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# Guidance Statement on the Lecturer Rank (Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor) in the Kelley School of Business

**(Indianapolis Campus)**

The Kelley School has academic appointments at the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Teaching Professor ranks. This document refers to many IU and IUPUI polices which provide guidance for Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor faculty on roles and promotion procedures. Such guidelines are frequently updated, and Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor faculty should therefore make sure that they have the most current versions of the documents.

Indiana University policy provides that “Lecturers/Teaching Professors may be assigned responsibility for teaching, and for research and service that supports teaching, in courses for which such assignments have been approved by the faculty of the academic unit. The Lecturer/Teaching Professor category is the appropriate classification for non-tenure-track teaching faculty in instances where the unit has a continuing need for the resource”. *Classification of Academic Appointments* (University Policy ACA-14)[1](#_bookmark0).

Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors must have completed an appropriate advanced degree or must possess the appropriate credentials as determined by the hiring department and the Dean’s Office. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors also must initially meet (and maintain) faculty qualification standards, as defined jointly by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and the Kelley School of Business. [2](#_bookmark1)

Business is an applied discipline. The Kelley School of Business strongly believes that Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor faculty contribute to the learning environment in the School through teaching, service, scholarly activity, mentoring, and contacts with businesses, governments,

1 The Academic Handbook has been replaced with IU Policies. <https://policies.iu.edu/> <https://policies.iu.edu/categories/academic-faculty-students.html> The IUPUI policies are the primary documents. The Kelley Policy Statement provides greater interpretation, but is subordinate to the IU and IUPUI policies and may lag the IU and IUPUI policies. Appendix 1 lists the IU and IUPUI policies referenced in this document.

2 From time to time, the AACSB changes the classifications and definitions of classifying scholarly activity. Kelley School policies are updated to reflect new classifications and definitions.

professional societies, and other organizations.

The Kelley School is committed to a number of values in fulfilling the teaching and service elements of its mission, including: ethical conduct; excellence and professionalism; personal initiative and responsibility; full engagement in the Kelley mission; ongoing innovation; collaboration, civility, respect and collegial conduct; diversity and inclusiveness; and just and equitable recognition for performance. The Kelley School mission statement emphasizes the role of two of these values in fulfilling its mission: a collaborative approach and a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Kelley School’s mission and values will be considered when evaluating a candidate’s teaching and service performance and contributions for reappointment and promotion. These values may be reflected in teaching or service in support of teaching.

1. LECTURER/SENIOR LECTURER/TEACHING PROFESSOR FACULTY

# Responsibilities

Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors perform an important role in meeting the teaching mission of the Kelley School. Their specific teaching responsibilities vary, depending primarily upon their educational and professional background and upon departmental needs. Teaching responsibilities will be focused on undergraduate courses and masters level courses.[3](#_bookmark2) They may also have organizational and oversight responsibility for the courses in which they teach. The standard teaching load for Lecturers will be 24 credit hours per academic year. This load may be adjusted depending on factors such as the number of preparations, class size, and type of instruction or to meet the specific needs of the Kelley School of Business or the appropriate department. *Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments* (University Policy ACA- 18) governs eligible academic administrative appointments.

Both undergraduate and graduate students at the Kelley School of Business are routinely involved in outreach activities in the business community. Accordingly, Lecturer faculty may be expected to lend their experience and leadership, in concert with other faculty and staff, to carefully monitor these outreach activities and evaluate students and the projects associated with them.

In addition to their contributions to the teaching mission of the Kelley School and the

3 Generally, under HLC faculty guidelines, faculty holding MBA and MS degrees in business as eligible to teach undergraduate business students across disciplinary areas and faculty holding terminal degrees teach graduate courses. Faculty holding MBA and MS degree may teach masters level courses based on “Tested Experience”. See the Kelley School of Business – Indianapolis policies related to the HLC faculty guidelines (1) Degree Equivalency for Business School Faculty, (2) “Tested Experience” as the Equivalent of a Graduate Degree in Business, and (3) Policy on Faculty Qualifications in compliance with AACSB International Accreditation Standards Standard 15.

University, Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are expected to participate in service in support of teaching. This service may include, but is not limited to, service on relevant Kelley School committees. (Further information on service responsibilities appears later in this document.)

Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are also expected to meet and maintain faculty qualification standards as defined jointly by the AACSB, the HLC, and the Kelley School.

More experienced faculty (Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors) provide greater leadership, mentorship, and higher levels of service responsibilities.

# Appointment to Rank of Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor

Indiana University policy provides that “[i]nitial Lecturer appointments should be at the level appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual. The process for appointment with probationary status or appointment with long-term appointment shall go through the ordinary procedures for faculty appointments.” *University Policy ACA-18*. As a general rule, initial appointments will be at the Lecturer rank. On rare occasions, however, a candidate’s experience and accomplishments may warrant an initial appointment at the Senior Lecturer or Teaching Professor rank.[4](#_bookmark3)

University Policy ACA-18 outlines rules and procedures regarding the appointment, reappointment, and non-reappointment of Lecturers. Lecturer appointments and any reappointments are governed by that policy, by all other applicable University and Indianapolis Campus policies regarding faculty appointments and faculty members’ conduct, and by this Kelley School policy.

Even when a candidate receives an initial appointment at the Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor rank, successful completion of a probationary period is expected in order for the candidate to be eligible for a non-probationary long-term appointment.

# Appointments During the Probationary Period

4 Under Kelley School policy, hiring of a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer may occur with or without a vote by members of the relevant department. Kelley School policy also provides: (1) that if a Senior Lecturer is being hired and the department chairperson conducts a vote, the faculty members eligible to vote are the department’s tenure-track and clinical faculty members, as well as the department’s other Senior Lecturers; and (2) that if a Lecturer is being hired and the department chairperson conducts a vote, the faculty members eligible to vote are the department’s tenure-track and clinical faculty members, the department’s Senior Lecturers, and the department’s other Lecturers. Note this policy is in the process of being updated to reflect teaching professor and the footnote will be updated when the policy is completed.

When Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are hired, they receive an initial 3-year appointment, contingent on the effective performance of their duties in teaching and service. This 3-year appointment begins a probationary period, which may be extended beyond the 3- year period through a series of annual reappointments until the time of consideration for a non-probationary long-term appointment. Such consideration must occur no later than the faculty member’s sixth year in rank.[5](#_bookmark4) (Further information on non-probationary long-term appointments and promotions to Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor appear later in this section)

Continued strong performance by the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor is a necessary condition for a favorable reappointment decision during the probationary period. However, reappointment decisions may also involve consideration of discretionary factors such as funding constraints and programmatic need. If the Kelley School or the relevant department exercises the discretion to decline reappointment to a Lecturer following the period of the initial 3-year appointment, notice of non-reappointment shall be given in writing at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment. (Further information on reappointment decisions during the probationary period appears in Section I(C) of this document.)

A Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor who successfully completes the probationary period will receive either a 5-year renewable appointment or a 3-year rolling appointment. Such an appointment supersedes the terms of any previous Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor appointment still in existence. A candidate who does not successfully complete the probationary period will remain as a Lecturer for a seventh year, which will serve as a separation year.

# “Visiting” Appointment

The Kelley School sometimes makes appointments to Visiting Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor positions. Under University and Indianapolis campus policies, a visiting appointment normally cannot extend beyond two years. Circumstances that make a visiting appointment appropriate include the existence of a teaching need that is temporary or of uncertain duration, or a teaching need that arises with insufficient lead time for conducting a search. For additional discussion regarding visiting and adjunct appointments, see *University Policy ACA-14.*

* 1. **Dismissal within the Probationary Period**

5 The full probationary period, therefore, is the period between the initial appointment as a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor and the awarding of a long-term appointment.

# Non-Reappointment

Following the period of the initial appointment, the Executive Associate Dean or Dean may decide to exercise the discretionary right to decline reappointment to a full-time Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor. If this occurs, notice of non- reappointment shall be given in writing at least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment.

**Policies for dismissal within the probationary period are also discussed in *University Policy ACA 18*:**“Lecturer/teaching professor appointments during the probationary period shall be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during the probationary period.”

*University Policy ACA 52*: describes timelines and additional information regarding dismissal

# Discharge for Cause:

*University Policy ACA 52,* provides information regarding discharge for cause.

# Performance Reviews

Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors and all other Kelley School faculty members must complete an annual report on their teaching activities and other Kelley-related professional activities. The department chairperson or equivalent supervisor will use information from this report in preparing annual reviews that assess the faculty members’ contributions during the preceding year. Reviews for Kelley School Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors focus on their contributions in teaching and service in support of teaching. See *University Policy ACA-18*. Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors should demonstrate valuable contributions across these two dimensions. Their performance in teaching and service will be carefully considered when decisions are made on reappointments during the probationary period[6](#_bookmark5) and at later stages of the review process.

6 Annual reappointment decisions apply to the further probationary period between the end of the initial three-year probationary appointment and the time the Lecturer is considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor and an accompanying non-probationary long-term appointment. See Section I(B)(1) of this document. Department chairpersons (or equivalent supervisors) are encouraged to obtain and consider input from the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee when probationary Lecturers/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor are evaluated for reappointment.

For each Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor shall set forth the above-described annual review in written form and shall share the written review with the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor. The department chairperson or equivalent supervisor shall also meet individually with the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor to discuss performance-related issues addressed in the written review.

Examples of types of evidence that may be taken into consideration in the evaluation of Lecturer’s/Senior Lecturer’s/Teaching Professor’s teaching performance may include the following. The text’s list of potentially relevant considerations is not meant to be all-inclusive. Neither is it meant to suggest that evidence pertaining to each of the listed considerations must be present in the candidate’s promotion dossier in order for a rating of *excellent* in teaching to be warranted.

## Teaching

* Classroom and course performance
	+ A record of sustained high-quality classroom performance as evidenced by student evaluation instruments
	+ Peer observations/evaluations that offer well-developed analyses of the candidate’s teaching and rate it highly
	+ Evidence of course rigor
	+ Letters received from students (particularly unsolicited)
	+ Teaching awards and other teaching recognition received
	+ Results of instruments used for assurance-of-learning purposes
	+ Evidence that the faculty member creates or fosters a welcoming classroom environment for students or particular groups of students
	+ Evidence that the faculty member’s teaching and/or interactions with students is consistent with the School’s teaching mission, values and goals
	+ Mentoring of students
* Curriculum development
	+ Leadership of or participation in the development of School or departmental instructional goals and objectives
	+ Participation in course or curriculum development and innovation
	+ Development of new course materials for use in the faculty member’s own course, if those materials extend beyond basic or routine teaching materials
	+ Development of new teaching materials for use beyond an instructor’s own course including textbooks, cases, instructor manuals, student guides, websites, videos, and other teaching media
	+ Engagement in out-of-class pedagogical activities (such as advising or supervising students regarding independent studies)
	+ Grants to develop new courses or revise existing ones, or to develop innovative teaching approaches regarding teaching or disciplinary scholarship
* Professional development
	+ Professional development to support the School’s teaching mission, values, and goals.
	+ Participation in teaching and learning development activities at the School, University, or peer professional group level
	+ Participation in Kelley School or University workshops and programs dealing with pedagogy
	+ Maintenance (or acquisition) of professional certification in the field in which the faculty member teaches (e.g., JD, CPA, CFA)
* Dissemination
	+ Development of new teaching materials for use beyond the faculty member’s own course, including textbooks, cases, instructor manuals, student guides, websites, videos, and other teaching media
* A record of publicly disseminated and academic and/or professional peer- reviewed scholarship in teaching is *not required* for promotion to Senior Lecturer; however, peer-reviewed scholarship supports a case of teaching excellence. A record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching is required for promotion to Teaching Professor.
	+ Publication of journal articles devoted to teaching or disciplinary scholarship
	+ Publications in conference proceedings
	+ Presentations at local and national conferences regarding teaching or disciplinary scholarship
	+ Grants to develop new courses or revise existing ones, or to develop innovative teaching approaches
	+ Mentoring of other faculty to help improve their teaching
	+ Contributions to local and national news media outlets.
	+ Contributions to the public welfare through teaching that calls upon a faculty member’s professional expertise in the discipline or as a teacher. Some examples include engaging students in community service or experiential projects, executive education, and/or significant participation/leadership in professional events or professional associations that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues. Engagement in out-of-class pedagogical activities (such as advising or supervising students regarding independent studies)

Because service in support of teaching is an important component of a Lecturer’s (Senior

Lecturer’s/Teaching Professor’s) teaching record, the following list provides examples[7](#_bookmark6) of forms that service in support of teaching may take:

## Service

The candidate contributes to the School’s service mission, values, and goals.

