

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM : Faculty Affairs Committee  
Peter Dragnev, Chair

SUBJECT: Proposed revision of Senate Documents SD 88-13, SD 88-25, and SD 94-3

DATE: February 2, 2010

WHEREAS, the wording in Senate Documents SD 88-13, SD 88-25, and SD 94-3 is not mutually consistent;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that SD 88-13 (Procedures for Promotion and Tenure), SD 88-25 (Criteria for Tenure and Promotion), and SD 94-3 (Promotion and Tenure Guidelines) be amended as follows:

Note: SD 88-13, Section 2.1: insert sentence

Note: SD 88-25, Section C: change wording

Note: SD 94-3, Paragraph 1 of first page: addition of “colleges”; Paragraph 2 of first page: change wording to be consistent; Section “Teaching”: change wording to be consistent

---

## PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

IPFW and its autonomous academic units shall establish, within the timeframes and by means of criteria established in other documents, procedures for the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure according to the following guidelines and procedures. Autonomous academic units shall consist of those units subject to the powers of the Faculty detailed in Section VI of the Constitution of the Faculty; other units may, at their option, adhere to these guidelines and procedures.

1.0 Decision Levels: Nominations for promotion and/or tenure shall be considered at several levels. The preponderance of the evaluation of a candidate shall occur at the first level.

- 1.1 The department/program committee, whose composition and functions shall be established according to a procedure adopted by the faculty of the department/program and approved by the faculty of the college/school/division. The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee shall be consulted about any newly established committee composition and functions procedures, and any changes to an established procedure. The Senate shall have the right of review of this procedure. The department/program committee shall follow procedures established by the faculty of the college/school/division or, in the absence of such procedures, by the Senate.

All full-time, tenure-track members of the department shall have the opportunity to review and comment on each case for promotion and tenure. The majority of the departmental committee shall be persons possessing the same or higher rank to which a candidate aspires.

The appointment letter of a faculty member to more than one academic unit shall identify that department/program whose tenure/promotion process shall apply to the appointee.

- 1.2 The chief academic officer of the department/program
- 1.3 The college/school/division committee(s), established by the college/school/division faculty, incorporated into the documents which define the procedures of faculty governance within the college/school/division, and approved by the Senate. This procedure shall be periodically published, simultaneously with the Bylaws of the Senate, as and when the Bylaws of the Senate are distributed.

Nothing in this document shall be construed as requiring a college/school or division without departments to perform a second review and make a second recommendation on promotion and tenure cases; however, when such a review and recommendation are made by a committee, the committee shall be constituted in such a way that a majority of its voting members will not have served on the first committee.

- 1.4 The chief academic officer of the college/school/division
- 1.5 The campus committee, consisting of the Chief Academic Officer of IPFW as nonvoting chair and seven tenured members of the Fort Wayne Faculty, a majority of whom hold the rank of Professor or Librarian, selected so as to provide balanced representation of the disciplinary areas. Voting members of this committee shall be

elected to three-year terms, staggered in the first instance, by the Chief Administrative Officer of IPFW and the two Speakers of the Faculty. The committee members will be elected from a panel of nominees composed of at least two representatives from the faculty of each college/school/division selected according to procedures adopted by the college/school/division Faculty and incorporated into the documents which define the protocols of Faculty governance within the college/school/division. Voting members of this committee shall recuse themselves from considering cases of candidates with whom they share significant credit for research or creative endeavor or other work which is a major part of the candidate's case or if they serve as department chair for the candidate under consideration. Faculty members shall not serve on this committee in a year when their own cases are pending. The purposes of this committee are to review the actions of the earlier decision levels to assure that the candidate is afforded basic fairness and due process in accordance with established university policies and procedures and to assess the adequacy and sufficiency of the evidence. The direct submission to members of materials which are not part of the promotion and/or tenure case dossier is prohibited.

