellence in Teaching
Operationalizing the Criteria
Peer to Peer Exchange
Panel Discussion with Q & A
Evaluation and Announcements
Adjournment
# Tenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Excellence Reputation</th>
<th>Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Excellence Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Associate Professor | Teaching  
Emerging national reputation | Research and Service     | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship |
| Professor     | Teaching  
Sustained national/international reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. | Research and Service     | Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered. |
# NonTenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Excellence</th>
<th>Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Excellence Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHAT CONSTITUTES EXCELLENCE?
Common Themes of Excellence

• **FOCUS** - Developed body of focused work that extends or advances knowledge and brings recognition

• **SCHOLARLY DISSEMINATION** - Dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship through publication, presentation or other media

• **REPUTATION** - Emergent or sustained national reputation

• **IMPACTFUL OUTCOMES** - Impactful products and outcomes that are innovative
Common Themes of Excellence

- **INTEGRATION** - Evidence of integration of all areas of endeavor appropriate for rank
- **REFLECTION** - Approach is reflective, systematic and purposeful
- **QUALITY** - Evidence of quality work and significant achievement
- **FUNDING** - Supports (as appropriate for rank) innovations or research in area of excellence
Excellence in Teaching

- Sophisticated teaching philosophy - reflective, innovative, evolved over time
  - Discussion of approach, methodology, goals and their achievement
  - Teaching innovation, curricular development, incorporation of new technology
- Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated, peer-reviewed scholarship
- Documented by peer/student evaluation over time
- Evidence of impact on student performance and learning outcomes
- Teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects
Teaching Documentation

• Supporting documentation related to teaching
  • Statement of Teaching (optional 2-page narrative analyzing teaching if area of excellence)
  • Teaching load information
  • Aggregated peer and student evaluation of teaching
  • Evidence of the student learning
  • Evidence of scholarly dissemination and leadership on teaching
  • Evidence of undergraduate/graduate student research mentoring
  • Evidence of course development/innovation
  • Evidence of teaching developmental efforts
# Documenting Teaching Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Teaching Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of exemplary teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of teaching and national leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and curricular development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition – grants and awards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Teaching Checklist

## Teaching Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load information; graduate committees served on or chaired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated student evaluation of teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning and match with unit/IPUI outcome goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly dissemination of work and leadership on teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of undergraduate or graduate student research or mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of quality of course development or innovation efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of teaching development efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Suggested Standards of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes; the case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy; evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course or Curricular Development</strong></td>
<td>In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation or other means. Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring and Advising</strong></td>
<td>Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach; high accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor. Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented; demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students. External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Suggested Standards of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly Activities Including Awards</strong></td>
<td>Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels. Positive departmental evaluations of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals). Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods. National or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects. Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure track faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development Efforts in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning. Membership in communities of practice on the campus, national, or international level. Participation in dissemination of good practice. Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate’s work in this area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOSSIER FORMAT OVERVIEW

TIMELINE
ADMINISTRATIVE SECTIONS
CANDIDATE SECTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate prepares dossier</td>
<td>Winter prior to dossier year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair sends dossier for external review</td>
<td>Based on school process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier submitted for school level reviews</td>
<td>Based on school process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School submits dossier to FAA</td>
<td>End of October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Committee reviews and evaluates all dossiers</td>
<td>December, January, February, sometimes early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Committee recommendations are forwarded to Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Immediately following campus committee reviews; early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer completes an independent review and forwards</td>
<td>Mid-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations to Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor reviews cases, confers with IU &amp; PU Presidents on joint</td>
<td>Late March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations which are forwarded to the respective BOTs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action by Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Mid-April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion takes effect</td>
<td>July 1 (12 month faculty) or August 1 (10 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure takes effect</td>
<td>July 1 of the following academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
eDOSSIER Update

- SCHOOL OF MEDICINE EXEMPT 2016-17
- ALIGN SUBFOLDERS TO IUPUI CRITERIA
- LIBRARIAN PLATFORM UNDERWAY
When Do You Submit Dossier?

• Tenure-track faculty - promotion & tenure
  • Submit in the 5th year of appointment
  • School of Medicine Faculty
    • 9-year cycle
    • Can submit in 5th, 6th, 7th or 8th year

• Tenured faculty and non-tenure rank faculty for promotion
  • Submit in the May or August of selected year depending on School timeline
  • Submit when achievements and evidence meet criteria
Tenure-track Timeline

**3 Year/5 Year Review**
- **Fall:** Notified review dossier must be prepared
- **Winter:** Dossier due to Office of Academic Administration (OAA)
- **Spring:** IUSM Committee evaluates progress, IUSM Committee provides feedback to faculty member & department chair

**Tenure and Promotion Review Year**
- **Summer:** Dossier submitted to OAA
- **Fall:** IUSM Committee evaluation; Dean’s evaluation
- **Winter:** IUPUI Committee evaluation; IUPUI Dean of Faculties evaluation; IUPUI Chancellor evaluation
- **Spring:** Vice President’s Office (Bloomington) Trustees

**Year 1**

**Tenure and Promotion Submission Year**
- **Winter:** Prepare CV and dossier
- **Spring:** Notified that dossier must be prepared; Letters of evaluation sought
- **June:** Primary committee review; Department Chair review; Regional Center director review (if applicable)

**Year 2**

**Promotion Effective**
- **July**

**Year 3**

**Year 4**

**Year 5**

**Year 6**

**Year 7**

**Year 8**

**Year 9**

**Year 10**

**Tenure Effective**
- **July**

Available for all tenure track appointees
Available for those hired after July 2011
EXTERNAL REVIEW

PURPOSE

Objective Evaluation

- National/international reputation
- accomplishments in area of excellence
- significance of scholarship
- stature of dissemination outlets
- contributions to professional organizations
- professional standing and expertise

Minimum of 6 arms-length letters of external review required.

CANDIDATE’S ROLE

May

- provide a list of experts or leaders in their field
- provide names of persons not to contact

Cannot

- provide the summary of reviewers
- know the final list of reviewers
- list mentors, close personal friends, co-authors, collaborators
DOSSIER FORMAT

50 page limit EXCLUDING Administrative Sections, CV, Appendices

Administrative:
• **Internal Letters and Votes:** Dean, School Committee, Chair, Primary Committee
• **External Letters:** External Assessments
• **Solicited Reference Letters:** Not Required
• **Assessment of Dissemination Outlets**

**Candidate:** Sections as Appropriate for Appointment
• **Candidate’s Statement:** 7 pages or 5/2
• **Curriculum Vitae**
• **Teaching**
• **Research and/or Creative Activity**
• **Professional and University Service**
• **Appendix**
Candidate’s Statement

It’s Your Unique Story

• Narrative addressing one’s work (7 pages)
  • Option to split 5/2 with area of excellence
• Well-organized with headings/subheadings
  • Understandable outside of discipline
  • Reflective, explanatory, well-written
• Identify present and future focus
• Describe journey and accomplishments in each area of evaluation
• Discuss outcomes, impact and significance of your work

Speaks FOR YOU at all levels of review.
Curriculum Vitae

• A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accordance with the standard P&T format.

