



Indiana University
Purdue University
Fort Wayne

Guidelines for Reappointment Review

This document provides a year-by-year reappointment checklist to complement departmental promotion and tenure criteria. The intent is to assist probationary faculty and their chairs in documenting progress toward meeting the promotion and tenure criteria, as reported in the annual reappointment reviews.

1. Faculty normally receive their reappointment reviews and notice of reappointment or nonreappointment in:

- February of year 1 (3 months' notice)
- November of year 2 (6 months' notice)
- May of year 2 and each subsequent year (one year's notice)

Due dates for faculty to submit information to their chairs will vary by department and school.

2. Faculty response to review:

- signature indicates that the faculty member has read the review;
- faculty member's initials next to tenure date indicate that he/she agrees with the stated date;
- faculty are entitled to request that errors of fact be corrected;
- faculty are entitled to attach a response if they disagree with the content of the review.

3. Year-by-year guidelines.

The guidelines represent **minimum** levels of acceptable progress toward tenure and promotion to associate professor. The following principles apply:

- these guidelines must be interpreted in light of the standards and criteria established by each department;
- the chair has primary responsibility for explaining the department's expectations to pre-tenure faculty and for ensuring that the faculty receive appropriate mentoring assistance;
- the department's expectations should be explained as part of the hiring process and reinforced yearly;
- the chair (and mentors) must make clear to faculty the level of performance/productivity needed to document excellence in teaching, research/creative endeavor and/or service;
- the annual reappointment letter must address each area to enable faculty to understand clearly their progress toward promotion and tenure;
- the faculty member's annual review must be consistent with the recommendations in the reappointment letter;
- if a faculty member has not documented satisfactory progress according to departmental standards but is nevertheless recommended for reappointment, there must be a convincing justification for granting an exception.

4. Nonreappointment.

Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment at any point, beginning in year one.

5. Continued Professional Growth. The campus criteria for promotion state: "Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon actual performance and the potential for continued professional growth" (SD 88-25). Thus, the minimum levels of achievement specified in this document must be viewed not as an end point, but as a milestone on the path toward Professor.

Year One

Time Frame

- Late Fall: Submit materials in late fall (specific due date varies by dept.)
January: Receive reappointment recommendation from chair
February: Receive OAA reappointment letter for year two in February (3 months' notice)
March: Receive annual evaluation from chair

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Teaching

1. The chair and faculty member have discussed the department's expectations for teaching, the criteria for establishing competence and excellence in teaching, and the need to document effectiveness using multiple measures.
2. The faculty member presents evidence of appropriate preparation of classes and of learning about/adjusting to the departmental/institutional culture and expectations.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Research/Creative Endeavor

1. Chair and faculty member have discussed department's expectations for research/ creative endeavor, criteria for establishing competence and excellence in this area, and the types of evidence needed.
2. Faculty member is in the process of articulating a multi-year plan for research/ creative endeavor.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Service

1. The chair and faculty member have discussed departmental expectations for service for pre-tenure faculty.
2. The faculty member participates in departmental meetings and events and performs other departmental service satisfactorily.

Reappointment Letter and Recommendation

The chair's reappointment letter addresses each area, including progress toward satisfying any hiring conditions stated in the contract. The letter enables both the faculty member and administrators beyond the department to understand how the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations in each area.

- If there are concerns in any area, the chair and the faculty member discuss a plan for addressing them. The chair reports the concern and the plan in the reappointment letter.
- Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment.

Year Two-Reappointment Review (recommendation for year three)

Time Frame

- Early Fall: Submit materials in early fall (specific due date varies by dept).
October: Receive annual evaluation from chair
November: Receive OAA reappointment letter for year three in November (6 months' notice).

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Teaching

1. Faculty member provides concrete evidence of teaching effectiveness, based on student evaluation data, curriculum contributions, and other measures.
2. Faculty member reflects on her/his teaching and makes adjustments as appropriate.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Research/Creative Endeavor

1. The faculty member has articulated and discussed with the chair a focused multi-year plan for research/creative endeavor.
2. There is evidence of research/creative activity.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Service

Faculty member provides evidence that service activities and contributions meet departmental expectations.

