

**Indiana University Maurer School of Law
Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment of Tenure-Track Faculty**

I. Procedures (adopted September 25, 2015)

Note: Where specific dates are indicated they are guidelines which will be followed whenever possible. However, some variation may be required by circumstances such as deadlines imposed by University and Bloomington campus procedures and the responsiveness of outside reviewers.

A. Annual Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty in the Probationary Appointment Period

1. Probationary appointment is the name given to the period of employment of a permanent (tenure-track) faculty member who has not yet been awarded tenure.
2. Upon an initial three-year appointment to the tenure-track faculty, a faculty member is reviewed for each year starting in Year 2 for possible reappointment for Year 4, in Year 3 for Year 5, etc. The Dean conducts annual reviews of all faculty members subject to tenure and promotion or reappointment decision. These reviews are usually conducted during the spring semester. It is the purpose of the annual review to inform the faculty member of all matters relevant to eligibility for reappointment and the award of tenure and promotion. The faculty member must cooperate with the Dean to ensure that the file on which such a review is based contains all relevant materials. A written statement summarizing the substance of each annual review shall be kept in the file, and a copy given to the faculty member.
3. The Committee on Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (hereafter the Committee) will assist the Dean in the implementation of the annual review process. The Committee will often designate one or more member(s) who will have the chief responsibility of collecting all materials relevant to the annual review. The Committee will then consult with the Dean concerning matters which should be discussed during the annual review process. It is anticipated that the annual review process will involve class visitation, the examination of teaching evaluation forms completed by students, the reading of published material (and, where appropriate, working drafts), and consideration of evidence of service. The material collected for purposes of the annual review will also be used for reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions.
4. If the Committee recommends reappointment and the Dean concurs, the Dean shall proceed with the reappointment. If the Committee recommends non-reappointment, the matter shall be presented to the tenured faculty for their advice. Likewise, if the Dean disagrees with an affirmative Committee recommendation, the matter shall be presented to the tenured faculty for their advice. The vote of the tenured faculty shall be included as part of the Dean's report and the recommendation on the reappointment.
5. In the event of a decision not to recommend reappointment of a faculty member on probationary status, the Dean shall notify the member of that decision as soon as possible and shall inform the faculty member of the subsequent review procedures. The dean shall

follow the procedures set out in the [Policy Statement on Reappointment and Non-Reappointment during Probationary Period \(ACA-22\)](#), promulgated by the University Faculty Council.

B. Promotion and Tenure

1. The tenure review and decision is ordinarily made during Year 6 of the tenure probationary period but solicitation of external letters begins June 1 prior to the beginning of Year 6. Various leaves and other interruptions of work may add years to the probationary period. Candidates may choose to be reviewed for tenure prior to Year 6, and may withdraw their early candidacy prior to a final decision by the provost. Length of the probationary period does not affect the criteria/expectations for tenure/promotion, and external referees will be informed of this. A faculty member shall receive only one full tenure review.

2. No later than May 1 of each year, the Dean, in consultation with the Policy Committee, shall appoint a Committee consisting of three or more tenured faculty members of full rank. This committee shall be responsible for the promotion and tenure recommendations which are made the following fall.

3. The Committee, in conjunction with the Dean, shall determine which members of the faculty are to be considered for promotion or tenure or both during the following fall semester. It shall be the privilege of any faculty member to submit a recommendation to the Dean concerning the promotion of or award of tenure to any faculty member including the person making the recommendation.

4. A member of the Committee shall be assigned the responsibility of assembling a file for each faculty member subject to review. This member shall ensure that a complete and thorough file is developed and that the specified procedures are followed, and shall present the faculty member's file to the Committee and, if requested by the Committee and the Dean, to the Faculty.

