IUPUI Promotion and Tenure
Important Changes for 2020-2021

Note: Candidates, administrators, and review committees for promotion or tenure submitting dossiers for consideration in the 2020-2021 cycle may use the 2019-2020 guidelines OR may use the 2020-2021, with the exception of teaching professor and senior lecturer candidates, who must use the 2020-2021 guidelines.

The 2020-2021 guidelines will be in effect for any submissions thereafter.

Temporary changes for 2020-2021 cycle only:
- External letters need not be on letterhead and signed. If not, they need to be sent directly from an institutional email.
- For teaching professor candidates, reviewers (chairs, members of review committees, and external reviewers) can be at full rank OR at associate-tenure-track or associate-clinical (if the unit's bylaws allow for participation by non-tenure-track faculty).

Changes

Creation of **teaching professor** rank; change in criteria for **senior lecturer**. Note that teaching professor cases for 2020-2021 must include at least two reviewers who are external to IU/IUPUI. See the Lecturer Rank page or the P&T Guidelines for more details.

Chairs are no longer asked to specially justify "online" publication outlets.

Language about **tenure extensions**. If a candidate has received a tenure extension (for any reason), this should be described as, "Dr./Professor X received a one-year *(or two, one-year extensions, as needed)* extension of the tenure probationary period, consistent with IU policy."
- *No specific reason should be described.* No medical or personal information should be included in any materials.
- This language should be used in the external letter solicitation, in the chair's letter, and in the candidate statement, so as to make clear to all readers the candidate's timeline.

Language around **student evaluation data** has been changed to emphasize individual professional development and de-emphasize comparisons.
- Student evaluations and peer evaluations are required for all faculty with teaching responsibilities (excludes only research faculty).
- Faculty are required to *reflect upon* the results of student and peer evaluations.

Student evaluation wording changes (page numbers are from the 2019-2020 Guidelines)

p. 6, Advice for candidates in Year 1 and 2:
"Collect, summarize, and analyze student evaluations every year. Areas where students indicate a problem provide excellent opportunities to document improvement from one semester to the next."
RETAIN

p. 7, Advice for candidates in Year 3:
"Analyze teaching evaluations to identify key themes and how they point to teaching achievements or areas for further attention. ~~If data are available, present your performance in relation to peer average scores.~~"
DELETE COMPARATIVE USE

p. 11, Directions to chair
"Compose a letter of evaluation of the candidate's case and recommendation for action….
Include the following:
Relationship of the candidate's evidence of achievement, such as student learning achievement ~~evaluations~~ or publications, to departmental norms and expectations."
DELETE COMPARATIVE USE; EMPHASIZE STUDENT LEARNING

p. 19, Candidate-prepared materials for external reviewers
"In addition, it is recommended that external evaluators are provided with summary analyses of peer and student input ~~peer reviews and summaries of student evaluations~~ to facilitate the evaluation of excellence in teaching."
RETAIN INPUT BUT EMPHASIZE ANALYSIS

p. 19, Dossier content, Teaching section
"Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or better).
- Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years ~~and compared to other faculty in the school/unit~~.
- **Only summaries** should be included in dossiers. The summary ~~should~~ may include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year and item to establish trend lines where applicable.
- Candidates should demonstrate how they use the results of student input for continuous improvement of teaching.
- ~~The summary should discuss individual results within the context of the department or school/unit to enhance the usefulness of the information to outside readers. When norms are available for comparison to others in the program, school/unit, campus, or discipline, these should be included. When results of scaled questionnaires are used, the values of the numeric ratings should be stated.~~"
DELETE COMPARATIVE USE. EMPHASIZE USE FOR IMPROVEMENT

p. 20, Dossier content, Teaching section
Evidence ….development and implementation [of innovations]…
"Evidence about student learning associated with these activities can be part of the peer review ~~or student evaluation evidence~~, especially when reviewers have been asked to comment on these specific innovations."
STUDENT EVALUATIONS ARE NOT EVIDENCE OF STUDENT LEARNING

p. 38 In grid, 'documenting teaching performance.'
In row, "Quality of Teaching" and column, "Section III: Statement contained in Evaluation of Teaching"
"**Use of s**tudent rating summaries, peer review of class performance or materials."
EMPHASIZES USE OF THE INPUT

p. 39 In grid, "Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance"
In row, "Instruction" in column "Unsatisfactory"
"Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data with no interpretation of their meaning, ~~either absolute or comparative~~."
DELETE COMPARISON; KEEP FOCUS ON 'INTERPRETATION'

p. 48, CV format
Teaching
"Teaching Assignments: ….~~Mean teaching evaluation scores may be included~~."
DELETE