

**To:** Core Department Chairs  
College of Arts and Sciences

**From:** Rick Van Kooten, Executive Dean

**Subj:** Promotion to Full Professor Procedures for 2022-23

**Date:** February 14, 2022

It is time to begin the process of recommending candidates for promotion to Professor from your department. If you expect to recommend anyone from your department in fall 2022, please keep the following guidelines and schedule in mind.

**Dates to note:**

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>May 2, 2022</b>        | <b>Proposed promotion to full professor reviewer lists to divisional Associate Dean and <a href="mailto:collprom@iu.edu">collprom@iu.edu</a></b> |
| <b>June 13, 2022</b>      | <b>Confirmed list of external reviewers to <a href="mailto:collprom@iu.edu">collprom@iu.edu</a></b>  |
| <b>September 19, 2022</b> | <b>Promotion to full professor eDossier submission deadline</b>  |

**PROMOTION STANDARDS**

The College views promotion to Full Professor rank as a most important decision. Full professorship represents the attainment of a position of leadership at the university and in the candidate's field, through contributions in research or pedagogy that significantly raise the level of knowledge in the discipline, and service that advances the university's research, teaching, and service missions. Conferral of the rank of full professor at this University represents our judgment of the achievement of outstanding contributions to the scholarly community.

Promotion to full rank is an affirmation of the significance of a colleague's career. An application for promotion that is turned down at any level is disheartening and may lead faculty to become disenchanted with the university. In some instances, it may also lead to a colleague's departure. For all these reasons, it is critically important that a dossier for promotion only be put forward when a compelling case can be presented.

The promotion criteria described below are based on statements by the College's Policy Committee and relevant campus policies that require that all candidates be evaluated with regard to contributions in research, teaching and service. The most current promotion criteria are provided in the [College Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Department Guidelines](#). When evaluating cases, the College Research Faculty Promotion Subcommittee and the Executive Dean use the following criteria:

(1) If research or creative work is the primary criterion for promotion, the candidate must have achieved excellence in research, i.e., a position of leadership in a substantial field based on a documented and robust record of achievement and distinction. This must be demonstrated by persuasive evidence in external reviewer letters and internal reports, and by other pertinent documentation in the dossier. The dossier must demonstrate, at a minimum, effective performance in teaching, and satisfactory performance in service.

(2) If the primary criterion for promotion is teaching, the candidate must provide evidence of outstanding classroom instruction as well as broad teaching impact beyond the campus; for promotion to full professor, candidates must have achieved a national and/or international reputation as a leader in the practice or study of teaching. Please refer to the [College Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Department Guidelines](#) and the [Policy on the Evaluation of Pedagogical Practices](#) revised in 2018 for further information. Similar to cases based on excellence in research, excellence in teaching must be demonstrated by persuasive evidence in external reviewer letters and internal reports, and by any other pertinent documentation in the dossier. The dossier must demonstrate, at a minimum, satisfactory performance in research and in service.

(3) We do not anticipate that candidates in the College will be put forward for promotion on the basis of their service contributions. If, however, there are such exceptional cases, then the documentation should provide evidence of having achieved national/international visibility and stature resulting from service activities. The dossier must demonstrate, at a minimum, satisfactory performance in research and effective performance in teaching.

(4) In a balanced case, the candidate's overall contribution to the University must be shown to be comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single primary area. In research, this means evidence of high quality and significant contributions to a substantial field. In teaching, it means evidence of outstanding classroom instruction and significant contributions to teaching outside the classroom. And in service, it means evidence of significant impact beyond the home unit on the university, the discipline, or public, private, professional, or civic organizations and institutions.

(5) It is also expected that all candidates will make a positive contribution to the professional environments of their departments and will make a positive service contribution to the University.

(6) There should be strong indications in the dossier that the candidates will maintain and enhance the level of performance on which the awarding of promotion is to be based.

These College standards derive from campus guidelines. Your attention is called to the [Criteria for Promotion](#) in the Faculty and Librarian Promotions policy:

“Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion criteria. Promotion considerations must take into account, however, difference in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual’s contribution to the school/campus mission. The relative weight attached to the criteria above should and must vary accordingly. A candidate for promotion [or tenure] should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be at least satisfactory in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University over time. In all cases the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.”