5. As soon as the Committee and Dean have jointly determined which faculty members are to be reviewed, the Dean shall notify each such faculty member in writing that he or she is under review and that within a specified and reasonable period of time the faculty member may submit materials relevant to a consideration of his or her professional qualifications. All materials listed in the "General" section of eDossier must be included and all other materials may be included at the discretion of the candidate. Candidates should consult the [Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Reviews at Indiana University Bloomington](#), promulgated by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs ("OVPF AA") and the [Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion](#), promulgated by the Bloomington Faculty Council, as such documents may be modified periodically. All members of the permanent faculty shall also be informed, and shall be invited to submit any statements they may desire concerning the candidate.

6. The Committee shall compile a complete file on each faculty member under consideration. The content of the file shall consist of such materials as shall be determined by the Committee, after consultation with the faculty member under consideration, including, but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- a. All materials submitted by the faculty member pursuant to (5) above;
- b. The faculty member's own statement about teaching, research, and service. The statement must clearly state the one performance area on which to base the case for tenure or promotion. The only exception is for statements that clearly state that the candidate wishes to be considered for tenure or promotion on a rare, "balanced case." The review committees and administrators (at all levels) take into consideration that the dossier materials (including external letters) are gathered and presented in order to justify a tenure or promotion decision based on the clearly stated option selected in the candidate's statement. The performance area to be considered as the basis for tenure/promotion must be decided prior to assembling the dossier, and clearly indicated in the candidate's statement and in the solicitation of external letters.
- c. The factual data on the faculty member's teaching, research and service activities required by the *OVPFAA Guidelines*;
- d. A summary of teaching evaluations by students. Faculty members eligible to vote on the promotion or tenure shall have access to the individual evaluations.
- e. The results of interviews with students;
- f. Peer evaluations of teaching, by faculty assigned to visit the faculty member's classes, and by faculty who have taught jointly with the faculty member or who otherwise have knowledge of his or her teaching competence;
- g. Peer evaluations of any pedagogical publications, by faculty assigned to review them or by outside references as the committee and the Dean deem appropriate;
- h. Peer evaluations of all scholarly publications. Whether the review is for tenure or promotion, it must include at least six outside evaluations. In order to maximize the availability of outside reviewers, we require the faculty member to submit both the materials for outside review and the names of potential outside references to the Committee by June 1 for tenure and promotion decisions to be made the following fall. The faculty member shall submit six names of potential reviewers for each group of material subject to review. The Committee shall independently compile its own list. Both lists shall contain statements describing why each individual was selected as a reference and the relationship of that person to the faculty member. In addition to submitting a list of outside references, the faculty member may request that certain persons not serve as referees and may give reasons for this request, but such a request shall not be binding on the Dean. The Dean, with the advice of the Committee, will

select three names from the faculty member's list(s) of recommended referees. All referees should receive a copy of the Substantive Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment in the School of Law, clear instruction regarding the candidate's chosen performance area, the candidate's curriculum vitae, all the materials to be reviewed by the particular referee, and an option to receive the candidate's other scholarly materials.

i. Candidates who submit co-authored pieces must document the relative contribution of each co-author and include that documentation in the dossier.

j. An evaluation of the quality of the faculty member's service activities by professional colleagues at Indiana University, or by associates in the service activity.

The faculty member may add materials to the tenure dossier at any time in the review process throughout faculty-level review. However, any material to be evaluated by outside experts must be submitted to the committee by June 1.

7. The Committee or a member designated by the Committee shall inform the faculty member from time to time regarding the development of the file and shall involve the faculty member as far as possible in the development of the file. The faculty member has the right to examine all parts of the file at any time, including each letter as soon as it becomes available.

8. The Committee shall decide whether an affirmative promotion or tenure recommendation or both is to be made. Following receipt of either a positive or negative recommendation (unless the faculty member withdraws), the Dean shall then promptly call a meeting of the appropriate members of the permanent faculty (those with tenure, if a tenure recommendation has been made; those with tenure and of the recommended rank or higher, if a promotion recommendation has been made). A written report reviewing the candidate's achievements in the areas of teaching, research and service with an indication of the Committee's recommendation shall be made available to faculty members voting on the recommendation (and the faculty candidate for tenure and promotion) at least seven days in advance of the meeting.