• [http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines/Resources](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines/Resources)
Appendix

• Not part of the 50-page limit
• Provide documentation for all assertions made in the Candidate’s Statement or other sections
• Provide a table of contents with page references; make it reviewer friendly
• May include articles published or accepted for publication, grant proposals accepted or under consideration, syllabi for redesigned courses, or other materials
• Be selective; avoid an excessively large appendix
Operationalizing the Criteria for Excellence in Teaching

Pratibha Varma-Nelson
Professor of Chemistry
Executive Director

January 12, 2016
IUPUI Promotion and Tenure, Excellence in Teaching

CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING
INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Indianapolis

Celebrating 20 years
The CTL

- Established in 1995
- Partnership among:
  - Academic Affairs
  - University Information Technology Services (UITS)
  - University Library
Space
Mission

To advance teaching excellence at IUPUI while supporting faculty through a collaborative approach that celebrates and embraces the diversity of our urban research university.
Vision

To create an internationally renowned model of collaboration with schools and departments to promote a culture of excellence in teaching and learning.
Relevant Expertise

• Instructional Technology Consultants
• Instructional Design Consultants
• STEM Education Specialist
• Faculty Fellow
Teaching Philosophy Statement

• Workshops on writing a teaching philosophy statement
  Thursday, February 18, 9 am – 12 pm or
  Friday, February 19, 9 am – 12 pm
  Presenter: Brian Coppola, University of Michigan

• Richard Turner, CTL faculty fellow,
  and James Gregory, CTL instructional
  design consultant, are IUPUI experts
Dissemination of Scholarship

• Limited travel grants (CEG and other)
• Journals for SoTL (local, national and International)
  AERA
  NARST (JRST)
  JCST
  JCE
• Which journals in your field publish education research?
Classroom Observations

• Instructional Design Consultants observe classes for faculty who wish to analyze their teaching behaviors or presentation skills.
• Consultant provides written report of the formative teaching review.
Student Focus Groups

• Conducted by a CTL Consultant during a regular class session without the instructor present.
• Consultant provides a written report of student feedback.
Grants

• Curriculum Enhancement Grants
  – Started in 2010
  – Awarded total of $656,500

http://www ctl.iupui.edu/programs/ceg.asp
Signature Events

- CTL Lecture Series (discipline focused)
- Edward C. Moore Symposium on Excellence in Teaching
- STEM Education Research Lecture Series
Workshops and Consultations

• Critical thinking
• Effective lecturing and learning
• Writing and assessing student learning outcomes
• Formative assessment of student learning
• Teaching and assessing metacognitive skills
• Incorporating technology
• ctl.iupui.edu, CTL Happenings
Teaching@IUPUI

• Webinar series focused on foundational teaching skills
• Designed for new faculty and those looking for a refresher on good teaching practices
• Recordings of past Teaching@IUPUI webinars are available on the Center for Teaching and Learning website
• Teaching@IUPUI: Documenting Your Teaching, March 31, 11:30 am – 12:30 pm
Early Career Teaching Academy

• Provides a setting for developing a teaching career rooted in evidence-based active learning strategies and high-impact educational practices, and designed to facilitate student success.
• Convenes in two intensive sessions, one full-day and one half-day session.
• Academy fellows have the opportunity to participate in faculty learning communities and teaching-related events over the course of the next year.
• Applications due in December.

Dates for 2016: February 5th and 12th
Date for 2017: February 3rd and 10th
Faculty Writing Circles

- Interdisciplinary
- Small: five-six members each
- Structured around “Publish and Flourish: Become a Prolific Scholar” by Tara Gray
Teaching-related Service

• Review CEG proposals
• Review EC Moore Proposals
• Serve on event planning committees
• Serve on panels
• Keynotes
• Offer workshops
• Serve on CTL advisory board
• Peer review of teaching
Teaching Development

- MyCTL
- Peer evaluations
- Classroom observations
- Student focus groups
pvn@iupui.edu

For more information visit ctl.iupui.edu

@CTLatIUPUI

facebook /CTLatIUPUI
Peer-to-Peer Exchange

1. Where are you in the documenting excellence in teaching?
2. What area of teaching is greatest challenge to document?
3. What needs the most work or development?
4. What is your strategy to get you there?
Panel Discussion

Documenting Excellence in Teaching
Panel Discussants

**Associate Rank**
Carolyn Gentle-Genitty, PhD, Associate Professor, School of Social Work
Natasha Flowers, PhD, Clinical Associate Professor, School of Education

**Full Rank** – Jeffrey Watt, PhD, Professor and Chair, School of Science

**Campus P&T Committee Member**
Floyd Robison, PhD, Associate Professor, School of Education
Questions and Answers
Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines

Dossier Samples
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/Dossier-Samples

Resources
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines/Resources

Adobe Presenter Online Foundational Programs
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/Online-Foundational-Programs
EDOSSIER RESOURCES

- **eDossier**
  [http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier)
- **eDossier Help**
  - [Candidate User Instructions](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier)
  - [Reviewer and Administrative Access User Instructions](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier)
  - [Instructions on how administrative access users set up review routing](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier)
  - [Video Tutorial on how administrative access users set up review routing](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier)
- **Additional Assistance**
  - IUPUI dossier content, contact [Gail Williamson](mailto:Gail.Williamson@iupui.edu)
  - IUPUI routing, access or other P&T process questions, contact [Christy Cole](mailto:Christy.Cole@iupui.edu)
Upcoming Programs

• Excellence in Service
  – Tuesday, February 9, 2016
  – 9:00 – 11:00 am in CE 309
  – Register at events http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/

• Promotion in the Clinical Ranks
  – Tuesday, March 8, 2016
  – 9:00 – 11:00 am in CE 305
  – Register at events http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/

• Promotion to Senior Lecturer
  – Tuesday, April 5, 2016
  – 9:00 – 11:00 am in CE 40
  – Register at events http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/
CAMPUS RESOURCES

• Center for Teaching and Learning (CRL)  
  http://www.crl.iupui.edu/

• Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching  
  https://facet.indiana.edu/

• Office for Women  http://ofw.iupui.edu/

• Office of Faculty and Professional Development, School of Medicine (OFAPD)  
  http://faculty.medicine.iu.edu/about-promotion-and-tenure/
Evaluation and Announcements

- Complete program the evaluation – your feedback and ideas are important to us!
- Thank you for your attendance today.
- We hope you found this information helpful.
- We wish you success!
Excellence in Teaching

What I Like to Find in a Teaching Dossier.