* School and University Service
	+ Service on department, Kelley School, or University committees
	+ Efforts to engage students with business professionals or with professional communities (including, but not limited to, outreach activities and projects)
	+ Leadership of or participation in departmental activities that support teaching and student learning
	+ Leadership of or participation in activities that support the teaching mission of the Kelley School or the University
	+ Involvement with student groups/clubs in support of student learning
	+ Support for student case competitions, including organizing the event, mentoring the student teams, or judging the competition
	+ Administrative service, if such an opportunity arose
	+ Engagement in School/University activities and events, including activities designed to attract students to the Kelley School and recognize accomplishments of Kelley students
	+ Collegiality reflects the importance of working rapport among the Kelley community needed for the long-run effectiveness of the Kelley School in the research, teaching, and service elements of its mission.
* Community or profession service
	+ Engagement in professional service such as leadership roles in academic organizations, reviewing, conference planning teams / track chairs / discussants, etc.
	+ Engagement in service to the community in ways that call upon the faculty member’s professional expertise and teaching skills
* Recognition received for service activities (both internal and external)

Because it places considerable emphasis on high-quality teaching, the Kelley School expects Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors to inquire into both the subject matter of their field and current pedagogy. Accordingly, Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are strongly encouraged to participate in School and University pedagogical/learning activities (*e.g.,* Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) seminars, teaching workshops, and Kelley’s

7 The text’s list of potentially relevant considerations is not meant to be all-inclusive. Neither is it meant to suggest that evidence pertaining to each of the listed considerations must be present in the candidate’s promotion dossier in order for a rating of *excellent* in teaching to be warranted.

Professional Development Program), as well as peer professional groups focused on subject matter content and pedagogy.

In addition to their teaching and service contributions, Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are expected to meet and maintain faculty qualification standards as defined jointly by the AACSB, the HLC, and the Kelley School. Maintenance of these qualifications will be taken into consideration by departments and department chairpersons or equivalent supervisors when they make decisions on reappointments following the initial 3-year appointment and decisions at later stages of the review process.

* 1. **Multi-Year, Long-Term Appointments Post-Probationary Period**

*University Policy ACA-18* discusses appointment terms and probationary periods more specifically.

# Initial Multi-Year Long-Term Appointment.

***Long-term appointment criteria***. A Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor hired with probationary status must undergo consideration for a non-probationary long-term appointment no later than the faculty member’s sixth year as a member of the faculty.[8](#_bookmark7) Depending on a number of factors including prior academic experience and performance, the faculty member may be considered for long-term appointment in years four through six. If the process outlined below leads to a decision that the faculty member should receive a non-probationary long-term appointment, that appointment will supersede the terms of any previous appointment still in existence for the faculty member. The long- term appointment may be either a 5-year renewable appointment or a 3-year rolling appointment, but normally is the former. A faculty member who is not approved for a

non-probationary long-term appointment will remain on the faculty for an additional year, which will serve as a separation year.

Long-term appointment and promotion decisions are separate decisions and may occur at different times. Faculty hired at the Lecturer or Senior Lecturer ranks have the option to pair, or not pair, a promotion request with the required long-term appointment decision. Faculty hired at the Teaching Professor rank are already at full rank. Accordingly, the required consideration of the faculty member for a non-probationary long-term appointment would not be accompanied by any promotion-related review.

8 At IUPUI, seeking a long-term appointment is a separate process from the process of seeking promotion. A Lecturer can seek a long-term appointment at the same time as seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer, but is not required to do so. At IUPUI, a Lecturer is not required to seek promotion to Senior Lecturer

When a faculty member is considered for an initial long-term appointment, the dossier should follow the guidelines for teaching and service documentation for faculty on tenure-related appointments. It should include teaching awards, peer evaluations, invitations to give workshops, student evaluations, curriculum development, assessment protocols, evidence related to the scholarship of teaching and/or service, and other measures of teaching effectiveness and innovation and service contributions. Because Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor appointments primarily are related to teaching and service in support of teaching, the dossier should clearly demonstrate the faculty member’s participation in learning activities such as SOTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) or CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) and teaching workshops and leadership in School activities that are designed to improve the learning environment for students. Further, the dossier should include a clear statement by the faculty member describing the candidate’s philosophy of teaching and service contributions.

A candidate seeking a non-probationary long-term appointment prior to seeking promotion must have a teaching record that is making significant progress toward the promotion standards of Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor as described in Section II(B), which requires a teaching rating of excellent, and service in support of teaching that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record.[9](#_bookmark8) In addition to their teaching and service contributions, full-time Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are expected to maintain either Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) status.

***Long-term appointment procedure***. These dossier materials will be reviewed by the Kelley School - Indianapolis Lecturer Faculty Review Committee and the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research as to whether the candidate should be appointed to a multi-year appointment. The recommendation of the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research and the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee shall be reported to the Dean’s Office, which makes the final decision on whether a long-term appointment should be granted. A multi-year appointment is typically for five years. If the decision is for non-reappointment, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year.

The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research on the IUPUI campus appoints the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee to review the promotion materials of Lecturer faculty on the Indianapolis campus. As part of the evaluation, the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee will review individual comments/input (email or in person) of the tenure- track, clinical faculty members, lecturer rank faculty of comparable rank in the candidate’s department.

9 If the candidate is seeking both an initial long-term appointment and promotion to Senior Lecturer, then the candidate must meet the criteria of Excellence for promotion.

1. ***Renewal of Multi-Year, Long-Term Appointments*** If a Lecturer faculty member receives an initial non-probationary long-term appointment under the provisions set forth in the above subsections, the appointment is subject to renewal for either a 5-year appointment or a 3- year rolling appointment under the provisions outlined below, as are subsequent long-term appointments obtained on a renewal basis. The procedure is as follows:

During the semester prior to the last year of the long-term appointment (whether the initial non-probationary appointment or a renewal appointment), the Executive Associate Dean shall evaluate the Lecturer faculty member’s performance and make a recommendation to the Dean regarding whether the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor should be reappointed under a renewal appointment that calls for another multiyear term. In order to justify recommending a Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor for a renewal appointment, the Executive Associate Dean must conclude that the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor continues to make strong contributions in teaching and in service that supports teaching appropriate for the candidate’s rank (Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor). Candidates should be making strong contributions that exceed the standard of highly satisfactory in teaching and exceed satisfactory service as defined in Section IV.

