I. Preamble

The School of Physical Education and Tourism Management’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document, is a supplement to the IUPUI Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers, hereinafter, referred to as the IUPUI Guidelines. As noted in the IUPUI Guidelines “each school must have a document that states with reasonable specificity the standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure”. This school specific document fills that requirement.

The IUPUI Guidelines are revised annually. Thus, faculty should become familiar with and review changes to the document each and every year. The IUPUI Guidelines and information about any revisions can be found on the Academic Affairs website. The school-specific information outlined in this document should be considered as adjunctive and supportive to the IUPUI Guidelines and the Indiana University Academic Handbook. It is imperative that individual faculty members, administrators, and promotion/tenure committee members familiarize themselves with these documents and their contents.

While both promotion and tenure are based on performance commensurate with rank, there are notable differences between the two (see “Distinctions Between Promotion and Tenure” in IUPUI Guidelines). In short, promotion is “recognition of achievement” and tenure is both “recognition of achievement and the promise of continued achievement with distinction”.

Categories for evaluation in regard to promotion and/or tenure in the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management and Indiana University are based on a continuing pattern of achievement in the following areas:

1. Teaching
2. Research and/or Creative Activity
3. Service (University and Professional)

In promotion cases, the activities within each of these categories must have been carried out while the candidate was in the rank from which he/she is being promoted. The information contained within this document and the IUPUI Guidelines should be used to evaluate annual faculty performance, to assess progress toward promotion and/or tenure and to prepare dossiers for consideration during the promotion and/or tenure process.

II. Procedure

The school supports the IUPUI affirmative action program and the Americans with Disabilities Act in assuring that sex, race, religion, national origin or disability will in no way interfere with the promotion and/or tenure proceedings of a faculty member.

A. Nominations:

Nominations for promotion can originate from the following:

- Individual faculty members may nominate themselves
- One or more faculty members may nominate other faculty members
- The Department Chair or Program Director may nominate faculty members
- The school’s Promotion and Tenure Committee may nominate faculty members
- The Associate Dean or Dean of the School may nominate individual members
B. Timeline:

The timeline for the preparation of dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review are elucidated in the *IUPUI Guidelines*. Below is a more detailed PETM-specific timetable for initiating and processing promotions and/or tenure dossiers:

*August (of the year prior to dossier submission for promotion and/or tenure)*
The Dean and the Promotion and Tenure Chair will meet annually to review procedures for any potential candidates coming up for promotion and/or tenure. The Associate Dean (or Department Chair) begins administrative preparation for the ensuing review process for each promotion and/or tenure candidate 12 months in advance of submission of dossier.

*April 1*
If there are candidates undergoing a third year review or that will be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean of the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management will appoint an ad hoc Mentoring Committee of no less than three faculty of rank relevant to the level of promotion being considered to review the dossier and provide editorial suggestions to the candidate.

The candidate undergoing a third year review or being considered for promotion and/or tenure should provide the Dean’s ad hoc Mentoring Committee with a copy of the dossier with required documents as specified in the check list (see “Faculty Promotion and Tenure Dossier Unit/School Review Form and Checklist” in the *IUPUI Guidelines*). A list of potential external reviewers with addresses should also be created by the Associate Dean or his/her designee (see “Chief Academic Officer’s Comments Regarding Outside Letters” in the *IUPUI Guidelines*).

*April 15*
The Dean’s ad hoc Mentoring Committee reviews the dossier and returns it with editorial suggestions to the candidate. The Dean’s ad hoc Mentoring Committee sends a summary of the suggested editorial changes to the PETM P&T Committee.

*May 15*
The candidate for promotion and/or tenure submits the finalized dossier to the Associate Dean (or Department Chair).

*June 1*
The Associate Dean (or Department Chair) reviews the dossier and sends out formal requests to the external reviewers to assess the candidate’s merits for promotion and/or tenure.

*August 1*
The Associate Dean (or Department Chair) ensures that all external review letters have been received and have been added to the candidate’s dossier. If a letter has not been received, follow up with the reviewer is required.

*September 15*
The Associate Dean submits his/her recommendation with the dossier to the PETM P&T Committee.

*October 1*
The PETM P&T Committee completes its deliberation and votes on each candidate.
October 8
The PETM P&T Committee completes its recommendation letter and submits it along with the dossier to the Dean.

October 22
The Dean of the School of PETM completes his/her recommendation and forwards it along with the dossier of the candidate to the Dean of the Faculties, IUPUI.