Dr. Floyd Robison, Campus P&T Committee Member

When I review a teaching dossier, I reflect on several things, things I hope the dossier will include so I can speak to my colleagues with excitement about the candidate’s pedagogical expertise.

The first thing I hope to find in the dossier is a powerful philosophy of teaching. A teaching philosophy, to me, forms the foundation of the teaching dossier. It should justify the inclusion of all other materials in the file. I’ll suggest that a good teaching philosophy has four major elements, as follows: (1) a description of the ways students learn under varying conditions or when learning various types subject matter, (2) a description of the personal and professional attributes of an effective teacher, (3) a description of the methods teachers facilitate learning under those conditions, and (4) questions that the candidate wants to address or ways the philosophy may be expanded and how the candidate wants to undertake that expansion. The ideas in the teaching philosophy are enhanced when they are grounded in the literatures of teaching and learning. A teaching philosophy with references to the recent literature is most impressive.

The second thing I hope to find in the dossier is a wide range of activities that enact the teaching philosophy. These activities are described in thorough, well-organized, detailed syllabi and materials describing course and curriculum development.

Third, I’m excited when I find in the dossier projects to study and improve one or more elements of the candidate’s teaching philosophy. This often takes the forms of funded and submitted grants, articles, talks, and conference presentations that describe those projects and their outcomes. It’s also exciting to find evidence that the candidate has described the teaching philosophy and applied it to learning problems or situations in the candidate’s field as well as other fields. Again, these applications are described in conference papers, invited talks, and publications, among other forms of dissemination. I note that the refereed publications, talks, and presentations indicate that the candidate’s work has risen to the top of the products that were competitively submitted, then selected by the candidate’s professional peers. The invited talks and publications allow me to conclude that this candidate is sought out to share views on teaching, and is establishing a reputation beyond the local level.

Of course, the true merit of one’s teaching philosophy and methods is determined by their reception by students, colleagues, and the professional community. Summaries of student course evaluations are the bottom line of this evaluation of merit. But peers should have a significant role in evaluating a candidate’s teaching. Peer reviews should be conducted at least annually in addition to student reviews, by colleagues who themselves are respected teachers in our institution. These reviews provide additional information that external referees need in order to justify their favorable impressions of the candidate’s teaching. Then, of course, other products are necessary to tell the story of the candidate’s teaching success. The publications, presentations, talks, grants, course development, and curriculum development activities inform the external reviewers of scope and quality of the candidate’s evolution as a teacher.
Excellence in Teaching  
Summary of Lisa Siefker Bailey’s Panel Remarks  
April 2, 2015

As a newly promoted Senior Lecturer at the Columbus campus in the Division of Liberal Arts, where I teach English, I am happy to share my best advice for preparing your dossier for promotion. I came to IUPUC in 1997 as an adjunct, was hired as a Visiting Lecturer in 1999, left the university to teach elsewhere for six years, and was rehired as a Lecturer in 2008. My PhD is from Vanderbilt University, where I specialized in Southern Literature and Drama. My dissertation is on Tennessee Williams in cultural context, and I have used my penchant for interdisciplinary studies to become a well-rounded generalist in English.

I constructed a solid case for excellence in teaching by studying my division’s list of suggested evidences for documenting excellence and making a concerted effort each year to check off items from that list and keep records of them for my file. I met with my division head and our dean of academic affairs to seek guidance in focusing on areas the P&T Committee would likely value most and to determine which of those areas I needed to boost. One such area was Peer Review of my teaching. In order to fill that need, I asked a variety of people, ranging from my division head, to colleagues in my division, to colleagues in my discipline, and colleagues from other IU campuses to peer review my classes. The best practice I developed is keeping a teaching journal. I keep one for each course I teach, and I update them weekly by listing how my class activities went, noting what I want to change and what I want to ensure I do again. I also made friends with my FAR. Knowing I could harvest items from that archive, I set out to do a better job of explaining my yearly tasks in that document, and I used it to present ways my duties fit into the category of teaching.

Having been trained at a research institution, and I realized I needed to shape my scholarship to count as the scholarship of Teaching and Learning, not just the scholarship of English or Theatre. I began this tweaking by including a couple paragraphs on applying content in the classroom in articles I had in the manuscript stage. But I knew I had to do more than fit attention to pedagogy into my content area, so I sought out workshops and symposia which focused on pedagogy, such as those offered in the CTL and by FACET. I highly recommend the FALCON conference, where you can attend and present in a myriad teaching sessions.

Using leads from conferences, I brought myself up-to-date on the latest literature on pedagogy, so that I could imbue my teaching and my writing with the language of up-to-date practices. I’m sure you are using excellent practices in your teaching. Your task now is to use language that an audience outside your discipline can easily understand in order to convince them of your case. I also focused my energies in areas of teaching that most enthused me. I realized the most exciting types of activities I use in my classroom are in the area of performance pedagogy, and I worked to deepen my expertise in those areas and to write about them for conference papers and publications. I researched places I could place my writing, and I targeted both the top publisher in my field, as well as a couple local and regional publications, so I could have a chance to publish in a variety of places—and to do so in a timely manner.
To prepare my dossier, I met with my division head and asked him to help me set a deadline. I had the personal incentive of wanting a raise in order to pay for my son’s college tuition, so I planned my writing schedule to coincide with that enticement. To do the actual writing, I spent much time reading and rereading the dossier instruction document, and I studied the models of both the lecturer and tenure-track statements to get ideas for ways I could present my case. I advise you to start with putting your CV in IU format, and then spend some time identifying and writing out your teaching philosophy. After you have these foundations, just write the sections of your dossier in pieces. Chunk them out, never letting the magnitude of the task or the claims of what others have done get to you. Just tell your story, making sure you address the most important points, the same way you instruct your students to pull out the key points of your class to demonstrate learning in a paper. Use good writing techniques, too. Make sure you have clear topic sentences, specific examples with explication of how and why your teaching deserves your claim of excellence, and a good final proofreading (read it aloud before you turn it in!).