9. As soon as practicable after the meeting of the appropriate members of the permanent faculty, the Dean shall prepare his or her recommendation. If the result is a negative recommendation, the Dean shall follow the BFC policies on non-reappointment. The Dean's recommendation will be provided to faculty members who were eligible to participate in the meeting.

10. If a faculty member is recommended for tenure but not for promotion to professor, the full professors of law shall discuss at the tenure and promotion meeting what they believe should be accomplished for the promotion to professor. The Dean shall present the faculty member with a written summary of that discussion.

11. As soon as is practicable after the promotion and tenure deliberations, the Dean shall inform the faculty member of the action of the faculty, and of his intended action or recommendation, if any. The dean shall follow the procedures set out in the [Policy Statement on Reappointment and Non-Reappointment during Probationary Period \(ACA-22\)](#), promulgated by the University Faculty Council. The faculty member will have an opportunity to request reconsideration in accordance with the OVPFAA Guidelines after “executive level” deliberation is completed by the Provost.

II. Substantive Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (adopted April 30, 1990 and applicable to faculty members appointed prior to February 17, 2017)¹

The Indiana University Maurer School of Law is dedicated to providing the highest quality professional education to those who wish to practice law in any common law jurisdiction to those who will become judges, legislators, and administrators, to those who plan to use their education to become teachers and scholars of the law. It is dedicated to critical analysis of the law and its foundations, to pushing back the boundaries of ignorance about law, its nature, functions, and limits, and to sharing new insights with the scholarly and professional communities. And it is dedicated to using its resources to provide high quality service to the University, professional societies, the state, and the nation.

The School of Law expects its faculty members to make high quality contributions to all three parts of its mission. Normally the school anticipates, along with the rest of the University, that a faculty member will excel in at least one of the three areas and render satisfactory/effective performance in the others. Satisfactory/effective performance is not merely minimally competent performance, but rather performance that is satisfactory/effective in the context of a first-rate university law school. In making promotion and tenure decisions the School ordinarily expects each of its faculty members to excel in either teaching or research. However, in exceptional circumstances a colleague whose service is excellent may be promoted or granted tenure as long as his or her teaching and research are both at least satisfactory/effective.

The School of Law is a professional school, whose faculty members must teach both the essentials of substantive law and the methods of legal analysis and argument. To some extent, the School hires faculty members based on their experience in the substance and practice of law. At the same time, legal scholarship involves a wide variety of

¹ On September 25, 2015, the faculty voted to replace its nomenclature in the substantive criteria: For evaluating Research/Creative Activity, and Service/Engagement, the University and Law School use four categories to rate the candidate’s performance: Excellent (formerly outstanding), Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. In evaluating Teaching, the categories are: Excellent (formerly outstanding), Very Good, Effective (formerly satisfactory) and Ineffective. The standards that follow have been edited to conform to this revised nomenclature.

methodologies and approaches, a number of which require different skills and training from those required to provide the basics of first-rate professional training. Thus, while many of the very best law professors begin their careers with strength in the professional skills essential to successful law school teaching, others begin with the ability, evidenced often by advanced degrees in other disciplines, to apply particular methodologies to their legal scholarship. First-rate law schools must help professors from these diverse backgrounds to develop into sophisticated researchers and quality professional educators. The School of Law must dedicate the resources and have the patience to allow its untenured faculty members to develop and realize their ambitions in teaching and research.

1. Teaching

Graduation from law school is the usual and, in most states, the only way to qualify for admission to the practice of law. It is also the necessary background of virtually every judge in the country and is part of the background of many legislators and administrative policy makers as well. Law, lawyers, and law makers have a profound effect on all persons and relationships in our society, which depends heavily upon the legal system for the protection of family and commercial relations, property, and the most basic liberties of the citizens. Thus, law teachers have a responsibility to their students to provide as full, rich, and challenging a professional education as is possible. This law school views its teaching mission as a matter of great importance to which major commitments of time, effort, skill, and intellect must be devoted.