In addition to satisfying the teaching and service quality requirements set forth above, Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor candidates being considered for renewal appointments must demonstrate that they met AACSB and HLC faculty qualification standards in the five years immediately preceding their promotion and/or current multi- year appointment.[10](#_bookmark9) Candidates who have held the position for five or more years must also demonstrate that they met AACSB qualification standards during the preceding AACSB accreditation period.

The recommendation of the Executive Associate Dean shall be reported to the Dean’s Office, which makes the final decision on whether a renewal long-term appointment should be granted.

1. ***Non-Renewal of Long-term Appointments****.* Renewal of a Lecturer’s/Senior Lecturer’s/Teaching Professor’s long-term appointment should not occur if the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor does not meet the above requirements (Section I(D). In addition, factors such as funding constraints and changing programmatic needs may lead to a non-renewal decision.[11](#_bookmark10) If the Kelley School declines to renew a

10 All Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are expected to meet AACSB and HLC faculty qualification standards even if the department or area in which they reside is not assessed for AACSB or HLC accreditation purposes.

11 See *University Policy ACA-18*. According to ACA-18, a non-renewal decision may also be based on the same grounds

Lecturer’s/Senior Lecturer’s/Teaching Professor’s long-term appointment, notice of non- reappointment shall be given in writing at least twelve months before the expiration of the relevant appointment. If the decision is for non-renewal, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year. Guidelines regarding non-reappointment decisions can be found in Sections 3b and 3c of *University Policy ACA -22.*:

***Dismissal.*** Dismissal of a lecturer faculty member prior to the end of a long-term appointment (whether an initial appointment or a renewal appointment) can be found in *University Policy ACA-18.*

***Procedure.*** In the academic year prior to the last year of any post-probationary term of appointment, the Executive Associate Dean will evaluate the faculty member’s performance for reappointment of a multiyear appointment. If the decision is for non- reappointment, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year. If the Executive Associate Dean is considering non-reappointment, the Executive Associate Dean Faculty and Research on the IUPUI campus may consult the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee to review the materials of the faculty member. The faculty member may be asked to provide dossier materials similar to those for an initial long-term appointment. The Executive Associate Dean Faculty and Research will make a recommendation to the Dean regarding whether the faculty member should be reappointed for another multiyear appointment.

***Discharge for Cause:*** As explained further in *University Policy ACA 52* dismissal may occur “for reason of (a) incompetence, (b) serious personal or professional misconduct, or (c) extraordinary financial exigencies of the University.”

# Promotion to Senior Lecturer

* 1. ***Timing****.* Lecturers may apply for the rank of Senior Lecturer during the sixth year of their probationary period. In special or exceptional cases, however, promotion to Senior Lecturer may occur earlier than the sixth year of a Lecturer’s probationary period. A shortened promotion period may be the result of demonstrated teaching excellence at another institution or other especially noteworthy teaching accomplishments. Lecturers who submit their dossiers earlier than the sixth year and receive a negative promotion recommendation at the School level may withdraw their promotion request from further consideration and may be reconsidered for promotion during a later year. It is strongly recommended, however, that any subsequent promotion dossier submission follow the normal timeline, which contemplates submission in the sixth year. Promotion decisions for Senior Lecturer

that would warrant dismissal from the faculty during the period of an unexpired long-term appointment. See Sections I(B) and I(D) of this document.

are separate from decisions for renewal of long-term appointments. Neither a Lecturer’s decision not to pursue promotion to Senior Lecturer nor a decision not to promote a Lecturer who seeks promotion to Senior Lecturer shall alone be a sufficient basis for non- renewal of a Lecturer’s long-term appointment.[12](#_bookmark11) A positive promotion decision to Senior Lecturer does not extend or renew a candidate’s current long-term appointment.

* 1. ***Promotion criteria***. University and Indianapolis Campus policies establish teaching as the primary responsibility assigned to Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Teaching Professors. Accordingly, Lecturers earn a promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer by demonstrating they either:[13](#_bookmark12)
1. Achieve a rating of *excellent* in teaching and a rating of at least *satisfactory* in service activities in support of teaching; or
2. Demonstrate excellence in case based on Integrative Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in teaching which includes an integration among accomplishments and an overall philosophy and achievement towards DEI. Candidates may discuss their activities and accomplishments without reliance on the categories of ‘teaching’ and ‘service,’ but as parts of the whole. A candidate for promotion in the Integrative DEI case would be expected to go well beyond the inclusive practices expected of all successful IUPUI faculty.

The Kelley School expects its Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to engage in such service and regards the performance thereof as part of those faculty members’ teaching records. When Lecturers seek promotion to Senior Lecturer, they must demonstrate that they have engaged in service in support of teaching and have done so to a degree that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record. Such service is thus a necessary component of a case for teaching excellence, but is not sufficient by itself to guarantee an *excellent* rating in teaching. For further detail on the teaching rating necessary for a successful promotion case and for explanation of other ratings that may be assigned to a promotion candidate’s performance, see the later discussion in this subsection, in Section IV (Teaching Ratings Applicable to Lecturer Promotion Cases), and in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

12 Considerations that influence a Lecturer not to pursue promotion to Senior Lecturer and evidence that leads to a negative promotion decision for a candidate who seeks such a promotion *may* be relevant to subsequent appointment renewal decisions. However, appointment renewal for a Lecturer is an independent decision from promotion to Senior Lecturer, and it is governed by Sections I.B(1) and I(E).

13 Candidates for promotion should review the current year IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines prior to beginning the promotion process.

Service in support of teaching may pertain not only to the candidate’s own teaching or to faculty colleagues’ teaching, but also to service that supports the teaching mission of the candidate’s department, the Kelley School, the University, or the Community. Examples of different forms of service in support of teaching are listed later in this subsection of the document.