My biggest challenge was putting aside my regular teaching tasks to clear enough time to complete the tedious work of the actual drafting and collecting of support evidence, and my biggest obstacle was writing with a tone of confidence in making my case. Since lecturers don’t lose their jobs when they don’t go up for promotion in a certain number of years, it’s tempting to keep working hard without doing the extra work of building the dossier. It’s also really scary to know your peers and your superiors are going to judge your work at a high level. I overcame these challenges by committing to a goal with a deadline determined mutually by my supervisors and myself and by imagining I was writing a recommendation about a colleague instead of just writing about myself.

I leave you with these pearls of wisdom:

James Earl Jones said, “If you expect someone else to guide you, you’ll be lost.” Remember his words when you feel like your dossier isn’t good enough. Your case is not anyone else’s, and—no matter what others do—you have include your best practices and your most provocative examples. And choose only the best ones—don’t let the crown jewels of your career get lost in the sea of information you’ve collected over the years.

Woody Allen said, “80% of success is showing up.” You have to show up at the page and write this monster out. Set up your writing schedule, and don’t let anyone take it from you. Write at a reasonable pace, and don’t let other people’s priorities become yours. After you have a full draft, you can get some feedback from colleagues and mentors, but no one can really help you with your writing until you have that initial draft. Its fun to think of all the things you could do—or you can stay forever in the “should” do—but you have to move yourself out of woulda, coulda, shoulda, and into the tangible realm of working with your draft after you have it in a complete form.

Dorthea Brande said, “Act as if it were impossible to fail.” I created an infallible dossier by doing more than the expected work in each category, selecting only my best examples as my evidence, and writing about my case with clarity and conciseness from my heart, to show the committee the real reasons I teach and why I truly am the teacher I always wanted to be.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>To Accomplish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Philosophy Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Goals and Their Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course, Curricular Development and Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Publications (Stature of Journal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Presentations (Stature of Venue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Grants and/or Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Impact of the Teaching, Advising, Mentoring Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student and Peer Review of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of National/International Reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of teaching performance</td>
<td>Potential Locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I: CV</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section II: Candidate's Statement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section III: Statement contained in Evaluation of Teaching</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peer Review (may be part of Sections I-Dean, Chair Comment or III-internal and external peers)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>List of courses, etc.</td>
<td>Details on students mentored, advised, etc.</td>
<td>Comment on relative size of load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching goals</td>
<td>Goals and/or Teaching Philosophy</td>
<td>Expansion of explanation in statement, if desired</td>
<td>Comment on fit with IUPUI and unit goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing professional development</td>
<td>List of formal activities and their significance</td>
<td>Details of workshops attended, study, reading, etc and their significance</td>
<td>Comment on efforts undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of exemplary teaching methods</td>
<td>Description of methods</td>
<td>Details, on specific methods such as teaching with technology, use of PBL, service learning, or other innovative methods, inclusive teaching</td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
<td>Student rating summaries, peer review of class performance or materials</td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning</td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
<td>Results of nationally normed tests, pre-post evaluations of course knowledge gains, analysis of student work, student/alumni reports, approach toward PULs (for UG courses) and PGPLs (for Grad courses)</td>
<td>Local peer review, external if knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Student report in letters</td>
<td>Local administrative and peer comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of teaching and national leadership</td>
<td>Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline</td>
<td>Descriptions of scholarly approach</td>
<td>Local or external peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and curriculum development</td>
<td>List of committees, etc.</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Details on CV entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (grants, awards)</td>
<td>List of recognitions</td>
<td>Can be mentioned</td>
<td>Details on CV entries, if needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUGGESTED STANDARDS FOR EVALUATING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Instruction                   | Incomplete lists of formal instruction  
Incomplete evidence to interpret load  
Incomplete information about goals of instruction  
Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data  
with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative  
Incomplete information on learning outcomes  
Absence of peer review evidence or superficial peer commentary not based on systematic review  
Poor performance on many of the above measures | Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes | Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction | Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes; The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy; Evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice. |
| Course or Curricular Development | Incomplete evidence of nature of activities or results  
Incomplete evidence of individual role in outcomes  
No review by others  
No evidence on how work is connected with department or campus goals  
Poor course or curricular design products | Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness | Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes | In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation or other means. Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence. |
| Mentoring and Advising        | Numbers of students mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided  
Comparative load for unit not indicated  
Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented  
Poor performance indicated by data | Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized  
Student satisfaction indicated by evidence  
Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear | Important impact and student achievement documented | Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach  
High accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor  
Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented  
Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students  
External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work |
| Scholarly Activities, including Awards | No teaching awards or other recognition of successful teaching and learning  
No evidence of dissemination of good practice or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) | Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL Some recognition of teaching efforts | Evidence of regular and significant local/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice  
Recognition of high quality of teaching  
Grants or awards at the department or campus level  
(For the lecturer category, this level constitutes excellence) | Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels  
Positive departmental evaluations of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals)  
Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods  
National or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects  
Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure track faculty. |
| Professional Development Efforts in Teaching | No information about teaching development efforts given  
Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise  
No mentoring of colleagues  
Evidence of ineffective performance in this area | Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance, personal experimentation, or reading  
Record of mentoring other teachers  
Reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching  
Peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth or mentoring of others | High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers  
Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues  
Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments  
(For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence) | Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning  
Membership in communities of practice on the campus, national, or international level  
Participation in dissemination of good practice  
Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area |
### SUMMARY OF AREAS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR VARIOUS FACULTY CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement to</th>
<th>Area of Excellence(^1)</th>
<th>Other Areas of Performance</th>
<th>Expectation for External Peer Review of Case</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor Tenure Track(^2)</td>
<td>Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school Highly satisfactory in all three areas for a balanced case</td>
<td>Letters from independent(^5) peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship Emerging national reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tenure Track(^2)</td>
<td>Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school Highly satisfactory in all three areas for a balanced case</td>
<td>Letters from independent(^5) peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian(^3)</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Beyond satisfactory in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Letters from independent(^5) peers outside unit on IUPUI campus</td>
<td>(No Additional requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian(^4,6)</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excellence in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and at least satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Letters from independent(^5) peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of superior performance as an associate librarian and attainment of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession (Indiana University Academic Handbook, UFC, 1978). Record of exceptional achievements in performance and a record of distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community in the secondary area of excellence. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity (Library Faculty Handbook, Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Librarians, 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Balanced case expectations are defined by the Indiana University Academic Handbook as: "balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others" to the University. This category applies to only tenure-track faculty and is to be used in exceptional cases.

2. For tenure decisions, tenure expectations are for performance commensurate with rank and evidence of continued service with distinction.

3. For tenure decisions, performance must be excellent, and professional development and service must be satisfactory. Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction.