Education for a profession with as broad an impact as the law will follow diverse approaches and methods. Some teachers will emphasize the learning of vast bodies of legal doctrine; some, the interrelationships among institutions; some, skill of analysis, synthesis, and expression; some, skills of advocacy and interpersonal relationships; some, the ethical dilemmas the profession of law confronts; and some, the need to appreciate and be able to utilize disciplines whose insights may give context to, explain, contradict, or permit evaluation of the law. Many teachers will try to serve several goals in their teaching. Similarly, different teachers will use different teaching methods. This School rejects any effort to impose a single model of good teaching.

Teaching is never easy to evaluate, but means do exist to make an informed assessment. Student evaluations can be helpful in uncovering strengths and weaknesses and in assessing the overall student-teacher rapport. These evaluations can be supplemented very usefully by more probing interviews with students. But student opinions cannot be determinative. Faculty colleagues must also evaluate teaching, and such evaluations can do much to complete the picture. Finally, a faculty member's own statement of his or her teaching goals and

philosophy provides a helpful framework for examining the other means of evaluation. Other forms of evaluation may sometimes be helpful, including (1) assessments of the opinions of graduates; (2) video tapes of a set of classes; (3) analysis of final exams; (4) analysis of course materials; (5) assessments of innovative teaching efforts; and (6) evaluation of the nature and quality of textbooks and other publications relevant to teaching. All these means to evaluate have limitations and weaknesses, but analyzed carefully they can provide a good picture of an individual's strengths and weaknesses.

2. *Research*

We view our scholarly mission as a matter of great importance. Major commitments of time, effort, skill, and intellect must be devoted to research for publication, and we expect such work from candidates for promotion and tenure.

As with teaching, no one model of scholarship should or can be imposed. Legal scholars employ a variety of methodologies, have different research agendas, and appeal to different audiences. Some scholarship is directed toward the courts and the development of legal principles. Other scholarship studies legal principles from an external perspective, attempting to explain or evaluate the law and its institutions according to some other explanatory framework. Some of the approaches to legal scholarship have very little in common. Proponents of one approach may even be hostile to another.

No one method of scholarship is privileged over the others. That does not mean, however, that we refrain from the sometimes difficult task of evaluation. We must personally evaluate the faculty member's scholarship. We must consider how the faculty member's program of research has developed and what it suggests for the future. It is important to find as referees the best scholars available who can help us make a fair assessment of the scholarly product, the candidate's reputation, and his or her promise as a scholar. We can expect some controversy as long as we seek evaluations from the best scholars available. We must test the evaluations with what our own faculty knows about an individual as a scholar.

We impose no restrictions on the form which research publications take. Probably most legal scholarship will appear in law journals, but publication in other types of journals, scholarly books, and other media may also be appropriate. Sometimes books which are used for classroom purposes, like casebooks, have a high intellectual content and may be counted as research. Long term major research projects are especially valued and are encouraged regardless of whether they lead to frequent publication of journal articles. For faculty whose primary teaching responsibilities are in clinical courses, written products of professional activity which evidence creativity and intellectual rigor and which constitute contributions

to the law and the profession may be considered as part of the faculty member's research production.

Because much legal research will be published in law journals, a word about such journals is appropriate. In law, unlike other disciplines, most journals, including most of the "best" journals, have no subject matter focus. Rather, they are published by and identified with law schools (*Harvard Law Review*, *Indiana Law Journal*, etc.). They serve the dual purposes of providing outlets for legal scholarship and providing a specialized kind of self-instructed education for law students. The law journals are edited by students without significant faculty involvement. They are thus not refereed. Students accept and reject articles, edit them, require changes in them, and control the timing of their publication. It is true that a publication in some law journals will attract more attention than in others, which will enhance the scholar's reputation and contribute to the impact of the scholar's ideas. But the ranking of student law journals does not necessarily mean that the best articles are in the most prestigious journals.