Both the departmental recommendation and the personal recommendation of the chair should indicate the primary criterion for their evaluation of a candidate. The Promotion Committee will review the case on this basis. Comparisons of research, teaching and service are to be made with respect to persons who have recently been promoted to full professor rank at major research universities. Departments and candidates should be explicit about the basis for promotion, and this decision will guide construction of the dossier, including which template is used to request external reviewer letters.

Revisions to IUB Tenure and Promotion Guidelines in 2013 included four areas that I bring to your attention.

Interdisciplinarity. Candidates for tenure and promotion are encouraged to pursue innovation wherever it seems promising, even at the edges of disciplinary boundaries or in between them. Reviewers at all levels should be open to the possibility that work “on the edges” or straddling two fields may eventually transform research agendas in fundamental ways not always easily recognized by the home unit. A candidate’s interdisciplinarity may require that home units adapt their expectations/criteria and procedures. For example, practices for assembling review committees and soliciting external reviewers may need to be altered in order to ensure that all aspects of research/creative activity get assessed by properly knowledgeable judges.

New Scholarly Communications. Reviewers at all levels should consider that the best new research/creative activity may not necessarily appear in the traditional disciplinary top journals or in books published by the historically most prestigious publishing houses. Peer reviewed publications are given greater weight than those that are not. Candidates assume responsibility for providing evidence of the value of their publication outlets.

*Impact on Diverse Communities.* In assessing the impact of research/creative activity, reviewers should consider the variety of communities – inside the academy and beyond – which may be transformed in significant ways by a candidate’s work. The emergence of “public scholarship” expands the range of audiences to whom a scholar/artist may direct their research/creative activity, and sometimes the best of this work does not appear in narrowly defined professional outlets. Candidates should describe how their research/creative activity targeted for non-academic audiences intersects with work targeted to a scholarly community. Public scholarship will not supplant expectations for publications targeted to peer professional communities, but it may supplement that work. Evidence for “public scholarship” includes panel/commission and other technical reports, policy white papers, and strategic plans for community/civic groups.

*Collaborative Work.* Candidates are expected to establish independent lines of research/creative activity. For that reason, it is vital to establish the autonomous role played by the candidate in collaborative publications and grant proposals. Candidates must clearly describe in the research statement their role in and contributions, including fraction of overall effort, to collaborative publications and grant proposals. The chair/dean must solicit letters from collaborators and co-authors, attesting to the autonomous contributions of the candidate.

Complete explanations are in the [IUB Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Reviews](#).

## **EXTERNAL LETTERS**

A minimum of six external review letters are needed for each dossier. Departments often have to request more than six letters to meet that requirement and all external letters that are received must be included in the dossier. These letters will be obtained by departments on behalf of the Executive Dean, based on a list of twelve names of outside reviewers, half proposed by the candidate and half by the department, compiled independently. See below for more details and deadlines. The Executive Dean reserves the right to solicit additional letters independent of the department. Our expectation is that external reviewers will represent a portfolio of professors active in the discipline from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. The external reviewers should be capable of evaluating faculty fairly and objectively in comparison to their peers in the discipline or field. Thus, the preponderance of external reviewers should be full professors who can provide an independent evaluation of the dossier. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, graduate school peers, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest should not be asked to serve as external reviewers. Please review the [College Policy on Letters Solicited for Promotion and Tenure](#) revised in 2021.

Candidates for promotion have access to the external reviewer letters. In general, we recommend that candidates refrain from viewing letters until the departmental recommendation is made but, if so requested, departments must accommodate requests to view the letters at any point in the process. Feel free to contact the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs or the College Executive Dean’s office for guidance on this issue, as

well as on confidentiality and other related concerns.

The departmental review committee should include no fewer than three faculty members. If there are an insufficient number of appropriately ranked faculty members in the department to constitute a review committee, the Chair of the Department should work with the candidate and the elected faculty committee to select appropriate committee members from faculty in other related departments with guidance from the Associate Executive Dean. Departments may propose alternative procedures that must be approved by the Executive Dean's Office.

## **DEADLINES**

**May 2, 2022 External reviewers:** Forward to your divisional Associate Dean and to [collprom@iu.edu](mailto:collprom@iu.edu) the following materials:

- candidate's CV
- identification of the basis for promotion (research/creative activity, teaching, service, balanced case)
- names of twelve proposed external reviewers, half selected by the candidate and half selected by the Department, and including information on each proposed reviewer (see below)
- current departmental promotion criteria.

