

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

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

**Subj:** Tenure Procedures for 2022-23

**Date:** February 14, 2022

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

**Dates to note:**

**May 2, 2022** Proposed tenure reviewer lists to divisional Associate Dean and [collprom@iu.edu](mailto:collprom@iu.edu)

**June 13, 2022** Confirmed list of external reviewers to [collprom@iu.edu](mailto:collprom@iu.edu)

**September 12, 2022** Tenure eDossier submission deadline

**PROMOTION STANDARDS**

The College Tenure Committee and the Executive Dean's office believe that one of the most important ways to assure IU's continued research and teaching excellence is to uphold the highest standards in the granting of tenure. I urge that your evaluations be made with the thought of endorsing only candidates who are among the best of their peers at this or comparable major research universities.

The following statements with regard to the evaluation of candidates for tenure decisions derive from recommendations by the College Policy Committee in conformity with relevant campus policies. All candidates will be evaluated with regard to their performance in the areas of 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 activity is the primary criterion for tenure (this is the default expectation for most units in the College), the candidate must have achieved, or be well on the way to achieving, a position of national and/or international leadership, based on a record of scholarly accomplishment and distinction appropriate to their field(s).

Because tenure is a forward-looking decision, candidates should also provide evidence of an ongoing program of research or creative activity. This must be demonstrated by the evidence in external 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 tenure is teaching, the candidate must provide evidence of outstanding classroom instruction as well as broad teaching impact beyond the campus. The candidate's accomplishments in classroom instruction should be comparable to those of the most effective teachers at this institution. Candidates for tenure based on teaching should also have achieved or be well on the way to achieving a national and/or international reputation for teaching impact. 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. As for research, this must be demonstrated by evidence in external letters and internal reports and by 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 also demonstrate, at a minimum, satisfactory performance in research and effective performance in teaching.

(4) In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence for the award of tenure on a balanced case. In a balanced case, the candidate's overall contribution to the university must be shown to be comparable in excellence overall 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 as well as 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 candidate will maintain and enhance the level of performance on which the awarding of tenure is to be based.

These College standards derive from campus guidelines. Your attention is to the [Criteria for Faculty Tenure](#) (Bloomington Campus, approved by Board of Trustees 5/6/94):

“Differences of mission between schools and departments are such that the relative weight attached to teaching, research, and service frequently vary considerably. A candidate for tenure (or promotion) should normally excel in at least one of the three categories (teaching, research/creative activity, 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 or comparable benefit to the university. In all cases, the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. The granting of tenure is not only a recognition of past achievement but a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. In addition, the sections of the Indiana University Academic Handbook on criteria for promotion labeled ‘Teaching’ and ‘Research and Creative Activities,’ apply also to the faculty member being considered for tenure. Consideration should also be given to the professional contribution made outside the faculty member’s own department or school, as well as to contributions made to the total intellectual climate of the University.”

Both the departmental recommendation and the personal recommendation of the chair must indicate the primary criterion for their evaluation of a candidate. The Tenure Committee will review the case on this basis. Evaluations of research, creative activity, and teaching are made with respect to individuals who have recently received tenure or who will soon be considered for tenure at major research universities. Please note that the Criteria for Faculty Tenure refers to “balanced cases” as “exceptional cases” and not as a routine alternative for cases that otherwise do not meet criteria for tenure. Departments and candidates should be explicit about the basis for tenure, and this decision will guide construction of the dossier. The selection of the primary area of excellence, or of a balanced case, should be reflected in the materials sent to the reviewers and the instructions for their review.

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 insure that all aspects of research/creative activity are 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 Promotion and Tenure Reviews.\*](#)

All assistant professors who are granted tenure on the Bloomington campus will automatically be promoted to associate rank and need not be considered for promotion separately. In rare circumstances, tenure and promotion to full rank may be considered in the same year, but will be handled sequentially at the College level, first by the College Tenure Committee, and then (if the recommendation is positive for tenure) by the College Research Faculty Promotion Subcommittee. In such cases, promotion to full professor as well as evidence for tenure must be addressed in external reviewer letters and in departmental reports. Votes in the department must be taken separately: one vote among tenured faculty for the tenure decision, and one vote among full professors for the promotion to full rank decision.

Only in exceptional cases should candidates be considered for early tenure. It is important for you and your faculty to understand that a candidate may be considered for tenure only once. **Exceptional cases that might merit early consideration of tenure should be discussed by the department chair with the Executive Dean before a full dossier is prepared.**

## **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 external 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.

When compiling their lists, both candidates and departments should consider carefully the professional stature and suitability of potential reviewers. Achieved rank is an important indicator of professional stature. Indeed, campus policy is explicit that external reviewers should “hold at least the rank that the candidate is applying for, or its equivalent, and be well-recognized and established members of their field(s) employed at peer institutions.” For these reasons, we expect the preponderance of external reviewers to be full professors. Rank is not itself the only indicator of suitability, however. Candidates and departments should also consider the relevance of a potential reviewer’s scholarly specialization, the currency of their knowledge of the state of the field, and the value potential reviewers’ diverse perspectives on the profession might bring to the evaluation of the candidate’s professional accomplishments and contributions. Ultimately, the selection of reviewers should be governed by the need to provide a full and fair evaluation of the candidate’s work. Reviewers should not have had a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate; 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. Whenever possible, reviewers from a single institution should be avoided. Please review the [College Policy on Letters Solicited for Promotion and Tenure](#) revised in 2021.