3. *Service*

As a professional school the Law School places heavy service demands upon its faculty. Each of us is expected to play a significant role in the governance of the School and to participate willingly in the affairs of the campus and the University. Beyond that, opportunities often arise to participate in state or national bar activities, law reform projects, etc. Pro bono legal representation, testifying before legislative committees, teaching continuing education courses, educating non-lawyers about the law and our legal system, serving as a mediator or arbitrator, participating in professional associations and many other activities are valuable and are encouraged by the School.

A. **Standards for Promotion and Tenure**

1. *General Expectations*

The School of Law expects its faculty members to make high quality contributions to all three parts of its mission. Normally the School anticipates, along with the rest of the University, that a faculty member will excel in at least one of the three areas and render satisfactory/effective performance in the others. Satisfactory/effective performance is not merely minimally competent performance, but rather performance that is satisfactory/effective in the context of a first-rate university law school. Our promotion and tenure process is designed to assure the excellence of our faculty.

In making promotion and tenure decisions the School ordinarily expects each of its faculty members to excel in either teaching or research. However, in exceptional circumstances a colleague whose service is excellent may be promoted or granted tenure as long as his or her teaching and research are both at least satisfactory/effective.

2. *Number of Critical Evaluation Stages*

Typical law school practice throughout the country requires no more than two critical evaluations. Some major law schools treat tenure as the only significant decision, treating promotions as pro forma actions. The most important decision for this law school is the tenure decision, which is normally, but not always, accompanied by promotion to full professor. The standards do not differ except for the focus – tenure on the promise for the future and full professorship for concrete achievement. In the words of the *Academic Handbook*, “the criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion are similar, not identical.” For individuals hired as assistant professors, there is also the promotion from assistant to associate professor. Normally, but not always, this first promotion will come before the tenure decision.

3. *Non-exclusivity of Specific Standards*

The specific standards that appear in each of the following sections, although normally applicable, do not exhaust all possible models of teaching, research, and service sufficient to qualify a candidate for promotion or tenure. A candidate who does not satisfy the specific standards normally will not qualify for such promotion or tenure, but exceptional cases may arise in which the candidate’s special contributions to teaching, research, and service may justify promotion and tenure.

B. Specific Standards for Teaching

1. *Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor*

- a. *Excellent.* Teaching will be evaluated as excellent if a candidate has demonstrated an exceptional ability and the promise of continuing excellence in assisting students to acquire knowledge, understanding, skills, and professionalism. Adherence to any particular teaching methodology is not required. Factors to be considered include mastery of the material taught, clarity of its organization and presentation, ability to challenge students to think rigorously and critically, and capacity to prompt students to explore subjects in their full intellectual richness. Additional evidence of teaching

quality may include textbooks and other publications relevant to teaching, and innovative curriculum development.

- b. *Effective.* Teaching will be evaluated as effective if, on the basis of the same criteria as specified above for an excellent evaluation, a candidate has demonstrated a high degree of competence and promise in teaching.

2. *Promotion to Associate Professor*

The same as applicable to the decision on tenure and promotion to full professor, except that evaluation will focus on the period in the rank of assistant professor.

C. **Specific Standards for Research**

1. *Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor*

- a. *Excellent.* Research will be evaluated as excellent if it manifests a significant contribution to scholarship, evidencing a substantial and creative intellectual endeavor and a commitment to ongoing scholarly contribution, consistent with the standards of a first-rate university law school. This requires an ongoing scholarly program, which typically is evidenced by publication or acceptance for publication of three articles of sufficient quality or a book of sufficient quality, but the quality of the research is the critical determinant.
- b. *Satisfactory.* Research will be evaluated as satisfactory if it manifests a valuable contribution to scholarship and a commitment to ongoing scholarly contribution consistent with the standards of a first-rate university law school. This requires an ongoing scholarly program, which typically is evidenced by publication or acceptance for publication of three articles of sufficient quality or a book of sufficient quality, but the quality of the research is the critical determinant.