1.6 The chief academic officer of IPFW

1.7 The chief administrative officer of IPFW, to forward recommendations to the President of Indiana University and to the President of Purdue University

2.0 Case Process

2.1 All cases for promotion and/or tenure shall pass sequentially through the decision levels above. **No additions to the case other than updating the status of items already included in the case can be made to the candidate's case after a final vote by the department/program committee.**

2.2 The administrator or committee chair at each level shall inform the candidate in writing of the vote or recommendation on the nomination, with a clear and complete statement of the reasons therefor, at the time the case is sent forward to the next level. When the vote is not unanimous, a written statement stipulating the majority opinion and the minority opinion must be included. The candidate may submit a written response to the statement to the administrator or the committee chair to be included with the case when it is sent forward to the next level. At the same time that the case is sent forward to the next level, the administrator or committee chair shall also send a copy of the recommendation and statements of reasons, and the candidate's response, if any, to administrators and committee chairs at the previous level(s). Committee chairs shall distribute copies to committee members.

2.3 The deliberations of committees at all levels shall be strictly confidential, and only the chair may communicate a committee's decision to the candidate and to the next level. Within the confidential discussions of the committees, each member's vote on a case shall be openly declared. No abstentions or proxies are allowed.

3.0 Individual Participation

3.1 Only tenured faculty may serve as voting members of promotion and tenure committees at any level.

3.2 No person shall serve as a voting member of any committee during an academic year in which his or her nomination for promotion or tenure is under consideration, nor shall

any individual make a recommendation on his or her own promotion or tenure nomination.

- 3.3 The department/program level excepted, no individual shall serve in a voting or recommending role at more than one decision level. In order that this be accomplished, the campus committee shall be filled before college/school/division committees. In the event that the chief academic officer of a department, program, college, school, or division serves as ex-officio member of a committee, then that person shall not vote during that committee's deliberations and decisions.

#### PROCEDURES FOR THIRD YEAR REVIEW

Departments will review the progress of probationary faculty toward tenure during the third probationary year. This review will occur at the time of the fourth reappointment, that is, for reappointment for the fifth year of the probationary period, normally initiated during February of the third probationary year.

- 4.0 Third year review shall occur at the first level (department or program committee referred to in 1.1 above) and shall result in a written recommendation to the second level (1.2 above) for reappointment for the fifth year of the probationary period.
- 4.1 The recommendation for reappointment made by the department/program committee shall be considered by all other levels involved in making the reappointment recommendation during the third year. Ordinarily those levels are those referred to in 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, & 1.7 above.
- 4.2 Departments and programs may use similar procedures to recommend reappointment in other probationary years.

## **CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

---

The most important decisions in the academic profession, for the individual and for the institution, regard the granting of tenure and the awarding of promotion. The granting of tenure involves a commitment on the part of the University for the working lifetime of the faculty member. Further, promotion may be granted before tenure. Consequently, the granting of tenure is a more serious decision than the award of promotion, as it has a significant impact on the faculty member, the University community, its students, and the citizens of the state.

With tenure a faculty member receives the opportunity to teach, study, and serve for the duration of her/his professional career in a community which protects academic freedom, provides adequate material rewards, and encourages intellectual growth. The university, for its part, benefits from the confident and disciplined pursuit of excellence undertaken by tenured faculty.

The decision to grant tenure, usually made at an early point in a colleague's career and/or after only a relatively short time has been spent at this university, must depend in part on what has been achieved in teaching, research, and service, and, to a greater degree, on what the candidate can reasonably be expected to achieve in these areas in the future. Those responsible for recommendations and decisions regarding tenure must also pay due regard to the mission of the candidate's unit and her/his contribution to it.

The granting of tenure then results from positive university action rather than a legal obligation or a reward; tenure can be acquired only as a result of positive action. In contrast to tenure, promotion in rank is more heavily dependent upon evidence of professional achievement. Considerations of promise of continued development and the candidate's contribution to the particular mission of her/his unit are also important, but less crucial. The application of criteria in promotion decisions provides evidence of the university's values and the seriousness with which they are applied. Promotions measure, reward, and inspire accomplishment.

### **A. Criteria for Tenure in the Professorial Ranks**

Tenure at any rank is based upon a record of satisfactory teaching, research, and service (see promotion and tenure guidelines in Senate Document SD 94-3).