Candidates for tenure and 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.

Please also note the following excerpt from the UFC policy, Procedures for Faculty Tenure, approved by Board of Trustees, June 20, 1991:

“The dossier constructed in consultation with the candidate provides the evidence upon which the tenure decision is to be made. If additional information is sought or received during the review of the dossier at any level, the candidate and all previous committees and reviewers must be notified and given the opportunity to respond to the additional information. The information and the responses shall then become part of the dossier.”

## **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW**

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

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

The basis for tenure 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).

**The preponderance of external reviewers should be full professors from peer institutions; they should not have a close association with the candidate.** If the suggested reviewer is not a full professor, works in a different field or discipline, serves at a non-research or non-academic institution, or has had other than a professional acquaintance with the candidate, please provide a more substantial narrative justification of their suitability.

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 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 an 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 [Policy on Tenure Criteria](#) and a copy of the department's promotion criteria. I recommend 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 work should not be left to the candidate to do without guidance and clerical**

**support.** 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 12, 2022 Tenure eDossiers due**

Tenure dossiers must be submitted via the eDossier system no later than **Monday, September 12**. A current curriculum vitae and bibliography of publications should be provided in all dossiers, with refereed publications clearly identified. Please refer to the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs' March 19, 2015 procedures in 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, annual peer evaluations, commentary from Ph.D. and M.A. advisees, and from AIs supervised by the candidate which are a major source of information in the teaching category. In the case of tenure, 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 at least once each 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.

---

<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.?)



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 tenure. To justify a positive vote for tenure, faculty must either rate the candidate as excellent in the category that serves as the basis for tenure 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 tenure 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 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 tenure in the chair's letter.** Chairs' letters are typically 2-3 pages long.

The department chair is required to inform the candidate of the department vote and the chair's recommendation immediately after the dossier is submitted to the Executive Dean's office.

For more information regarding the department and chair's review, please refer to pages 10-13 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 utmost 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.

## **POLICY ON COLLEGE TENURE CRITERIA**

All candidates will be evaluated with regard to their performance in the areas of research, teaching and service as stipulated in the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs' 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 committee and the Dean use the following criteria in evaluating the relevant categories:

**(1) If research or other creative work is the primary criterion for tenure, the candidate must have achieved, or clearly be developing, 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 tenure 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. Other 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 tenure primarily on the basis of their service contributions. However, if there are such exceptional cases, then the documentation should demonstrate the 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 or 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 candidate will maintain and enhance the level of performance on which the awarding of tenure is to be based.**

The College Policy Committee has also clarified the populations within which candidates for tenure are to be evaluated. Evaluations of research, creative activity, and teaching are to be made with respect to individuals who have recently received tenure or who will soon be considered for tenure at major research universities.

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 tenure or 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 tenure (and promotion to Associate Professor) in the Department of \_\_\_ at Indiana University. As part of our review process, we customarily write to experts in the candidate's field to ask 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 tenure and promotion at Indiana University. I very much hope you will agree to do so.

Professor \_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for tenure and promotion on the basis of excellence in (research/creative activity). Thus, we are particularly interested in your evaluation of 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.

Indiana University is strongly committed to academic excellence. Thus, 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 represents the work of a person who has the potential to achieve a position of leadership in a field of scholarly endeavor. Finally, we seek your opinion on whether Professor \_\_\_'s work should result in the awarding of tenure in a university of the 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 their work was known to you previously.

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

Your letter will be seen by faculty members serving in a tenure and 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 tenure. As you know, a review by outside experts, such as yourself, is essential to this process. I thank you for your consideration of this request.

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 is under review for tenure this year. Enclosed are their materials. 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 tenure as established by the College of Arts and Sciences and a copy of the department's tenure 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 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 the potential to achieve a position of leadership in a substantial field of scholarly endeavor?
5. Do you believe that Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s body of work should result in the awarding of tenure at a university of the first rank?

At Indiana University Bloomington, the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same for all faculty regardless of length of service during the probationary period. Time in rank beyond six years should not be considered as additional time nor should it be considered as relevant when evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure. Recognizing the disruption to faculty scholarly, instructional, and service activities from the COVID-19 pandemic, Indiana University Bloomington allowed all candidates for tenure the option to extend their tenure clock by one year. In addition, candidates for tenure may have received additional extensions of the tenure clock because of other types of interruption to their work.

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 is under review for tenure this year. Enclosed are their materials. 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 tenure as established by the College of Arts and Sciences and a copy of the department's tenure criteria. We also include a [link](#) to of Indiana University's Institutional Pandemic Fact Sheet, which describes the timeline of institutional changes in response to 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 tenure 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 the potential to achieve a position of leadership in these areas?

5. Do you think Professor\_\_\_\_'s body of work should result in the awarding of tenure at university of the first rank?

At Indiana University Bloomington, the criteria for promotion and tenure are the same for all faculty regardless of length of service during the probationary period. Time in rank beyond six years should not be considered as additional time nor should it be considered as relevant when evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure. Recognizing the disruption to faculty scholarly, instructional, and service activities from the COVID-19 pandemic, Indiana University Bloomington allowed all candidates for tenure the option to extend their tenure clock by one year. In addition, candidates for tenure may have received additional extensions of the tenure clock because of other types of interruption to their work.

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