2. *Promotion to Associate Professor*

- a. *Excellent.* Research will be evaluated as excellent if it constitutes a significant contribution to scholarship in the context of a first-rate university law school. This requires an ongoing scholarly program, which typically includes publication or acceptance for publication of one article of sufficient quality is required, but the quality of the research is the critical determinant.
- b. *Satisfactory.* Research will be evaluated as satisfactory if it constitutes a useful contribution to scholarship in the context of a first-rate university law school. This requires an ongoing scholarly program, which typically includes

publication or acceptance for publication of one article of sufficient quality is required but the quality of the research is the critical determinant.

D. Specific Standards for Service

1. Background Considerations

Service includes service to the School of Law, to the University, to the professions of law or law teaching, and to the national, state, or local communities. Only in rare instances could a faculty member combine such extraordinary internal service and very significant professional service with a sufficiently satisfactory/effective teaching and research program to justify promotion or tenure on the basis of excellent service.

2. Standards

a. Tenure and Promotion to Full Professor

- i. *Excellent.* Service will be evaluated as excellent if a candidate has rendered and seems likely to continue to render service deemed to be of extraordinary quality and of exceptional merit and value over and above satisfactory performance of committee assignments and other routine service functions.
- ii. *Satisfactory.* Service will be evaluated as satisfactory if a candidate has rendered and seems likely to continue to render useful service as chair or member of law school for university committee or in other equivalent service functions.

b. Promotion to Associate Professor

The same standard as applicable to the decision on tenure and promotion to full professor except that evaluation will focus on the period in the rank of assistant professor.

II. Substantive Criteria for Tenure and Promotion (adopted February 17, 2017, for tenure-track faculty members with appointments commencing after this date)

Maurer School of Law faculty aspire to be ambitious scholars, inspirational teachers, and leaders in academic, professional, and public communities. Our substantive criteria for tenure and promotion reflect this aspiration and the School expects its faculty members to make high quality contributions to all three parts of its mission.

In evaluating Research and Service, the Law School uses four categories to rate the candidate's performance: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. In evaluating Teaching, the categories are: Excellent, Very Good, Effective and Ineffective.

Except in the rare instance of a "balanced case," the Law School requires, along with the rest of Indiana University--Bloomington, that a faculty member will be Excellent in at least one of the three performance areas and at least Satisfactory/Effective in the other two. Satisfactory or Effective performance is not merely minimally competent performance, but rather performance that is satisfactory/effective in the context of a first-rate law school. Candidates seeking to be judged on the "balanced case" must be rated as Very Good in all three performance areas

Candidates for tenure and promotion normally submit a dossier that supports a rating of "excellent" in research. Campus guidelines allow candidates to choose to be reviewed for excellence in teaching or service, but Maurer typically hires entry-level faculty with the expectation that they will produce scholarship that satisfies the criteria for excellence in research. In exceptional circumstances, a colleague whose teaching or service is Excellent may be promoted or granted tenure as long as he or she is at least Satisfactory/Effective in the other two performance areas.

Research

Research and writing about law are the core scholarly activities for Maurer's tenured and tenure-track faculty. For tenure and promotion decisions, the candidate must show evidence of both future promise (tenure) and past performance (promotion) as indicated by a distinguished publication record, external peer evaluations, and an ongoing research agenda.

Scholars at Indiana University Maurer School of Law engage in diverse types of research – for example, doctrinal and theoretical scholarship, innovative applications of empirical methods, economic and historical analysis, public policy evaluation, pedagogy, and literary analysis. The School values a broad array of styles and topics for faculty scholarship, including interdisciplinary and comparative research. In evaluating research by a candidate who critically and substantially draws upon other scholarly disciplines, we consider indicia of scholarly achievement relevant to those fields in addition to the criteria normally considered in evaluating traditional legal scholarship.