In addition, the candidate for promotion must have met faculty qualification standards as defined jointly by the AACSB, the HLC, and the Kelley School. A candidate promoted to Senior Lecturer must continue to meet these qualification standards.

IUPUI Guidelines for promotion to Senior Lecturer require that the candidate be assessed as Excellent in Teaching and Satisfactory in Service. Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer should use the most current IUPUI Guidelines. Excellence requires:

* Documented student learning
* Distinct teaching philosophy
* Excellent achievement in a teaching-related domain
* Course or curricular development
* Mentoring and advising

For examples of considerations potentially relevant to the determination of whether the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor merits a teaching rating of *excellent* or *highly satisfactory* or *satisfactory*; see the listing in Section I.D. That listing of potentially relevant considerations is meant to be illustrative and is not meant to be all-inclusive. Neither is it meant to suggest that evidence pertaining to each of the listed considerations must be present in order for a teaching rating of *excellent* or *highly satisfactory* or *satisfactory* to be warranted (Section IV).

Because it places considerable emphasis on high-quality teaching, the Kelley School expects Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors to inquire into both the subject matter of their field and current pedagogy. Accordingly, Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are expected to participate in School and University pedagogical/learning activities (*e.g.*, Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL) seminars, teaching workshops, and Kelley’s Professional Development Program), as well as peer professional groups focused on subject matter content and pedagogy. Lecturers who are promoted to Senior Lecturer are expected to continue engaging in the subject-matter and pedagogical inquiries and participation noted above.

The Kelley School’s commitment to its mission, values, and goals is reflected in various performance evaluation assessments, including the consideration of a faculty member for promotion. Activities that enhance the School’s mission, values, and goals are recognized as

part of a candidate’s performance, contributions, and achievements in teaching or service. Activities contrary to the School’s mission, values, and goals may be considered as evidence of ineffective/unsatisfactory performance, contributions, and achievements.

In addition to satisfying the above-described standards in teaching and service in support of teaching requirements, candidates seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer must demonstrate that they met AACSB and HLC faculty qualification standards in the five years immediately preceding their promotion.[14](#_bookmark13) Candidates who have held the position of Lecturer for five or more years must also demonstrate that they met AACSB qualification standards during the preceding AACSB accreditation period.

* 1. ***Promotion Procedure.*** Promotion to the Senior Lecturer rank requires the preparation of a portfolio or dossier. Faculty interested in promotion to Senior Lecturer should discuss the issue during the faculty member’s annual review at least one or two years prior to the year in which the faculty seeks promotion.

Before any decision is made within a department, school, program, or division about whether to recommend promotion, the appointee shall be notified that he or she is under such consideration and that within a properly specified and reasonable period of time, such as two to four weeks, he or she may submit materials which it is believed will be relevant to a consideration of his or her professional qualifications. (*University Policy ACA 38*).

The teaching portion of the candidate’s dossier should follow the IUPUI promotion and tenure guidelines for teaching documentation for tenure-track faculty under consideration for promotion. It should include items such as summaries of teaching evaluation scores and actual student comments, teaching awards, peer evaluations, invitations to give workshops, curriculum development, assessment protocols, and other measures of teaching effectiveness and innovation. It also should include a statement written by the Lecturer describing the candidate’s philosophy of teaching.

The candidate’s dossier should also follow the IUPUI promotion and tenure guidelines for tenure-track faculty for service documentation. The dossier should include a service statement which describes the candidate’s participation in departmental activities in support of teaching/learning (e.g., curriculum development, course development), involvement in student groups/clubs in support of student learning, engagement in School/University activities in support of our programmatic goals, and of community service activities.

14 All Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are expected to meet AACSB and HLC faculty qualification standards even if the department or area in which they reside is not assessed for AACSB or HLC accreditation purposes.

The candidate will be reviewed by the candidate’s department, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor, and the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee, which will provide a recommendation to the Dean of the Kelley School of Business.

For candidates considered for Senior Lecturer, a Department faculty advisory vote will be taken with qualified colleagues who are eligible to participate: faculty holding the rank of Senior Lecturer, Teaching Professor, Associate Clinical, Full Clinical, Associate Professor, and Full Professor. To ensure consistency, the voting procedure used by the department shall be identical to the procedure used by the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee, described in the next paragraph. The Department faculty advisory vote shall be documented and supported by a written statement/report. This vote and the Department’s report shall be given to the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee.

As part of the promotional process, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor should prepare a statement reviewing the candidate’s qualifications after having solicited input from the candidate’s colleagues within the department regarding the candidate’s teaching and service contributions.

The Lecturer Faculty Review Committee is a standing committee appointed by the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. This committee is responsible for examining the candidate’s total record in a comprehensive and rigorous fashion. The committee’s members should vote on the candidate regarding recommending promotion. The decision to promote should be based on the following conditions: the candidate must score an “excellent” rating on teaching and at least a “satisfactory” on service. Section IV provides examples of how departments might define various dimensions such as “excellent,” “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory.”

Criteria for the Integrative Lecturer DEI Case are inclusive and complete. That is, a candidate under review for promotion through this specific case is not also evaluated against the non- DEI senior lecturer and teaching professor criteria. The candidate under review for a DEI case must demonstrate excellent contributions to the teaching mission of the program, department, school, campus and/or university.

The Lecturer Faculty Review Committee’s vote shall be documented and supported by a written statement/report. The Department faculty advisory vote, the Chair’s vote, and the Faculty Review Committee’s vote along with their respective reports shall be given to the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research, who in turn, will provide a recommendation to the Dean of the Kelley School of Business.

* 1. ***Decisions Denying Promotion*.** When a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer is not

promoted, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research shall meet with the candidate to review the reasons for the non-promotion decision.