III. Preparation for Promotion and Tenure

Preparation for promotion and/or tenure begins in the first year at IUPUI. Become very familiar with both the IUPUI P&T Guidelines and this document and review them on an annual basis. This is particularly important because the IUPUI P&T Guidelines are revised every year.

It is also very important to attend an IUPUI Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure Workshop sometime within your first year. These workshops give you a first hand look at the promotion and tenure process and help get candidates off to a good start in regards to documentation in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Candidates, chairs, deans, the Chief Academic Officer, and FAA all have distinct and significant roles and responsibilities in the promotion and/or tenure process. As a faculty member it is important to review the section entitled “Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

The dossier presents the evidence upon which promotion and/or decisions are to be made. Guidelines for dossier format and documentation are to be used whether the candidate is being reviewed for promotion, tenure or both. Specific details on dossiers preparation and format can be found in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. Lastly, faculty should not hesitate to communicate with members of the PETM P&T Committee and/or senior faculty members whenever questions arise or consultation is needed.

IV. Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

A. Teaching:
Teaching is defined as instruction to any number of students in any appropriate setting such as a classroom, on-line, an activity center, and tutorial/workshop. The quality of teaching must achieve the level of excellence when considered as the primary area for promotion and/or tenure.

Satisfactory in Teaching:
For satisfactory in teaching, the candidate’s teaching activities should equal, both in quality and quantity, that which is normally expected of one in the present rank. For the candidate’s total time in the current rank, the candidate is expected to produce documented evidence of accomplishment in criteria 1, 3, 5, and 6 in Table 1 (see below).

Excellence in Teaching:
Candidates pursuing excellence in teaching should exceed in quality and quantity that which is normally expected of one in the present rank. The candidate should demonstrate a potential for continued productivity, demonstrate an independent scholarship of teaching and learning agenda and a potential for continued productivity. For the candidate’s total time in the current rank, the candidate is expected to produce documented evidence of accomplishments in all nine criteria listed in Table 1 (see below).
**Evaluation Criteria for Teaching:**

### Table 1
Criteria for Rating Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Quality and Quantity of Teaching</strong></td>
<td>a. Documented student evaluation scores that are slightly below, above or at</td>
<td>a. Documented student evaluation scores that have been consistently above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the departmental averages</td>
<td>the departmental averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Documented expected teaching load (i.e., 6 - 12 hours/semester) dependent</td>
<td>b. Documented typical teaching load (i.e., 6 - 12 hours/semester) dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on faculty appointment or as otherwise adjusted by alternate teaching-related</td>
<td>on faculty appointment or as otherwise adjusted by alternate teaching-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>departmental duties</td>
<td>departmental duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Documented PETM P&amp;T committee classroom visit evaluation ratings at or</td>
<td>c. Documented PETM P&amp;T committee classroom visit evaluation ratings at or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>above 2.0 based on PETM P&amp;T Committee’s classroom visit review form</td>
<td>above 3.0 based on PETM P&amp;T Committee’s classroom visit peer review form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Documented laudatory external peer review of teaching by a recognized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching professional**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Evidence of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Documented presentations related to teaching at professional conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and/or workshops. The reach of the presentation (i.e., (campus, local, state,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regional, national, or international) should be in alignment with faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rank expectations. A summary of the audience evaluation should be included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>whenever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Documented publication(s) related to teaching such as articles in local,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>state, regional or higher publications, book chapters, textbooks, instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>software, or invited reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Nature and Quality of Courses             | Documented comprehensive syllabi with clear delineation of course objectives, content, and assessment that connect with department and school learning outcomes and with campus initiatives such as Principles of Undergraduate Learning (hereafter PULs), Research-International-Service-Experiential Learning (hereafter RISE) | a. Documented comprehensive syllabi with clear delineation of course objectives, content, and assessment that connect with department and school learning outcomes and with campus initiatives such as PULs, RISE  
   b. Documented teaching philosophy and evidence that it is practiced in the classroom or learning environment  
   c. Documented use of innovative pedagogical methods (e.g., service learning, technology)  
   d. Documented laudatory peer evaluation of syllabi and other relevant course materials** |
| 4. Course and/or Curriculum/Program Development |                                                                                                   | a. Documented new course development, curriculum and/or program development or substantial course revision  
   b. Document how courses are aligned with overall curriculum and how course content develops new learning or skill but is tied to overall student learning goals |
| 5. Ongoing Assessment of the Learning Environment | Documented use of assessments and reflections and how such items have been used to improve teaching and learning | Documented use of assessments and reflections and how such items have been used to improve teaching and learning |
| 6. Efforts by the Candidate to Improve Teaching | a. Documented acquisition of new teaching techniques, skills and strategies  
   b. Documented active participation in educational projects and programs that improve teaching, change course delivery or impact student learning** | a. Documented acquisition of new teaching techniques, skills and strategies  
   b. Documented active participation in educational projects and programs that improve teaching, change course delivery or impact student learning** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching Awards</td>
<td>Documented nomination or receipt of campus, local, state or regional teaching awards including information about their stature and significance**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Mentorship</td>
<td>Documented evidence of mentoring students, such as (but not limited to): joint workshopconference presentations, co-authored papers, ongoing work with scholarship students (e.g., Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program, Multidisciplinary Undergraduate Research Institute, Diversity Scholars Research Program or other selected groups), and/or work with honor students, interns, and student teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Grants</td>
<td>Documented involvement/participation with grants (school, campus, local, state or regional) to assist with teaching practices, course development, course assessment, and/or curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** (Seek advice from the PETM Mentoring Committee or a senior faculty member)