A successful candidate for tenure will present a scholarly agenda demonstrating the promise of continued productivity. The candidate's research agenda ordinarily should build upon the trajectory of his or her current scholarship. To be promoted, a candidate normally should demonstrate excellence in scholarship through publications that are recognized by leading scholars in the relevant field as original and significant.

Excellence in research means a demonstrated capacity for imaginative and original work and a clear indication that the candidate will continue to contribute significantly to scholarship. This is demonstrated by a body of work produced since the candidate's terminal degree, with work

produced during the candidate's tenure-track appointment considered the best predictor of future success. The body of work must be narrated in the candidate's personal statement and assessed by external peer reviewers. The body of work should reflect a coherent agenda of intellectual and scholarly inquiry, and should present sufficient quality, quantity and scope to demonstrate excellence. In making its independent judgment about scholarship, the faculty considers external letters of peer evaluation, which are important measures of research accomplishment and promise. Candidates judged excellent in research are, or exhibit the potential to become, leading figures in fields intellectually vital and important to the law. Excellence also is reflected in scholarship that demonstrates the capacity for incisive critical analysis, original synthesis, and creative solutions to intellectual or social problems. Excellence in research also will depend upon clarity of expression, thoroughness of analysis, breadth of scope, complexity of subject matter, originality, and impact.

A candidate's record supporting an "excellent" determination normally will include at least three substantial articles reflecting work produced in a tenure-track academic position, though other forms of scholarship (such as a scholarly book) may contribute to a sufficient record. This numerical standard is merely meant as a guide for the ultimate question, which is whether the candidate has compiled a record of achievement and promise that satisfies the tenure and promotion criteria.

"Very good" research means that the body of work comes very close to satisfying the standards for excellence. "Satisfactory" research means that the body of work comes close to meeting the standards for excellence.

Teaching

The Maurer School of Law uses four ratings to assess a candidate's teaching: excellent, very good, effective and ineffective. We expect all Maurer faculty to aspire to excellent teaching.

A teaching dossier will consist of course materials, student evaluations, peer assessment, and publications directly related to law pedagogy.

The quality of teaching includes evaluation of several factors: ability to communicate; preparation for classes and of class materials; breadth of knowledge relevant to the subject; organization of class sessions and overall course content; ability to stimulate and inspire students; ability to control and direct a classroom meeting; ability and commitment to evaluate students' progress and achievement; effectiveness of guidance and supervision of student research and writing; accessibility to students and demonstrated interest/involvement in their welfare; and attention to teaching methodology.

Excellence in teaching requires evidence of a national and/or international reputation as a leader in the practice and study of teaching (stellar classroom performance is necessary but not sufficient). Indicators include: development of instructional/curricular materials, pedagogical publications

(e.g., textbooks) and presentations; active engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning (papers/books about teaching); invitations to speak and consult on teaching. External letters should focus on the candidate's contributions to the improvement of pedagogy and first-hand analysis of the candidate's teaching excellence. In the rare situation of a truly "balanced case," candidates must demonstrate that their teaching qualifies as "very good." "Very good" teaching entails stellar classroom performance and exceptional contributions to student learning. "Very good" teaching indicates superior teaching skills that challenge and inspire students to think rigorously and critically, exploring subjects in their full intellectual richness.

To achieve a rating of "effective," a faculty member must demonstrate a strong capacity to analyze, synthesize, and explain complex material to students, as well as a strong commitment to student learning and professional development.

Service

Service encompasses the contributions candidates make to the school, university, and profession. It also includes civic engagement at the local, state, national, and international levels. We expect all Maurer faculty to be at least "satisfactory" in service by the time they are considered for tenure and promotion.

A rating of "excellent" in service should be demonstrated by a record of national/international visibility and stature resulting from service. Excellence can be demonstrated by sustained and transformative work for a professional association, public agency, or community. A finding of "excellent" must be supported by external letters. "Very good" service means that the candidate has provided extraordinary leadership in one or more levels of service. "Satisfactory" service indicates that the candidate has contributed a fair share to faculty governance and institutional advancement.