4. Balanced case exceptions for librarians only apply to the secondary criteria (to professional development, research and/or creativity and to service).

5. Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.

6. For more detailed information regarding evaluating librarian performance, please review the "Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement to</th>
<th>Area of Excellence¹</th>
<th>Other Areas of Performance</th>
<th>Expectation for External Peer Review of Case</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area and in University Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI or department</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area and in University Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Satisfactory in University and Professional Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI or department</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Professor, Associate Scientist/Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, set by unit</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Professor, Senior Scientist/Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, set by unit</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of independent work; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Balanced case expectations are defined by the Indiana University Academic Handbook as: "balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit [to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others] to the University." This category applies to only tenure-track faculty and is to be used in exceptional cases.

² Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.
SECTION 06: Candidate’s Statement: This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

- Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate’s statement that reflects their own assessments of their accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, and service (for tenured or tenure track faculty); teaching and service (for clinical and lecturer faculty); or performance, professional development, and service (for librarians). Prospects for continued development in these areas must be addressed.

- Candidates have the option to limit the Candidate’s Statement in Section 06 to five pages and include two single-spaced pages, addressing the area of excellence, as a section introduction in either Section 07, 08 or 09 depending on chosen area of excellence.

- Candidates going up on a balanced case should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate’s statement, inclusive of the three areas of highly satisfactory work in Section 06. In cases where the candidate undergoes unit-level review at another campus (e.g., Core Schools like Business, Education, etc.), an accommodation with the page-length expectations of those campuses may be needed.

- Candidates are cautioned to describe their work in clear language that can be understood by readers from other disciplines.

- The Candidate’s Statement is a place for reflective commentary focused on the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

- The Candidate’s Statement should address the interrelated aspects of a whole, integrated career. Few candidates make sharp distinctions among the various aspects of their work as they do it, and the statement should indicate how the candidate views the integration of these aspects, even while assessing achievements in each. Special attention should be given to work that cuts across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.

- Candidates engaged in interdisciplinary work or team science should make every effort to represent their contribution to collaborative scholarship clearly, as well as the significance and value of any interdisciplinary approach they are pursuing. Candidates should carefully document their individual contributions within this context and should also demonstrate some level of independent research beyond the team science work.

- Candidates involved in public scholarly work or civic/community engagement should clearly articulate the nature of their work and how it differs from traditional scholarship, evidence metrics and dissemination outlets.

- Candidates should be careful to provide clear and sufficient information about their individual roles in collaborative projects, publications, presentation, or grants.

- Candidates should explain how their service has contributed to the common good of the campus and University and how these contributions reflect department and school/unit expectations.

- Candidates should especially address their own assessment of the impact, significance or value of their work to their discipline or profession, to the unit and campus, and to society as a whole.

- Candidates should also indicate the prospects for continued personal development in their defined areas of professional activity.
  - Whenever possible, tenure-track faculty members should state specific plans for a research or creative activity agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, and for continued participation through professional service in their profession, the campus, and a community.
  - Faculty in non-tenure track appointments should focus on their respective areas of performance.
  - Similarly, librarians should indicate the prospects for maintaining excellent performance and for continuing to contribute to their profession through their engagement in professional development and service activities.

- Candidates who seek advancement based on excellence in professional service should be able to demonstrate that such service is, in fact, academic work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers. The application of criteria to professional service should be clear, and professional service must be clearly related to the mission of the University, campus, and school/unit.

- The candidate’s case for excellence should be made in relation to department, school/unit, and University criteria.

SECTION 07: Teaching (For Librarians: Performance): This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier. This section is excluded for non-tenure eligible research ranks.

Faculty: Documenting Teaching

IUPUI requires documented evidence of at least satisfactory teaching by each faculty member for tenure and for advancement in rank (with the exception of those classified as research faculty, scientists and scholars).
This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to teaching and, if this is the area of excellence, the candidate has the option to limit the Candidate’s Statement in Section 06 to 5 pages and add a Statement of Teaching (a narrative analyzing the teaching area that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages as a section introduction). Candidates should provide the following evidence to document teaching and advising in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

**Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers (required for satisfactory level or higher).**

- Peer review of teaching is as important as peer review of research and creative activity.
- Review of teaching is a formative activity to facilitate improvement and skill development in teaching. Rank requirements such as those used for external evaluators are not applied to the formative teaching review processes.
- Local disciplinary peers can provide essential information and assessment based on observation of the classroom, studio, laboratory, or other learning environments, including those based on technology. Additionally, local peers outside the discipline can provide an additional perspective of excellence in teaching, including practices in the classroom, teaching materials, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Peer review of classroom instruction is most effective when it is based on multiple visits to classes and examination of materials; isolated observations are rarely helpful.
- It is much more difficult for external peers (i.e., external to IUPUI) to observe actual teaching, and thus local peers should prepare reports sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers along with other documented results of effectiveness.
- Evidence in the dossier should summarize statements, checklists, and methods used by peers to comment upon the quality of classroom performance and the quality of course design as evident in the syllabus and other course materials reviewed by colleagues. Similar statement or summary evidence of instruments may be submitted to document impact on student learning based on peer review of such indicators as student work (papers and projects), performance on standard exams, or personal experience with students in subsequent courses or institutions of higher learning. This evidence from peers may have resulted from in-person review or from review of materials in print or electronic form by those at a distance who teach in similar fields or use similar methods.

**Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or better).**

- Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years and compared to other faculty in the school/unit.
- **Only summaries** should be included in dossiers. The summary should include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year and item to establish trend lines where applicable.
- The summary should discuss individual results within the context of the department or school/unit to enhance the usefulness of the information to outside readers. When norms are available for comparison to others in the program, school/unit, campus, or discipline, these should be included. When results of scaled questionnaires are used, the values of the numeric ratings should be stated.

**Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media, is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence.**

- Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
- Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in teaching should have peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning.
- Discussion of the significance and impact of peer-reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.
- In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate’s work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination. Candidates and department chairs (or deans) may wish
Section 6 to Section 11 Guidance

to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may better fit with standards in the field.

Evidence that courses taught contribute to the overall student learning outcomes specified by the unit and evidence that students have met or exceeded course or curricular learning objectives should be provided.

- The role of the faculty member in assisting students to meet learning objectives should be documented and assessed in ways appropriate to the discipline and to the mission of the unit.
- This may be captured through peer review or through systematic assessment of student achievement or from standardized, nationally-normed profession-related tests.
- Faculty who teach undergraduate students should also address how their courses and scholarship of teaching contribute to learning outcomes specified by their academic unit and the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) in the statement they submit for this section.
- At the graduate and graduate professional levels, comparable assessment measures for student learning should be developed if they do not yet exist and the Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGPLs) should be addressed.

Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable.

- This evidence can be provided by listing co-authored papers or joint conference publications with students on the curriculum vitae or by discussing the nature of the student outcomes in the statement for this section.

Evidence of the nature and quality of course and curriculum development and implementation to enhance the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching is expected.

- Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present these aspects of course design (even experimental use), and how they conform to or extend principles of good practice.
- Course and curriculum development and implementation activities not reported in the candidate’s statement or in the curriculum vitae may be included in this section.
- Evidence about student learning associated with these activities can be part of the peer review or student evaluation evidence, especially when reviewers have been asked to comment on these specific innovations.
- Improvement in teaching for probationary faculty can be compelling when documentation demonstrates that the improvements can be sustained.
- External peer evaluation of course development is highly recommended for faculty documenting excellence in teaching.

The number of student graduate committees the candidate has served on or chaired and the evidence of the quality of results as documented by student achievements should be provided, as appropriate.

Local, regional, national, or international teaching, advising or mentoring awards, including information about their nature and significance (e.g., criteria, competitiveness, pool of applicants, number awarded) should be listed. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae, but if explanatory details are needed, they may be included in this section.

Teaching or advising grants (including training grants) received and their outcomes should be included. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae with outcomes information included in the statement for this section.

Leadership roles in professional associations in organizing conferences, in presenting papers at conferences related to teaching, advising or mentoring, and in advancing other aspects of teaching should be included.

- While these can be listed as professional service on the curriculum vitae, they may be included in the statement for this section if explanatory details are needed to support the candidate’s case.

Information on the teaching load of the candidate should be reported.

- While the teaching load is reported on the curriculum vitae, an indication of whether it is greater or less than the average teaching load in the department should be reported in this section.
- A large number of students is not per se evidence of achievement; teaching and student learning must be evaluated.
- Similarly, teaching a small number of students does not indicate diminished achievement if the teaching load is appropriate and there is a sufficient threshold for evaluating the quality of the teaching.
- Faculty may hold part-time appointments at any rank and in any classification; the expectations and measures for teaching achievement should be proportionate.
Section 6 to Section 11 Guidance

Using technology, distributed education, problem-based learning, community-based learning, international videoconferencing, or other new techniques and tools to enhance student learning.

- Faculty are encouraged to report their experiments and to document results.

**Interdisciplinary work**
- Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary teaching are encouraged to describe the significance and impact of bringing multiple disciplinary approaches to their area of interest.

**Retention**
- Since retention of students is of considerable importance to IUPUI, faculty members involved in retention efforts should include a description of these activities.
- Include any evidence that indicates the impact these activities have had on increasing retention, either in their own classrooms or in a broader school/unit or campus setting.

**Librarians: Documenting Performance**

The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* requires that the primary area of excellence for every librarian be Performance. This section consists of supporting documentation related to librarian performance. Any scholarship related to performance is considered Librarian Professional Development.

Candidates should provide the following evidence to document librarian performance in Section 07 of the dossier:

- **A Statement on Performance** describing performance activities and their impact is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian performance area. When performance is highly repetitive, as is often the case for librarians, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated activities.
- **Position description(s) detailing performance responsibilities.**
- **Evidence of quality or impact by patrons, faculty or other recipients of librarian performance.** It is difficult for external peers to observe actual performance, and thus, these activities should be sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers.
- **Other documentation addressing the quality of performance can be included, and might contain:**
  - Table or charts that summarize major performance projects/products.
  - Statistical summaries over time.
  - Other documentation addressing the quality of performance, as described in the “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance,” should be included.

**SECTION 08: Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: Professional Development):** This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

- Research or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty at IUPUI, as well as all research faculty, scientists, and scholars.
- For these faculty members, a threshold of documented satisfactory performance is required for promotion and/or tenure.
- In some units, funded research is an expectation and has become incorporated in departmental or school/unit standards for assessing excellence or satisfactory performance. Candidates should be careful to understand departmental or school/unit standards for external funding. Expectations should be applied consistently and equitably to all faculty within units. Information regarding the expectation for externally funded research should be available to all faculty in written form if it is a requirement for advancement.
- Peer review of research and creative activity is required, both for satisfactory and for excellence levels of evaluation.

**Faculty: Documentation of Research or Creative Activity**

This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to research or creative activity and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Research or Creative Activity (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the research or creative activity area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to document research or creativity in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

- **Identification and discussion of the three to five most significant publications that reflect the candidate’s major research accomplishments in rank.**
  - IUPUI places a higher value on quality and impact of research than number of publications.
In order to help reviewers outside the discipline to understand the importance placed on the order in which authors are listed in a publication notation, candidates should include descriptions of these conventions in their dossier.

- Increasingly, research or creative activity involves collaboration. Such collaboration across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work. They should make clear their individual role (e.g., conception of work; acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing, revisions, and other communication; administrative and material support; corresponding or primary authorship) in such collective activity, preferably as related by colleagues involved in the joint work. Department or school/unit assessment of the individual contributions of the candidate who works with more than one author or collaborator must be included.

- The candidate’s own description of a continuing program of research or creative activity that will carry forward into the future.

- Discussion of the significance and impact of peer reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.

- Where applicable, there should be an assessment of the candidate’s contributions to interdisciplinary research, including written evaluations from appropriate peers in research centers or other departments.

Librarians: Documentation of Professional Development
Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to Performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If Professional Development is selected, a Statement on Professional Development describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian’s Professional Development.

- Librarian Professional Development includes all scholarship (including any scholarship of performance, professional development, and service).

- Documentation may take many forms, such as research (both applied and theoretical), publications, or presentations to professional or disciplinary groups.

- Documentation should include a definite continuing program of professional development that advances ideas, knowledge, and technical ability to the whole profession and academic life, including internal and external peer review. Annual reviews may also be included.

SECTION 09: Professional and University Service (For Librarians: Service): This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

Faculty: Documentation of Professional and University Service
This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to service and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Service (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the service area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to service in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

- Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:
  - the public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);
  - the profession or discipline; and
  - the campus and University.

- Satisfactory professional service is expected of each faculty member and librarian.

- The importance assigned to service in considering candidates for promotion or tenure may vary according to individual circumstances and the mission of the unit.

- Professional service, including professional service in the community and patient or client services, is characterized by those activities conducted on behalf of the University that apply the faculty member’s and librarian’s disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge of interrelated fields to issues in society.
• In documenting excellence in professional service, faculty must be alert to the need to collect information and evidence at the time services are provided so that it can be used later to demonstrate impact.