**You must indicate clearly those reviewers suggested by the candidate and those suggested by the department.**

The basis for promotion may not be changed once reviewer letters are invited as each basis requires a different letter of invitation.

For each proposed reviewer, please also provide us with:

- their institutional affiliation, academic rank, and a brief narrative detailing their qualifications and reputation in the field
- an embedded link to, or a webpage for, the reviewer's CV
- a brief description of any previous contacts with (e.g. served on a panel together) or relationships between the proposed reviewer and the candidate (e.g., supervisor, collaborator).

**External reviewers should be full professors from peer institutions; they should not have a close association with the candidate.**

The divisional Associate Dean will select three or four names from each of the two lists submitted and at least one alternate from each list. The same number of letters shall be solicited from the candidate and department lists. All letters that are received must be included in the dossier.

**May - June 2022      Contact reviewers; distribute materials to reviewers, prepare dossier**

After the proposed reviewer list is returned to you with the divisional Associate Dean's approved reviewers, chairs should contact potential reviewers immediately by sending them a copy of the candidate's CV and a letter asking them to serve as a reviewer. Please do not send any dossier materials to a reviewer until the reviewer has agreed in writing to serve. (See Letter #1 sample below.)

If any potential reviewer declines the invitation, refer to the approved list from the College which will indicate preferences for alternates whom you can then contact. If you need to use names beyond those already approved, please contact your divisional Associate Dean. You may find it helpful to have ready an alternate list of reviewers.

Distribute materials to external reviewers who have agreed to supply an assessment. Depending on the nature of the case (research/creative activity, teaching, balanced case), use the appropriate version of Letter #2 (below) as a cover letter. You should work with the candidate to prepare identical packets of materials (articles, books, etc.) for the external reviewers. Packets should include materials that correspond to the principal basis (e.g., research/creative activity, teaching, balanced case) that will be used in the department's assessment of a candidate, a copy of the College's [Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor](#) and a copy of the department's promotion criteria. It is recommended that the candidate's personal statement be included in the information sent to external reviewers. Please provide each reviewer with a list of all materials that you are sending for their review.

**It is the department chair's responsibility to oversee the compilation of the dossier; this should not be left to the candidate without guidance from you and clerical support from the Department.** The chair is expected to work with the candidate to prepare a dossier that accurately and clearly reflects the candidate's accomplishments with all the documentation required to meet the university's procedures and guidelines, and to work with staff to prepare the list of materials for each reviewer.

**June 13, 2022                      Submit to the College the names of external reviewers who have agreed to write letters. Please send the list to [collprom@iu.edu](mailto:collprom@iu.edu).**

**September 19, 2022              eDossier for Full Professor Promotions due**

Promotion dossiers must be submitted via the eDossier system no later than **Monday, September 19**. A current curriculum vitae and bibliography of publications should be provided in all dossiers, with refereed publications clearly identified. Please refer to the [IUB Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Reviews](#) when preparing a candidate's dossier.

Special attention often needs to be paid to the teaching portion of the dossier to include and organize student evaluations, peer evaluations, commentary from Ph.D.

and M.A. advisees, and from AIs supervised by the candidate all of which are a major source of information in the teaching category. In the case of promotion, the general expectation in the College is that there will be evidence of undergraduate and graduate teaching while in rank and that a peer evaluation will be conducted every other year. Summaries of quantitative teaching evaluations from the four campus-required questions<sup>1</sup> for all courses taught at Indiana University are expected as well as all open-ended student responses. Quantitative data must be presented in a summary spreadsheet or graph (showing course, semester/year, and results on campus-wide survey items), enabling trends and comparisons to reference groups to be easily discerned. As far as possible, please interpret student evaluation data within your departmental context; e.g., “this introductory course is a challenge for even our most experienced teachers, and this score is close to the departmental norm for this course.” Please also refer to the College [Policy on the Evaluation of Pedagogical Practices](#) revised in 2018.

## **DEPARTMENTAL VOTE**

After the external reviews have arrived, typically in early fall, the vote-eligible faculty in the department will meet to discuss the case, rate the candidate’s performance in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, and vote on the question of promotion.