Further Information on Teaching:

Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer must achieve excellence in teaching and demonstrate an emerging local, state or regional reputation related to teaching.

Clinical assistant to clinical associate professor candidates choosing teaching as their area of excellence must meet the criteria 1-9 in Table 1 and demonstrate an emerging local, state, or regional reputation related to teaching. Those seeking promotion to Clinical Professor must meet the same teaching criteria 1 – 9 (see Table 1) in addition to demonstrating a “sustained national reputation”.

Assistant to associate professor candidates seeking teaching excellence should meet the teaching requirements (i.e., criteria 1-9, Table 1) and demonstrate an “emerging national reputation” in the area of teaching while those seeking promotion to full professor must demonstrate a “sustained national reputation”.

All candidates should understand that there should be a degree of balance in activity in each of the above listed teaching criteria (see Table 1) within one’s dossier. Where candidates pursue an activity that requires an excessive amount of time (e.g., federal grant, service learning development, curriculum...
development) in one criterion area, the disproportionate time commitment of the activity will be considered in evaluating their productivity. Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek advice from their department chair/program director and mentoring committee when productivity concerns arise.

Those seeking excellence in teaching should also consider the importance of seeking external funding as compared to internal funding. Finally, all candidates should understand that the impact and/or importance of the various teaching activities may differ depending on the discipline and/or school expectations.

For additional information on documentation of teaching, see the table entitled “Documenting Teaching Performance” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

B. Research and Creative Activity:

**Research** is defined as either singular or collaborative scholarly and scientific investigation, which may be basic or applied. Research involves peer-reviewed abstracts resulting in state, national, or international presentations, refereed proceedings, peer-reviewed journal publications, and internal/external/contract grant submissions.

**Creative Activity** is defined as work outside the typical genre of journal publications and grants but relates to the dissemination of peer-reviewed, scientific investigation or inquiry. Examples include technical briefs, patentable products or procedures, invited research reviews, conference research roundtables, or special sessions at professional conferences.

**Satisfactory in Research and Creative Activity:**
For satisfactory in research, the candidate’s research should equal, both in quality and quantity, that normally expected of one in the present rank. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate an independent research agenda and a potential for continued productivity. For satisfactory in research, guidelines will vary slightly depending on the candidate’s assigned teaching load per academic year (see Table 2 below).

**Excellence in Research and Creative Activity:**
For excellence in research, guidelines for research productivity are typically double that presented in Table 2.

**Evaluation Criteria for Research and Creative Activity:**
Research productivity is defined by the three following research activities:
- Peer-reviewed publications or full paper proceedings
- Peer-reviewed presentations and published refereed abstracts
- Grant and/or contract funding, preferably from external sources
Table 2
Satisfactory Performance in Research in Relation to Assigned Teaching Load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year Teaching Load (Fall/Spring)</th>
<th>Academic Year Research Load (Fall/Spring)</th>
<th>Research Productivity Guidelines**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 of 3 research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 of 3 research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 of 3 research activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**for excellence in research, expectations are typically doubled

Further Information on Research and Creative Activity:

Research activity is not a requirement for lecturers and clinical faculty. Therefore, any research or creative activity that is performed should be listed under scholarship in the areas of teaching or service, not research.