Reappointment Letter and Recommendation

A positive reappointment recommendation from the chair must enable both the faculty member and administrators beyond the department to understand how the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations in each area.

- Previous conditions (if any) have been met.
- Any problems in teaching, research/creative endeavor, or service are reported, with a plan for addressing them, in the reappointment letter. If there are multiple problems, a formalized plan agreed upon by the faculty and member and chair, with a timeline, is appended to the reappointment letter.
- Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment.

Year Two: Annual Review (recommendation for year four)

Time Frame

Early Spring Semester: Submit materials early in spring semester (specific due date varies by department).

March: Receive annual evaluation from chair

May: Receive OAA reappointment letter for year four in May (1 year's notice).

By the time of this reappointment, the faculty member has identified his/her potential area of excellence for promotion and tenure, understands the department's standards and criteria for documenting excellence, and is in the process of building a case for excellence.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Teaching

1. Faculty member provides concrete evidence of teaching effectiveness, using multiple measures.
2. Faculty member reflects on teaching and makes adjustments as appropriate.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Research/Creative Endeavor

1. Faculty member provides evidence that her/his research/creative endeavor is proceeding according to plan.
2. Faculty member is able to project completion point(s) for work in progress.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Service

Faculty member provides evidence that service activities and contributions meet departmental expectations

Reappointment Letter and Recommendation

A positive reappointment recommendation from the chair must enable both the faculty member and administrators beyond the department to understand how the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations in each area.

- If problems in teaching, research/creative endeavor, or service have surfaced that were not apparent earlier, they are reported, with a plan for addressing them, in the reappointment letter.
- A previously reported concern that was not satisfactorily addressed may be grounds for nonreappointment or the chair and faculty member may formalize a plan, with timeline, for addressing the problems. The formalized plan is appended to the reappointment letter.
- Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment.

Year Three

Time Frame

Early Spring Semester: Submit documentation materials early in spring semester (specific due date varies by department). A comprehensive, department-based third-year review, prepared according to the P&T dossier format outlined in OAA 99-1, is strongly recommended at this point.

March: Receive annual evaluation from chair

May: Reappointment letter for year five in May (1 year's notice)

Promotion requires demonstrated excellence in one area and competence in the other two. If no area of excellence has been identified by this time, the chair and faculty member must recognize this as a critical concern that is grounds for nonreappointment. A decision to reappoint despite this critical concern requires a convincing justification and a plan for achieving excellence in one area.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Teaching

1. Faculty member provides concrete evidence of teaching effectiveness, as above.
2. If teaching is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides concrete evidence pointing toward excellence, per departmental criteria.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Research/Creative Endeavor

1. Concrete evidence of progress.
2. If research/creative endeavor is the area of excellence, there is concrete evidence pointing toward excellence, per dept. criteria.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Service

1. The faculty member provides evidence that service activities meet or exceed departmental expectations.
2. If service is the area of excellence, there is concrete evidence pointing toward excellence, per dept. criteria.

Reappointment Letter and Recommendation

A positive reappointment recommendation from the chair must enable both the faculty member and administrators beyond the department to understand how the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations in each area.

- If problems have surfaced that were not apparent earlier, they are reported, with a plan for addressing them, in the reappointment letter.
- A previously reported concern that was not satisfactorily addressed may be grounds for nonreappointment or the chair and faculty member may formalize a plan, with timeline, for addressing the problems. The formalized plan is appended to the reappointment letter.
- Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment.

Year Four

Time Frame

Early Spring Semester: Submit materials early in spring semester (specific due date varies by department).

March: Receive annual evaluation from chair

May: Reappointment letter for year six in May (1 year's notice).

The faculty member documents concrete progress in the area of excellence and satisfactory performance in the other two.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Teaching

1. Concrete evidence of teaching effectiveness, as above.
2. If teaching is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides significant evidence of concrete progress toward meeting departmental criteria.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Research/Creative Endeavor

1. Concrete evidence of progress, as above.
2. If research/creative endeavor is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides evidence of significant progress toward meeting departmental criteria.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Service

1. Evidence that service activities and contributions meet or exceed departmental expectations.
2. If service is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides evidence of significant progress toward meeting dept. criteria.