The award of tenure at the end of the probationary period as an assistant professor is linked to promotion. This connection is appropriate and even natural. In many careers the duration of the probationary period and the time needed to build a record in teaching, research, and service meriting promotion to associate professor are equal, and the university can address the separate decisions simultaneously. Both Indiana and Purdue Universities, however, recognize that in exceptional circumstances these decisions may not be made at the same time and that, although the criteria are the same, the weight assigned

to each criterion differs from tenure to promotion. The university grants tenure and promotion to associate professor in the same year when a candidate meets the criteria established for both. Whenever these decisions are made in different years, however, a recommendation to award tenure is based upon evidence of:

1. a record of satisfactory achievement in teaching, research, and service
2. (for the award of tenure at the rank of assistant professor) the likelihood of promotion to a higher rank in the near future, and
3. the unusual importance of the individual's contribution to the university.

Cases for tenure in these exceptional circumstances must address each of these points.

B. Criteria for Tenure for Instructors

Tenure decisions for instructors should be based primarily on teaching and service. A recommendation to award tenure to instructors is based upon evidence of:

1. A high level of teaching performance (as attested to by such traditional measures of classroom instruction as student and peer evaluations, results of common examinations, review of classroom materials and student work, contributions to curricular development, and teaching awards).
2. A record of satisfactory achievement in service, particularly service related to teaching.
3. Other activities that support teaching, demonstrate a consistent pattern of professional growth, establish connections with professional peers in the region or nation, and maintain currency with pedagogic developments elsewhere (as attested to by such activities as the design and analysis of instructional innovations, presentations at conferences and workshops, or writing for publication).

C. Criteria for Advancement to Senior Instructor

A tenured instructor who has established a record of excellence in teaching and continued ~~competence~~ **satisfactory achievement** in the other duties under B above is eligible for advancement to the title of Senior Instructor.

D. Criteria for Promotion within the Professorial Ranks

1. Teaching

A candidate who excels in teaching is one who guides and inspires students and stimulates their intellectual interest and enthusiasm; one who displays a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads him/her to develop and strengthen course content in

the light of developments of the field, as well as to improve methods of presenting material.

2. Research

A candidate who excels in research is involved in scholarly or creative endeavor appropriate to the candidate's discipline. The results of research should have been evaluated by authorities in the field.

3. Service

A candidate who excels in service contributes in one or more of the following areas: Institutional service, professional service to the community, or service to the profession. The evaluation of service should be supported by evidence drawn from various sources.

E. Application of Criteria to Professorial Ranks

When considered for promotion, the individual should be assessed in light of the criteria specified in section D above. Favorable action shall result when the individual has demonstrated, in one area of endeavor, a level of excellence appropriate to the proposed rank. Failure to promote may arise, however, from unsatisfactory performance in the other areas.

1. Promotion to Assistant Professor

Promotion to Assistant Professor is based upon a strong academic record, and the individual should have in most cases completed a terminal degree. There should be clear indications that the individual possesses those qualities which will eventually assure promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

2. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon actual performance and the potential for continued professional growth.

3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion to Professor is awarded to individuals recognized by professional peers as authorities in their fields. It is expected that candidates will have made important and recognized contributions in at least one of the areas: teaching, research, and service. Candidates will be recognized and respected in state, regional, or national educational and professional circles.

## PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

---

As a comprehensive university, IPFW is committed to maintaining a standard of excellence in its diverse programs, departments, and schools/**colleges**. To maintain that standard, it must be applied consistently at all levels of evaluation throughout the institution. This standard of excellence applies to teaching, research and creative endeavor, and service. Because the needs and goals of programs vary widely, faculty contributions to the university may be very different, yet all are essential to its success. Our criteria for promotion and tenure must take these differences into account. And yet there are standards applicable to all who hold faculty appointments in the institution. Meeting these standards is the responsibility of every faculty member; granting tenure or promotion is our recognition that they have been successfully met.

Promotion is a recognition of past achievement; tenure, a statement of confidence in future achievement. While promotion and tenure criteria are often the standards for summative judgment, they are most properly viewed as guidelines for faculty development. To this end, each department should develop a promotion and tenure policy of its own, setting out criteria for excellence and ~~acceptability~~ **satisfactory achievement** in teaching, research and creative endeavor, and service. The policy should define what the department means by "teaching," "research and creative endeavor," and "service" and list activities and achievements properly associated with those terms, along with qualitative standards by which they may be judged.