# Promotion to Teaching Professor

* 1. ***Timing***. The Kelley School – Indianapolis expects the promotion to Teaching Professor to be a significant step, with rigorous but attainable criteria that surpass performance expectations for the Senior Lecturer rank. It is likely that not every Senior Lecturer will aspire to and/or will achieve promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor. Senior Lecturers who forgo the opportunity for promotion or who do not achieve promotion should still be making valuable contributions to the teaching mission of the Kelley School – Indianapolis. Promotion decisions for Teaching Professor are separate from decisions for renewal of long-term appointments. Neither a Senior Lecturer’s decision not to pursue promotion to Teaching Professor nor a decision not to promote a Senior Lecturer who seeks promotion to Teaching Professor shall be a sufficient basis for non-renewal of a Senior Lecturer’s long-term appointment.[15](#_bookmark14) A positive promotion decision to Teaching Professor does not extend or renew a candidate’s current long-term appointment.
	2. ***Promotion criteria***. University and IUPUI Guidelines for promotion to Teaching Professor require that the candidate be assessed as Excellent in Teaching and Satisfactory in Service. Candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor should use the most current IUPUI Guidelines. Excellence requires:
* Record of publicly disseminated and academic and/or professional peer reviewed scholarship in teaching
* Documented student learning
* Distinct teaching philosophy
* Excellent achievement in a teaching-related domain
	+ Course or curricular development
	+ Mentoring and advising

At the Kelley School of Business – Indianapolis, excellence in teaching in consideration of promotion to Teaching Professor encompasses three elements:

1. A sustained record of excellence in classroom teaching while in rank as a Senior Lecturer;

15 Considerations that influence a Senior Lecturer not to pursue promotion to Teaching Professor and evidence that leads to a negative promotion decision for a candidate who seeks such a promotion *may* be relevant to subsequent appointment renewal decisions. However, appointment renewal for a Senior Lecturer is an independent decision from promotion to Teaching Professor, and it is governed by Section I(E).

1. A sustained record of service in support of teaching to a degree that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record while in rank as a Senior Lecturer for the Kelley School of Business; and
2. Evidence and recognition of meaningful pedagogical leadership outside of the candidate’s area.

All three elements must be present during a Senior Lecturer’s performance in rank to warrant promotion to Teaching Professor with overall assessment of excellence in teaching. The following paragraphs provide further explanation of criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor.

The first two elements, sustained records of excellence in classroom teaching and service in support of teaching, indicate that the candidate for promotion to Teaching Professor should have continued to demonstrate performance in rank as Senior Lecturer at least at the level required for teaching “excellence” for promotion to Senior Lecturer. The expectation of *sustained* excellent performance while in rank as Senior Lecturer indicates that a meaningful period of time as Senior Lecturer is needed to fulfill the criteria for promotion to Teaching Professor. Because the evidence of performance in rank is the primary consideration, candidates for promotion to Teaching Professor should expect to spend enough time in rank as Senior Lecturer to build a record sufficient to support the significant step and fulfill the rigorous criteria a promotion to Teaching Professor entails. While there is no specific minimum/maximum time a candidate must/can spend in rank as Senior Lecturer to be eligible for promotion to Teaching Professor, the timeline would generally be expected to reflect that which is typical for promotions to the top rank in other faculty classifications (e.g., Full Professor for tenure-track and clinical faculty).

The third element, meaningful evidence and recognition of pedagogical leadership outside of a candidate’s department (or Kelley School area), indicates that a candidate for promotion to Teaching Professor should engage in and demonstrate leadership in pedagogical activities that have positive impact beyond the candidate’s home department (or Kelley School area). As indicated by Indianapolis campus policy, activities related to pedagogical leadership include curriculum development; innovation and mentoring at the school, college, campus or university level; and/or by recognition and impact at the regional or national level.

A number of paths are available for becoming a pedagogical leader. Those paths reflect various categories of pedagogical leadership activities, as well as considerations of the quality and quantity of those activities. In evaluating dossiers for promotion to Teaching Professor, reviewers will look for clear evidence of the positive impact of and recognition for the pedagogical leadership activities upon which the candidate’s case for promotion is based.

While pedagogical leadership activities should be substantial in terms of number, the higher

the quality of those activities in terms of positive impact, breadth of effect, and validation by peers, the more concentrated a meaningful set of pedagogical leadership activities might be. Moreover, recognition received at a regional or national level may serve as evidence of the quality and impact of pedagogical leadership activities. Examples of such recognition include awards and invitations to serve in prestigious roles or positions due to the candidate’s pedagogical reputation.

Pedagogical leadership paths and examples of associated activities can include[16](#_bookmark15) dissemination to others. Pedagogical Leadership may focus primarily on an individual path or may leverage activities across multiple paths. For further detail on the teaching rating necessary for a successful promotion case and for explanation of other ratings that may be assigned to a promotion candidate’s performance, see the later discussion in this subsection, in Section IV (Teaching Ratings Applicable to Lecturer Promotion Cases), and in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

1. Curricular Leadership
	1. Developing curriculum at the school level or beyond
	2. Engaging in program development at the school level or beyond
	3. Developing teaching materials that are used at the school level or beyond
	4. Developing innovative teaching approaches that are used across the school curriculum, in other campus units, or at institutions outside Indiana University
	5. Developing cases, textbooks, and other instructional materials used by instructors outside the candidate’s area
	6. Presenting on curricular development issues at conferences
2. Mentoring and Peer Assessment
	1. Engaging in training programs to gain a thorough understanding of peer review of teaching (e.g., FACET peer review training)
	2. Conducting peer review of teaching for faculty outside of the candidate’s area
	3. Engaging in thought leadership and innovations in approaches to peer assessment and mentoring
	4. Mentoring faculty outside the candidate’s area on sound and/or high-impact pedagogical practices

16 The text’s list of potentially relevant considerations is not meant to be all-inclusive. Neither is it meant to suggest that evidence pertaining to each of the listed activities must be present in the candidate’s promotion dossier in order for the candidate’s record of pedagogical leadership to be rated as sufficiently strong for promotion to Teaching Professor.