• To be the basis for tenure or for advancement in rank, University and professional service must be directly linked to the unit and campus mission; the quality and impact of professional service must be evaluated within this context and must be assessed as academic work characterized by the following:
  o command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
  o contributions to a body of knowledge;
  o imagination, creativity and innovation;
  o application of ethical standards;
  o achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact.

• Peer review within IUPUI and by disciplinary or professional peers at other universities or public settings is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service, as it is for teaching and research.

• Evaluations of effectiveness by clients, patients, and other recipients of or participants in professional service activities may be critically important as evidence that can be summarized and assessed by disciplinary peers. Evaluation of service impact may include outcome data for the population served, compliance with evidence-based practice guidelines, or comparative data from benchmark groups.

• Faculty claiming excellence in service, whose professional service consists primarily of patient or client service, must document how their work exceeds normative levels of activity and quality and is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. In all cases, this work must have impact beyond the direct recipient of the service; and be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities.

• For lecturers, service may be directed toward the academic unit, but must be characterized as intellectual work to be considered as professional service. For example, developing standards for the assessment of the portfolios of entering students may be appropriately classified as professional service.

• Excellence in professional service ordinarily results in the dissemination of results and findings through appropriate publication, whether in print or electronic media. The journals, books, or web documents in which faculty publish the results of their service activities should be assessed and evaluated by department chairs (or deans) in the same manner as they are for research or teaching publications.

• As with research, professional service may span traditional disciplinary boundaries. In such instances, candidates and chairs or deans may wish to develop appropriate procedures (e.g., a specially composed primary committee) to ensure that the nature of interdisciplinary professional service is fully and adequately understood and assessed.

• Professional service to clients and patients as well as to the discipline may be local, regional, national, or International.

This section should minimally include the following items:

• **Description of the candidate's professional service activities.**
  o Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care.
  o Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
  o Faculty presenting committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate that it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work.
  o Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as academic work.

• **Evidence of the significance and impact of the professional service** should be provided through tangible results that can be assessed in the context of unit and campus mission.

• **Evidence of the candidate's individual contributions**, especially when the professional service is collaborative in nature; specific contributions of the candidate should be noted.

• **Evidence of leadership** in providing professional service, especially when there is a collaborative environment, including contributions that build consensus, help others (including patients or clients)
complete required assignments, and reflect the best practices and standards of the discipline; evidence of increasing levels of responsibility and sustained contributions are important.

- **Evidence of effective dissemination of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or service recipients** in reports, documents, or other means of dissemination that are designed appropriately to make the results understood and useful. While these reports may not be peer reviewed as a part of the publication and dissemination process, they should be evaluated by disciplinary peers for appropriateness and effectiveness as a part of the advancement review process. Evidence and evaluation of the impact of university service.

- **Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:**
  - Evidence of effective dissemination of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or service recipients. 
  - **External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service**, including refereed and nonrefereed publications or other means of dissemination. While some peers may come from the practice community, a majority should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at "arm's length" or independent as described in the section on External Assessment.
    - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
    - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
    - Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.

- **Assessments from local faculty colleagues** who can place the quality of professional service within a context of departmental, school/unit, or interdisciplinary standards.

- **Evaluation by clients, patients or service recipients.** Faculty should arrange for timely evaluations by recipients and determine appropriate ways to use this information.

- **When professional service is highly repetitive**, as is often the case in patient care, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated activities. Quantity of patient service ordinarily is not a sufficient factor in promotion or tenure, although it is expected to be high to support an area of excellence.

**Librarians: Documentation of Service**
Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to Performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If Service is selected, a Statement on Service, describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian’s Service. The notion of professional service, as it is applied to faculty, is seldom applicable to librarians since ‘professional service’ is more typically an aspect of librarian performance. Nonetheless, professional services that do not fall within the scope of a librarian’s position description may be included as evidence satisfying the service criterion. These may take the form of professional consulting or teaching.

- Documentation of service should focus on impact.
- A librarian must present evidence of satisfactory service for tenure and, if service is cited as an area of emphasis, evidence of continued improvement beyond the satisfactory level for promotion from assistant to associate librarian.
- Service to national or international organizations is highly encouraged, but not required. Institutional, local, regional, and national service should be documented through peer and external review.

**SECTION 10: Assessment/Curriculum Vitae**
This section of the dossier is prepared by the candidate and the primary/department level reviewers/administrators. For core schools based in Bloomington, this is typically the Executive Associate Dean or their designee. For schools that do not have a level one review this will be done by unit/school level reviewers/administrators. This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:

- An assessment the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case). This is typically prepared by the department Chair (see Year 6 under Chair Responsibilities for complete details); however, it could be prepared by the primary committee chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee. It is NOT prepared by the candidate. Department or school/unit evaluation of the stature of the journals in which the publications appeared, the museums or galleries showing creative work, or other venues for disseminating the results of research or creative
activity must be included. Whenever available, the acceptance rates (or other evidence of stature or quality) should be noted. Avoid abbreviations; reviewers outside the candidate's field are not likely to be familiar with them. In instances where a candidate is working in an interdisciplinary field and is publishing in journals or media other than the normal disciplinary publications, care should be taken to explain the nature, quality and role of the journals. If the published work is of demonstrably high quality, the fact that a journal is not (yet) highly ranked or even recognized within a discipline should not by itself be grounds for disqualifying or devaluing the publications. The actual assessment must be placed here; it is not acceptable to simply place a marker that asks the reviewer to refer to the chair's letter or some other place in the dossier.

- A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard format.

SECTION 11: Appendices: Appendices are not part of the 50-page limit.

- Appendices should provide documentation for all of the assertions made in the Candidate's Statement.
- Appendices may include articles published or accepted for publication, grant proposals accepted or under consideration, syllabi for redesigned courses, or any other materials that support a case for excellence in a chosen area and at least satisfactory performance in the other areas.
- Librarians, in accord with guidelines for librarian dossiers, should add separate appendices that include supporting documents for: (1) performance; (2) professional development; and (3) service. Appendices should be as succinct and as carefully selected as possible.
- Appendices are to be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested. If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in the electronic copies sent to FAA; however, this is not required.
IUPUI eDossier Information for 2015-16 P&T Submissions

Beginning with 2015-16 P&T dossier submissions, eDossier will be used university-wide with the exception of Librarians and the School of Medicine, who will be using the existing IUPUI system. eDossier organizes a promotion and/or tenure candidate’s dossier according to the various sources of evidence typically used to make a case for excellence. NOTE: Some of the suggested content may not be applicable to all campuses or all case types.

The table on the following pages maps the sections from IUPUI’s current dossier format to the appropriate location in the new eDossier system.