The following evaluative ratings must be used for teaching performance: Excellent, Very Good, Effective, and Ineffective. For research/creative activity and service, the evaluative ratings are: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory.

Faculty who vote on the case must rate the candidate in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, and also submit a positive or negative vote for promotion. To justify a positive vote for promotion, faculty must either rate the candidate as excellent in the category that serves as the basis for promotion and at least satisfactory/effective in the other categories or, for a balanced case, rate the candidate as at least very good in all evaluative categories. No explanations or comments should be included on ballots. Ballots that register votes for promotion that are inconsistent with the ratings of research, teaching, and service, should not be counted. If a ballot is marked abstain and the three areas are rated, do not count the ratings. If a faculty member was not present at the meeting, did not submit a vote, and did not declare an abstention, the faculty member should be counted as absent.

Our procedures call for the chair to provide an evaluation of the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses independent of the department committee and to provide a recommendation on promotion independent of the departmental vote. The chair’s letter should adequately address and interpret the positives and negatives in the dossier, including minority votes and any critical comments contained in external letters, or blemishes in student

---

<sup>1</sup> How clearly were course learning goals and objectives communicated to you? How effectively was class time used to help you learn? How effectively did out-of-class work (assignments, readings, practice, etc.) help you learn? How available was the instructor to provide help when needed (in person, by email, office hours, etc.?)

evaluations. Please include any unique characteristics of the discipline that may bear on the case (e.g., books versus articles, extent of co-authorship, significance of order of names on publications, whether grants are expected). **The chair must report the ratings for research, teaching and service as well as the overall vote for promotion in the chair's letter.** Chairs' letters are typically 2-3 pages long.

For more information regarding the department and chair's review, please refer to pages 8 – 10 10-12 in the [College Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Department Guidelines](#) posted on the Intranet.

These procedures help the College and the University assure each candidate a fair and full consideration in a decision of great personal and institutional importance. Any questions about these procedures can be directed to Associate Executive Dean Jane McLeod at [jmcleod@indiana.edu](mailto:jmcleod@indiana.edu). Thank you for your help.

## CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The criteria described below reflect the recommendations of the Chairs Advisory Committee and the College Policy Committee on the evaluation of candidates for promotion decisions. All candidates will be evaluated with regard to their contributions in the areas of research, teaching and service as stipulated in the Dean of Faculties' Academic Guide. It is expected that the candidate should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be satisfactory in the others. In exceptional cases the candidate may present evidence of a balance of strengths. In all cases, the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Specifically, the College Promotions Committee and the Dean will use the following criteria in evaluating the relevant categories:

- (1) If research or other creative work is the primary criterion for promotion, we expect the candidate to have achieved a position of leadership in a substantial field. This must be demonstrated by evidence of letters, both internal and external, and by other pertinent documentation.**
- (2) If the primary criterion for promotion is teaching, it should be comparable to that of the most effective teachers at this institution. The faculty member must have demonstrated a superior ability and interest in stimulating in students (at all levels) a genuine desire for study and creative work. Candidates should also provide evidence of a significant educational impact on their particular discipline, both inside and outside of Indiana University. Evidence of outstanding teaching might include indications of the success of students, student evaluations, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, active participation in organizations devoted to teaching, and so forth.**
- (3) Generally, we do not anticipate that candidates in the College will be put forward for promotion primarily on the basis of their service contributions. However, if there are such exceptional cases, then the documentation should demonstrate an impact of this service on the individual's discipline as well as contributions to this institution.**
- (4) In a balanced case, the candidate's overall contribution to the university must be shown to be comparable in excellence to that of a candidate with a single primary area. In research, this requires evidence of significant contribution to a substantial field. In teaching, it requires evidence of an important contribution to teaching inside this university and, where possible, outside of it. And in service, it requires evidence of significant impact on the university and one's discipline.**
- (5) In all cases, the dossier must demonstrate effectiveness in both research and teaching.**
- (6) It is also expected that all candidates will make a positive contribution to the professional environments of their departments and will make a positive service contribution to the University.**
- (7) There should be strong indications in the dossier that the candidates will maintain and enhance the level of performance on which the awarding of promotion is to be**

**based.**

The College Policy Committee has also clarified the populations within which candidates for promotion are to be evaluated. Evaluations of research, creative activity, and teaching are to be made with respect to individuals who have recently received promotion to Full Professor or who will soon be considered for such promotion at major research universities. In addition, the College Policy Committee has formulated a policy for evaluation of classroom teaching stipulating the kinds of information on classroom teaching that must accompany the dossier for promotion.