* 1. Serving on and demonstrating leadership in the activities of committees whose charge is to foster and improve teaching, including committees for selecting teaching award winners
	2. Developing and presenting pedagogical workshops for faculty outside the candidate’s area
	3. Taking on a leadership position in a pedagogy-oriented organization
1. Leadership in Activities Related to Substantive Teaching Field
	1. Developing and delivering curriculum related to teaching field in a professional certification, continuing education, or executive education program
	2. Presenting to business or professional organizations on issues related to teaching field
	3. Participating in media interviews about issues related to teaching field
	4. Publishing articles in professional journals and practitioner books/chapters on issues related to teaching field
	5. Reviewing or serving on editorial board of professional journals in the teaching field
	6. Serving on and demonstrating leadership in activities related to the teaching field for professional organizations and community committees
2. Scholarship in Support of Teaching and Learning[17](#_bookmark16) Peer reviewed scholarship is required for the promotion to Teaching Professor.
	1. Applying for or receiving grants that support the scholarship of teaching and learning
	2. Publishing articles, books, book chapters on teaching and learning
	3. Presenting on scholarship of teaching and learning
	4. Reviewing for scholarly pedagogical journals
	5. ***Promotion Procedure.*** For promotion to Teaching Professor, the procedures are the same as in Section II(C) (Promotion to Senior Lecturer). Those eligible to vote for the rank of Teaching Professor include faculty who hold the rank of Teaching Professor, Clinical Professor, and Professor.
	6. ***Decisions Denying Promotion*.** When a candidate for promotion to Teaching Professor is not promoted, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research shall meet with the candidate to review the reasons for the non-promotion decision.

# TEACHING RATINGS APPLICABLE TO PROMOTION CASES

17 Peer-reviewed scholarship is broadly defined at IUPUI. While peer-reviewed scholarship can include peer- reviewed research, it can also include other peer-reviewed activities, such as research reports, conference presentations, blogs, etc. (See Appendix 2 for examples.)

The possible teaching ratings listed below (Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory) are the ratings set by Indianapolis Campus policy.[**18**](#_bookmark17)This section of the document adds explanatory detail regarding those ratings, as applied by the Kelley School in cases where Lecturers seek promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturers seek promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor.[19](#_bookmark18) As defined in the IUPUI Promotion standards, candidates for promotion must be assessed as excellent in teaching, at least satisfactory in service in support of teaching, and for promotion to Teaching Professor have publicly disseminated and academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship.

The Kelley School’s commitment to its mission, values, and goals is reflected in various performance evaluation assessments, including the consideration of a faculty member for promotion. Activities that enhance the School’s mission, values, and goals are recognized as part of a candidate’s performance, contributions, and achievements in teaching or service.

# Teaching Ratings and Related Explanations

***Excellent (Teaching)*.** The candidate has carried a teaching load that is appropriate for the candidate’s department or area (considering number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed) and teaching contributions support the School’s teaching mission, values and goals. The portfolio of student evaluations, unsolicited comments, peer evaluation, professional development, contributions to course/curriculum development, and scholarship/dissemination support a case for overall excellence. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments (the numerically scored questions as well as the open-ended questions calling for narrative responses) are sufficient to lend support to the conclusion that the candidate is excellent in teaching. Unsolicited student letters or other similar indications provide further support for such a conclusion.

Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues offer well-developed justifications for concluding that the candidate’s teaching performance is high in quality. The candidate has made valuable contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy.

18 The Indianapolis and Bloomington campuses use slightly different assessment classifications. Bloomington uses Excellent, Very Good, Effective, and Ineffective. Indianapolis uses Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. As a Core School, the Kelley School treats as equivalent the classifications of Very Good and Highly Satisfactory, Effective and Satisfactory, and Ineffective and Unsatisfactory.

19 The Lecturer promotion context is important to keep in mind. Although Indianapolis Campus policy calls for the same teaching rating categories (Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory) to be used in promotion cases regardless of whether they involve tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, or lecturers, the particular promotion context sometimes influences what may or must be considered in a determination of whether a certain rating is warranted. For instance, a tenure-track faculty member who seeks to be rated as excellent in teaching must normally establish that he or she has developed a national reputation in that regard. In a Lecturer promotion case, however, a national reputation for teaching excellence *is not* a necessary element of the candidate’s teaching excellence case.

Contributions are recognized beyond the candidate’s individual course(s). Further evidence of the candidate’s strong teaching record stems from a significant number of the considerations listed in Section I(D) of this document. As a *necessary* component of the candidate’s teaching excellence case, the Lecturer must have engaged in service in support of teaching and must have done so to a degree that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record.[20](#_bookmark19)

For promotion to Senior Lecturer, the faculty members must demonstrate: reflection; evidence of student learning; and impact in a particular area, which can be focused on one’s own area. Dissemination to others is defined in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

For promotion to Teaching Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate: reflection; evidence of student learning; impact in a particular area; and sustained impact and leadership, which must be broader in scope than one’s own program. Pedagogical Leadership (defined Section III(B)) may focus primarily on an individual path or may leverage activities across multiple paths. Leadership incorporates dissemination to others as defined in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

***Excellent Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)*.** DEI candidates are evaluated on Teaching DEI Excellence only, thus service in support of teaching is incorporated into this rating.

Signature activities should advance DEI at IUPUI or Kelley, but need not be classified or be based within traditional teaching categories, thus any of these would be acceptable and the list is not exhaustive:

* Inclusive classroom practices. For senior lecturer, not only work on making one’s own courses inclusive, but some other leadership role is expected, such as building inclusivity into course design (for multi-section course directors) or adjunct preparation (for program directors/those who recruit and supervise adjuncts.)
* Recruitment of and support for the educational path of diverse students, for example from high school to IUPUI, from Ivy Tech to IUPUI, from IUPUI undergraduate to graduate level study.
* Advising and mentoring for student success at IUPUI.
* Coordinated with one’s own department, work with pre-college students that supports the educational pursuits of diverse students, e.g. work with science fairs, with college prep, Upward Bound, etc.
* Design of study-abroad programs / internationalization of curricula that enhance cultural literacy.

20 Although such service in support of teaching is a necessary component of a Lecturer’s teaching excellence case, it is not sufficient by itself to guarantee an excellent rating in teaching. See Section II(B) of this document.

* Scholarship that supports the teaching mission is acceptable.

The DEI candidate has carried an appropriate teaching load as noted above (number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed) and teaching contributions that support the School’s teaching mission, values and goals. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments (the numerically scored questions as well as the open-ended questions calling for narrative responses) suggest that the candidate fulfills the candidate’s teaching responsibilities well. Unsolicited student letters express, or other similar indications suggest, that students hold a favorable view of the candidate’s teaching. Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues also view the candidate’s teaching favorably and provide evidence that the candidate incorporates DEI practices or activities into the classroom. The candidate has made contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy related to DEI. A significant number of the considerations listed in Section I(D) of this document indicate that the candidate is performing well in teaching. The candidate has engaged in service in support of teaching that serves as meaningful evidence of integrating DEI into their teaching record.