The policy so developed should be consistent in content and criteria for quality with those governing promotion and tenure in comparable departments at other universities, and may be evaluated by peers in the discipline in order to strengthen claims that faculty here are judged according to widely recognized professional standards. The policy must also be consistent with applicable Purdue University or Indiana University standards for promotion and tenure.

All types of evaluations should be accompanied by a statement indicating who solicited them, the terms under which they were obtained, the number solicited, and the number returned.

### TEACHING

IPFW faculty are expected to be effective teachers and to have demonstrated a significant commitment to teaching. If teaching is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate's performance should be clearly superior to the standard of ~~acceptability~~ **satisfactory achievement** at IPFW and comparable institutions; if the primary basis for promotion to Professor, the candidate should not only have established a record of excellent teaching but also have contributed to the general improvement of instruction at IPFW or in the discipline.



Teaching includes not only classroom instruction, but all other activities with a direct bearing on student learning. Evidence to support the evaluation of teaching should represent multiple perspectives, which may include information from students and colleagues, on and off campus, as well as self-evaluation.

Information from students may take the form of student evaluations, interviews, letters, surveys of graduates, and measurements of learning. This information should be accompanied by a statement of the manner in which it was gathered, the individuals involved in the process, and the safeguards employed to preserve confidentiality.

Evidence from colleagues may include evaluation of course materials, instructional contributions and curriculum development, pedagogical publications or presentations, formal observations of classroom teaching, and teaching awards. In many departments, a summative judgment by a senior colleague or colleagues of all the evidence concerning teaching effectiveness can provide support for a claim of comparative excellence.

Self-evaluation may include methods such as personal statements, self-assessment forms, and video and audio-tape analysis.

Furthermore, active involvement with professional organizations which focus on teaching effectiveness or with university-sanctioned student organizations may provide additional support for the candidate's interest in teaching and working with students.

## **RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ENDEAVOR**

IPFW faculty with release time for research are expected to be engaged in long-term programs of research, scholarship, or creative endeavor. This work should reach and be favorably acknowledged by an audience that extends beyond the campus. Faculty with release time for research are expected to maintain currency in their discipline and to share their expertise with peers at IPFW and other institutions. If research and creative endeavor is the primary basis for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate should have demonstrated substantial achievement beyond the terminal degree; if the primary basis for promotion to Professor, the candidate should have gained national or international recognition for his or her work.

While assessing the scholarly or creative contributions of a candidate, some of the factors which may be important in establishing excellence are originality, significance, depth of consideration, contribution to the discipline, and relevance to the candidate's teaching. Depending upon the discipline and area of endeavor, some combination of several or all of these aspects may be involved in building a case for excellence. The quantity of research or creative endeavor is a sign of productivity; however, its quality is more important. And because the judgment of the candidate's work is primarily qualitative, it cannot be reduced to quantitative formulae.

The evaluation of research, scholarly, or creative outcomes by authorities in the field is accomplished by a variety of means, such as publication, presentation, exhibition, and performance. In general, the widely accepted evaluation practices within the discipline will determine what evidence a candidate includes in a tenure/promotion case. Documentation concerning the stature of the publication, conference, place of exhibition, or performance venue,

as well as the selection process (refereeing, judging, competition) may also be important in establishing excellence. Letters solicited from authorities in the field outside the university should be an essential part of the documentation as well.

## **SERVICE**

IPFW faculty are expected to take an active role in the campus beyond teaching and research or creative endeavor; they are encouraged to contribute their expertise to the community, state, and nation and to participate in professional organizations. If service is the primary basis for promotion, it should represent a unique achievement of special value to the campus, community, or profession.

Individual members of the Faculty should provide evidence of service adequate to enable its fair assessment. Such evidence might include self-reports, documents from those served, products of the service, reports of the results of the service, evaluation reports received with or without solicitation from disinterested third parties, and requests for continue service from those served. The evidence should demonstrate both the quantity and the quality of the service.

Policy regarding service should distinguish between professional activities (those related to the faculty member's discipline or assigned university duties, or to the mission of the university) and nonprofessional activities (those not so related). The quality of nonprofessional service should not be a major factor in promotion and tenure considerations.

Policies should also take into account the possibility that certain service activities may overlap with activities in the other two areas.