Assistant to Associate professor candidates seeking research excellence should demonstrate an “emerging national reputation” while those seeking promotion to full professor should demonstrate a “sustained national reputation”.

Candidates should understand that there should be a degree of balance in the research activities within one’s dossier. For example, a person should not have 5 presentations and no refereed publications or grant/contract submissions.

As noted above, for candidates pursuing research excellence, productivity expectations are typically double that indicated in Table 2. Where candidates pursue an activity that requires an excessive amount of time (e.g., NIH grant; publication in one of the top journals in their field), the disproportionate time commitment of the activity will be considered in evaluating their productivity. Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek advice from their Dean, Associate Dean and/or mentoring committee when productivity concerns arise.

Those seeking excellence in research should also consider the importance of seeking external funding as compared to internal funding. Finally, all candidates should understand that the impact of the various types of research and creative activity may differ depending on discipline.

For additional information on documenting research and creative activity, see the table entitled “Documenting Research and Creative Activities in the Dossier” in the IUPUI Guidelines.
C. Professional and University Service:

The area of service is composed of two component parts: Professional Service and University Service. Professional Service is characterized by activities that apply a faculty member’s professional knowledge, skills, and disciplinary expertise to benefit others in a manner that is consistent with the mission of the School of PETM and the university. The types of professional service will vary, but are generally defined as:

- Professional service to the Institution (e.g., Department, School, Campus, University);
- Professional service to the Profession or Discipline;
- Professional service to the Public (e.g. local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients)

University Service, which is alternatively referred to as service to the university or university citizenship, is distinctly different than the “professional service” described above. University service entails committee work, administrative work, and/or participation in school related functions that do not necessarily require application of ones’ professional skills or expertise. Examples of university service would be serving on the departmental, school and/or campus committees; attending miscellaneous school related functions; engaging in various initiatives as they arise, etc. University service is critical to the support and development of the school and university and as a result, is a required responsibility of all faculties. In fact, as stated in the Dean of the Faculties’ Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers, “unsatisfactory service to the University may preclude successful application for promotion and/or tenure”. It should be noted that not all committee service is equal and some committees require extensive time commitments and/or address issues fundamental to the continued effectiveness of the campus. Thus the special features of each type of university service needs to be documented and recognized. While satisfactory university service is required of all faculties, it should be understood that it is “professional service” that should constitute the bulk of evidence when excellence is being sought.

Evaluation Criteria for Service:

Evaluation of service is based on the information and documentation provided in the dossier. As noted above, the importance assigned to each activity will differ depending on the type of service and the features/characteristics of each service activity. Regardless, at a minimum satisfactory university and professional service is required of all faculty members. For additional information and clarification regarding service expectations, faculty members should refer to the School of PETM Faculty Workload Guidelines and the service section in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. The table below outlines the general expectations for achieving satisfactory or excellence in service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>The candidate’s service activities should equal, both in quality and quantity that normally expected of one in the present rank.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>The candidate’s service activities should exceed, both in quality and quantity that normally expected of one in the present rank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information, including examples within each category of service performance, see the table entitled, “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Professional Service” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

Further Information on Service:

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion should review the IUPUI P&T Guidelines (at least
annually) regarding the expectations for documenting service. Similar to teaching and research activities, faculty members should consider documentation of service an ongoing process. For tenure and/or promotion consideration, sufficient and appropriate documentation should be included in the candidate’s dossier to enable evaluators to appropriately assess a faculty member’s quality and quantity of professional and university service. Types of documentation will vary greatly, primarily due to differences in kinds of services provided and the constituencies served. However, personal reflection of one’s service work, examples of scholarly/analytical service work, and evaluative entries (e.g. peer review) may be summarized and used to offer concise and effective documentation. Providing only a list of all service activities is insufficient documentation for proper evaluation.

In the Candidate’s Statement and, if service is the area of excellence, in the Statement of Service, the faculty member should provide a brief, narrative summary of his/her service activity, distinguish the individual role(s) and individual contribution(s) for each type of service, demonstrate the significance and impact of the service work, and briefly describe the manner in which the impact was assessed. In this regard, all faculty members, particularly those declaring service as the area of excellence, must be alert to the need to collect information and evidence at the time services are provided so that it can be used later to document the significance and impact of the faculty member’s intellectual and professional service work.

Peer review within IUPUI and by discipline-specific or professional peers at other universities or public settings is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service and should be included (when applicable) when documenting service activity. For additional information on documenting professional service, see the table entitled “Documenting Professional Service” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.