Amended 1998

## **POLICY ON THE EVALUATION OF PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES**

Classroom teaching is central to the educational mission of the University, therefore an annual evaluation of teaching across NTT and tenure stream ranks should be incorporated into the departmental process of faculty evaluations, such as reappointment, tenure, promotion, and salary, in order to ensure that excellent teaching is recognized and rewarded.

Chairs should make clear to their faculty and to the Executive Dean 's office the criteria the department uses to identify and reward meritorious teaching for reappointment and promotion of NTT ranks, as well as for tenure and promotion for tenure stream professors.

As per the [\*College Promotion/Tenure Guidelines\*](#):

- Teaching excellence requires the candidate to provide evidence of a significant national and/or international educational impact on their field outside of Indiana University.
- In contrast, a rating of Very Good requires evidence of an important contribution to teaching inside this university and, where possible, outside of it.

In evaluating teaching performance, a program or department should use a variety of methods that are most appropriate to the particular discipline including (but not limited to): peer reviews, pedagogical publications, efforts to update old and/or develop new courses, evidence of student success, participation in teaching Faculty Learning Communities, course evaluations by students, and time and effort devoted to students both outside the classroom and in thesis and dissertation supervision.

College Policy Committee  
Revised 2018

## LETTER #1

Dear :

Professor \_\_\_\_ is being considered for promotion to Full Professor in the Department of \_\_\_\_ at Indiana University. As part of our review procedures, we customarily write to experts in the candidate's field to ask them for an independent evaluation of the candidate's contributions. Your name has been suggested for this service. On behalf of Indiana University's Executive Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, I therefore write to ask you to help us make a judicious assessment of Professor \_\_\_'s suitability for promotion at Indiana University. I very much hope you will agree to do so.

Professor \_\_\_\_ is being considered for promotion on the basis of excellence in (research/creative activity; teaching; balanced strengths in research, teaching and service). Thus, we are particularly interested in your evaluation of (*Research*) the quality and impact of Professor \_\_\_\_'s (research/creative) accomplishments. If you have knowledge of their contributions to teaching and service/engagement, we would also value your evaluation of those activities. (*Teaching*) the quality and impact of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s teaching. If you have knowledge of their research/creative activity and service/engagement, we would also value your evaluation of those activities. (*Balanced*) the quality and impact of their performance in all three areas.

Indiana University is strongly committed to academic excellence. Thus, seek your opinion on whether Professor \_\_\_\_ is among the very best of their peers. In particular, we request your evaluation of the importance of their work, its range and depth, and its quality. We are also interested in learning whether their scholarship/teaching/service represents the work of a person who has achieved a position of leadership in a field of scholarly endeavor. Finally, we ask your opinion on whether Professor \_\_\_\_'s work should result in the awarding of promotion to Full Professor in a university of first rank.

I enclose a copy of Professor \_\_\_\_'s most recent curriculum vitae for your consideration.

It would be useful for us to know whether and in what ways you are acquainted with the candidate and whether Professor \_\_\_\_'s work was known to you previously.

*[Note: The following statement must be included]*

Your letter will be seen by faculty members serving in a promotion advisory capacity. The candidate may request access to the entire dossier at any time, and the University is legally compelled to comply.

I realize that my request will doubtless be an incursion on your time and generosity, but nonetheless I hope you are able to help us review Professor \_\_\_\_'s credentials for promotion. As

you know, a review by outside experts, like yourself, is essential to this process. I thank you for your consideration of this request.

We would very much appreciate your response by \_\_\_\_\_. Please contact \_\_\_\_\_. If you agree, we would expect your review by \_\_\_\_\_. As soon as we hear from you, we will forward all of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s pertinent material. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

[CHAIR]  
Enclosures

## LETTER #2 – RESEARCH

Dear :

On behalf of the College Executive Dean, I thank you very much for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for Professor \_\_\_\_\_, Department of \_\_\_\_\_, Indiana University, who has been nominated for promotion to Full Professor this year. Their materials are enclosed. We appreciate very much the time and effort involved in such evaluation and thank you in advance for your interest in Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s future.