Please note the following:

- Upload all documents as searchable PDFs only.
- Name each file to clearly reflect its contents.
- eDossier organizes and routes the 50-page dossier. The 50-page limit includes the 5-7 page Candidate Statement and all the evidence provided in the Teaching, Research, and Service sections.
- If an appropriate folder cannot be found, use any folder in the related area (Teaching, Research, or Service) and name the file appropriately regardless of the existing title for the folder.
- Candidate should only use those folders that are relevant to their case. Some of the suggested content may be more appropriate to include in an Appendix.
- If candidates wish to make their appendix electronic, they may be uploaded to eDossier; however, this is not required. Hard copies of candidate’s appendix are to be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested.
- In order for the candidate submit button to appear, there must be one file in the first three subfolders in the General section (Department and School Criteria, Candidate's Curriculum Vitae and Candidate's Statements). The candidate or their delegate (see instructions on how to assign a delegate in candidate help document) should upload an official copy of the current department and/or school criteria for excellence in the appropriate subfolder.
  - Please note: As of July 30, 2015, a blank document under General - Department (School) List of Prospective Referees is no longer required to trigger the submit button. Please leave these subfolders blank as these lists are not required for IUPUI dossiers.
  - The submit button is has been activated for the IUPUI campus. All candidates and administrators were sent notifications.

For eDossier help:

- Candidate User Instructions: http://go.iu.edu/zmD
- Reviewer and Administrative Access User Instructions: http://go.iu.edu/zmE
- Instructions on how administrative access users can set up review routing: http://go.iu.edu/zmF
- Video on how administrative access users can set up review routing: http://go.iu.edu/zmG
- eDossier Overview PowerPoint: http://go.iu.edu/zmC

For additional assistance with:

- IUPUI dossier content, contact Gail Williamson (gwilliam@iu.edu) and/or Melissa Lavitt (mlavitt@iupui.edu).
- IUPUI routing, access or other P&T Process questions contact Christy Cole (ckcole@iupui.edu).
- eDossier technical problems, contact edossier@indiana.edu.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous IUPUI Dossier Format</th>
<th>eDossier Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 01: Transaction Forms</strong></td>
<td>Does not apply; the checklist and routing and action forms will no longer be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)</strong></td>
<td>Internal Letters: The Dean Letter and School Committee Letter are uploaded as separate documents after the vote is recorded in the Vote Record folder and before routing to the next level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)</strong></td>
<td>Internal Letters: The Chair Letter and Department Committee Letter are uploaded as separate documents after the vote is recorded in the Vote Record folder and before routing to the next level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 04: External Assessments</strong></td>
<td>External Letters: The required documents are uploaded as a single PDF. In addition, the Chair’s assessment of dissemination outlets will be uploaded here as a separate document (see Section 10 below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 05: Reference Letters</strong></td>
<td>Optional: Not all cases will have letters for this section; however, if an administrator requests reference letters on behalf of a candidate, they will be uploaded to the Solicited Letters section under the appropriate subfolder: Teaching, Research, or Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 06: Candidate’s Statement</strong></td>
<td>General - Candidate’s Statement: Not to exceed 7 pages. In addition, if candidate’s appendix is electronic, it will be uploaded here as a separate document (see Section 11 below). Candidate’s appendix is not required to be electronic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Section 07: Teaching** | Teaching: Candidate will upload their evidence for this section in the appropriate subfolders. Faculty for whom teaching is not required will not have materials to upload in this folder.  
- Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.  
- If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.  
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in the Appendix.  
- Note: Everything uploaded in this section counts towards the 50-page limit. |
| **Section 08: Research/Creative Activity** | Research/Creative Activity: Candidate will upload their evidence for this section in the appropriate subfolders. Faculty for whom research is not required will not have materials to upload in this folder.  
- Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty. The subfolder labeled “Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues” should be left blank as this information is provided by the chair. (See Section 10 below.)  
- If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.  
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in an Appendix.  
- Note: Everything uploaded in this section counts towards the 50-page limit. |
| **Section 09: Service/Engagement** | Service/Engagement: Candidate will upload their evidence for this section in the appropriate subfolders. Faculty for whom service is not a required will not have materials to upload in this folder.  
- Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.  
- If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.  
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that for IUPUI should be included in an Appendix.  
- Note: Everything uploaded in this section counts towards the 50-page limit. |
| Section 10: Assessment*/Curriculum Vitae | **General - Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae**: If the candidate is in a core school and needs to provide their CV in two different formats, one should be clearly labeled IUPUI format.  

**External Letters**: The assessment of dissemination outlets* in the candidate's area of excellence, typically prepared by the department chair, is uploaded as a separate document to the External Letters section prior to the dossier being routed for review. |
| --- | --- |
| **New for eDossier** | **General - Department and School Criteria**: Candidate should upload an official copy of the current department and/or school criteria for excellence.  

**General - Department (School) List of Prospective Referees**: Not required for IUPUI dossiers, leave this subfolder empty. (As of July 30, 2015, uploading a blank document in order for the system to function correctly is no longer required.)  

**General - Candidate's List of Prospective Referees**: Not required for IUPUI dossiers, leave this subfolder empty. (As of July 30, 2015, uploading a blank document in order for the system to function correctly is no longer required.) |
| Additional Materials and/or Reconsideration Documentation | **Supplemental Items**: Once the Candidate has submitted their dossier, this folder will appear. Candidate will upload any additional materials or reconsideration documents in PDF format to the Supplemental Supporting Items subfolder. |

*The Vote Record, Internal Letters, External Letters and Solicited Letters folders are not visible to the Candidate. Deans, department chairs and support staff with administrative rights have access to the External Letters and Solicited Letters folders while the candidate is preparing their dossier and during the routing process to upload documents. They are also able to view all of the candidate folders at any time; however, they cannot make any changes or upload documents to the candidate folders unless the candidate has specifically given them delegate access. Those with access at the department level can only see dossiers for candidates in their department. Those with access at the school level will see dossiers for all the candidates in their school.

During the review process, in addition to having view only access to all other folders in the dossier, the Vote Record and Internal Letters folders will be accessible to committee chairs, department chairs and the dean. Once the review for a level is done, the vote is recorded in the Vote Record and the review letter uploaded to the Internal Letters folder then the dossier is routed to the next level for review. They will only have access to enter votes and upload while the dossier is at their level for review; once it is routed to the next level their access changes to view only. Each level can view items in these two folders for their level and below.

Committee reviewers will have view access only to all folders in the dossier once it is routed to their committee for review. Each committee can only view items the Vote Record and Internal Letters folders for their level and below.
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