Reappointment Letter and Recommendation

A positive reappointment recommendation from the chair must enable both the faculty member and administrators beyond the department to understand how the faculty member is meeting departmental expectations in each area.

- If problems have surfaced that were not apparent earlier, they are reported, with a plan for addressing them, in the reappointment letter.
- A previously reported concern that was not satisfactorily addressed may be grounds for nonreappointment or the chair and faculty member may formalize a plan, with timeline, for addressing the problems. The formalized plan is appended to the reappointment letter.
- Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment.

Year Five

Time Frame

Early Spring Semester: Submit materials early in spring semester (specific due date varies by department).

March: Receive annual evaluation from chair

May: Reappointment letter for year seven in May (1 year's notice).

The faculty member documents additional progress in the area of excellence and satisfactory performance in the other two.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Teaching

1. Strong evidence of teaching effectiveness, using multiple measures.
2. If teaching is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides strong evidence that departmental criteria for excellence are or will be met.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Research/Creative Endeavor

1. Concrete evidence of continued progress, as above.
2. If research/creative endeavor is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides strong evidence that departmental criteria for excellence are or will be met.

Evidence of Satisfactory Performance and Recommendations for Service

1. Evidence that service activities and contributions continue to meet departmental expectations.
2. If service is the area of excellence, the faculty member provides strong evidence that departmental criteria for excellence are or will be met.

Reappointment Letter and Recommendation

A positive reappointment recommendation from the chair must enable both the faculty member and administrators beyond the department to understand how the faculty member has met or will meet expectations for promotion and tenure.

- If progress in the area of excellence is not adequate to meet departmental expectations, the faculty member and chair must recognize this as a critical concern that is grounds for nonreappointment.
- Unsatisfactory performance or progress is grounds for nonreappointment.

Year Six

Time Frame

Early Fall: Dossier to department in early fall (varies by department).

October: Review by school committee

November: By 2nd week to campus committee

December: Campus committee reading period

January: By 2nd week to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; By 3rd week to Chancellor

February: To IU Bloomington or Purdue West Lafayette

Spring: Final decision, from Indiana University or Purdue University Board of Trustees, announced in spring; official notification varies by department (approximately April)

Newly tenured faculty in both Indiana University and Purdue University missions are eligible in the fall of year seven to vote and to serve on IPFW committees open only to tenured faculty. If tenure is denied, the end of the probationary period is the day before the start of the fall contract date for both universities.

Year Seven

Newly tenured IPFW faculty in both IU and PU missions are eligible for “tenured-only” responsibilities.

Carl N. Drummond
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Calendar for Promotion and Tenure and Reappointments

Year 1

November-December: Submit documentation for reappointment review to chair

January: Receive reappointment recommendation from chair

February: Notified of reappointment for year two by Office of Academic Affairs

March: Annual evaluation from chair

Year 2

August-September: Submit documentation for reappointment review to chair

October: Receive reappointment recommendation from chair

November: Notified of reappointment for year three by Office of Academic Affairs

January-February: Submit documentation for reappointment and/or annual review to chair

March: Annual evaluation from chair

May: Notified of reappointment for year four by Office of Academic Affairs

Year 3

January-February: Submit documentation for reappointment and/or annual review to chair

March: Annual evaluation from chair

May: Notified of reappointment for year five by Office of Academic Affairs

Year 4

January-February: Submit documentation for reappointment and/or annual review to chair

March: Annual evaluation from chair

May: Notified of reappointment for year six

Year 5

January-February: Submit documentation for reappointment and/or annual review to chair

March: Annual evaluation from chair

May: Notified of reappointment for year seven

Year 6

August-September: Submit P&T dossier to department for review by primary committee and chair

October: Review by school committee

November: By second week, campus committee

December: Campus committee reading period

January: Second week to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; third week to Chancellor

February: To IUB or PUWL

April: Board of Trustees decision (approximately)

Year 7

Newly tenured IPFW faculty in both IU and PU missions are eligible for “tenured-only” responsibilities