For your information we enclose a copy of the criteria for promotion as established by the College of Arts and Sciences and a copy of our department's promotion criteria. We also include a [link](#) to Indiana University's Institutional Pandemic Fact Sheet, which describes changes in access to campus resources promotion candidates may have experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

We are particularly interested in your addressing the following questions as part of your review:

1. Does Professor \_\_\_\_\_ rank among the very best of their peers?
2. How would you rate the importance of their work, its range and depth, and the quality of its presentation?
3. Has the work appeared in what you consider important or appropriate places?
4. Does their scholarship represent to you the work of a person who has achieved a position of leadership in a substantial field of scholarly endeavor?
5. Do you think Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s body of work should result in promotion to full professor at a university of the first rank?

We have already forwarded to you a curriculum vitae for Professor \_\_\_\_\_. If there are any additional materials you require or if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. We would appreciate receiving your letter of evaluation by \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely,

[Chair]

Enclosures

## LETTER #2 — TEACHING

Dear :

On behalf of the College Executive Dean, I thank you very much for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for Professor \_\_\_\_, Department of \_\_\_\_, Indiana University, who has been nominated for promotion to Full Professor this year. Their materials are enclosed. We appreciate very much the time and effort involved in such evaluation and thank you in advance for your interest in Professor \_\_\_\_'s future.

For your information we enclose a copy of the criteria for promotion as established by the College of Arts and Sciences and a copy of our department's promotion criteria. We also include a [link](#) to Indiana University's Institutional Pandemic Fact Sheet, which describes changes in access to campus resources promotion candidates may have experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Professor \_\_\_\_ has asked to be evaluated for promotion on the basis of teaching. We are particularly interested in your addressing the following questions as part of your review:

1. Is Professor \_\_\_\_'s teaching comparable to that of the most effective teachers in their field? On our campus or your campus?
2. Do Professor \_\_\_\_'s materials provide evidence that Professor \_\_\_\_ has superior ability and interest to simulate in students a genuine desire for study and creative work? Students at what levels?
3. Has Professor \_\_\_\_ made a significant impact on teaching in their discipline?
4. Do you think Professor \_\_\_\_'s teaching, together with their research and service records, should result in the awarding of promotion at a university of the first rank?

We have already forwarded to you a curriculum vitae for Professor \_\_\_\_\_. If there are any additional materials you require or if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. We would appreciate receiving your letter of evaluation by \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely,

[Chair]

Enclosures

## LETTER #2 — BALANCED CASE

Dear :

On behalf of the College Executive Dean, I thank you very much for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for Professor \_\_\_\_, Department of \_\_\_\_, who has been nominated for promotion to Full Professor this year. Their materials are enclosed. We appreciate very much the time and effort involved in such evaluation and thank you in advance for your interest in Professor \_\_\_\_'s future.

According to Indiana University policy, "Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion [and tenure] criteria." For your information we enclose a copy of promotion criteria established by the College of Arts and Sciences and a copy of our department's promotion criteria. We also include a [link](#) to Indiana University's Institutional Pandemic Fact Sheet, which describes changes in access to campus resources promotion candidates may have experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic.

In 1994 the University Faculty Council adopted the following addendum to the Handbook:

A candidate for promotion [or tenure] should normally excel in at least one of the above categories [teaching, research and creative work, and service] and be at least satisfactory in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university over time. In all cases the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.

Professor \_\_\_\_'s promotion case has been put forward as an "exceptional" case as described above. We are particularly interested in your addressing the following questions as part of your review of their teaching, research, and service:

1. Is this an "exceptional" case? Does Professor \_\_\_\_ rank among the best of their peers in overall performance?
2. How would you rate the importance of their work in teaching, research, and service, its range and depth, and the quality of its presentation?
3. Has the research appeared in what you consider important or appropriate places? Has the teaching been recognized in important or appropriate places outside this university? Has the service had similar recognition?
4. Does their scholarship, teaching, and service represent to you the work of a person who has achieved a position of leadership in these areas?
5. Do you think Professor \_\_\_\_'s body of work should result in promotion at a university of the first rank?

We have already forwarded to you a curriculum vitae for Professor \_\_\_\_\_. If there are any additional

materials you require, or if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. We would appreciate receiving your letter of evaluation by \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely,

[Chair]

Enclosures