The evidence of service in support of teaching demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission, values, and goals of the School through his/her service activities (all activities are evaluated, but DEI activities are expected to be higher), provides effective leadership on activities and has made an important impact. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its impact. Where appropriate, the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to develop support for service activities. The faculty member’s activities contribute substantially beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Their activities required a significant time commitment.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer, the faculty members must demonstrate: reflection; evidence of student learning; and impact in DEI, which can be focused on one’s own area. Dissemination to others is defined in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

For promotion to Teaching Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate: reflection; evidence of student learning; impact in DEI; and sustained impact and leadership, which must be broader in scope than one’s own program. Pedagogical Leadership (defined Section III(B)) may focus primarily on an individual path or may leverage activities across multiple paths.

Leadership incorporates dissemination to others as defined in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

***Highly Satisfactory/Very Good.*** The candidate has carried an appropriate teaching load as

noted above (number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed) and teaching contributions support the School’s teaching mission, values and goals. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments (the numerically scored questions as well as the open-ended questions calling for narrative responses) suggest that the candidate, though not an outstanding instructor, fulfills the candidate’s teaching responsibilities well. Unsolicited student letters express, or other similar indications suggest, that students hold a favorable view of the candidate’s teaching. Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues also view the candidate’s teaching favorably. The candidate has made contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy. A significant number of the considerations listed in Section I(D) of this document indicate that the candidate is performing well in teaching, though not at the level of being outstanding. The candidate has engaged in service in support of teaching, though not necessarily to a degree that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record.

***Satisfactory/Effective.*** The candidate has carried the teaching load assigned and teaching contributions support the School’s teaching mission, values and goals. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments (the numerically scored questions as well as the open- ended questions calling for narrative responses) indicate that the candidate is performing the candidate’s instructional responsibilities at an acceptable level. Peer evaluations and other relevant evidence support the conclusion that the instructor’s teaching, though generally effective, does not warrant a rating of very good or excellent. (A rating of satisfactory/effective may also be appropriate if particular problems with the candidate’s teaching have been identified, the candidate has taken appropriate steps to address the problems and bring the candidate’s teaching quality to an acceptable level.) Candidates demonstrate a commitment to continued professional growth and keeping current with pedagogical developments in their field. The faculty member has engaged in service in support of teaching, but perhaps not to a significant degree.

***Unsatisfactory/Ineffective***. The contributions to the instructional mission are at an unacceptable level. A rating of ineffective typically stems from one or more of the following:

* + Results from the student evaluation instruments (numbers and comments) generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher and/or that there are significant student complaints about course organization, delivery, and/or teaching effectiveness.
	+ When problems have been identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft effective responses to address the problems, and there is a discernible lack of improvement over time and/or an inability to bring the teaching up to an acceptable level on a regular basis.
	+ Peer assessments confirm that the faculty member’s teaching quality falls below

an acceptable level.

* + The faculty member demonstrates an inability to prepare a course that is or was new to him or her.
	+ The faculty member demonstrates unwillingness or an inability, despite appropriate requests, to undertake assignments that would be helpful in addressing teaching needs at the department and/or School level.
	+ The faculty member demonstrates unwillingness to participate in professional development to enhance their pedagogy or disciplinary knowledge and professional development to support the School’s teaching mission, values, and goals.
	+ The faculty member does not conduct the class in the appropriately assigned format (in- class, hybrid, on-line).
	+ The faculty member demonstrates unwillingness or an inability to effectively work with others on the curriculum design in their course area.
	+ The faculty member has not completed instruments requested for assurance-of- learning purposes.
	+ The faculty member is frequently absent without good reason or routinely does not make himself or herself available to meet with students during office hours or designated meetings.
	+ The faculty member creates, fosters, or tolerates an unwelcoming or hostile classroom environment for students or particular groups of students.
	+ The faculty member’s teaching and/or interactions with students is contrary to the School’s teaching mission, values and goals.
	+ The faculty member has engaged in little or no service in support of teaching, despite appropriate assignments of such service tasks.

# Evaluating Service in Support of Teaching

1. *The Role of Service in Support of Teaching*

Indiana University policy provides that the primary assigned responsibility of Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors is teaching, but that they may be assigned the responsibility of engaging in service in support of teaching. As indicated earlier in this document, the Kelley School expects Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors to engage in service in support of teaching.

The Kelley School has determined that as a necessary (though not sufficient) component of a teaching excellence case when a Lecturer seeks promotion to Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturers seek promotion to the rank of Teaching Professor, the candidate must have engaged in service in support of teaching to a degree that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record.

1. *What Service in Support of Teaching May Include*

Service in support of teaching may pertain to the candidate’s own teaching, to the teaching of the candidate’s colleagues, or to service that pertains to the teaching missions of the relevant department, the Kelley School, or Indiana University. It may also pertain, in appropriate cases, to public service insofar as it draws upon the candidate’s background and skills as a teacher and relates to or complements the aforementioned teaching missions. Section I(D) of this document contains a list of examples of service activities that may be regarded as service in support of teaching. Service activities sufficiently similar to those listed in Section I(D) may also be treated as service in support of teaching.

1. *The Meaningful Evidence Standard*

Although the *meaningful evidence* standard cannot be defined with complete precision, this subsection provides comments to help guide the standard’s application to Lecturer/Senior Lecturer promotion cases. The *meaningful evidence* standard contemplates a balancing of quantity and quality considerations. The quantity consideration takes into account not only the number of service activities in support of teaching (see the examples of such activities listed in Section I(D) of this document) but also the time commitment associated with those activities. Service in support of teaching that seems substantial in terms of number of such activities and/or time commitment involved should satisfy the quantity prong of the meaningful evidence standard. As the preceding sentence suggests, the quantity prong may be satisfied by a record of relevant service activities that is not extensive in terms of number of activities but is significant in terms of the time commitment involved. On the other hand, the quantity dimension of a meaningful evidence finding would not be met when the list of relevant service activities seems both short and reflective of only minor time commitments.

The quality prong of the meaningful evidence standard focuses on the apparent value of the candidate’s service in support of teaching. Consideration of the time commitment involved applies here as well, as an extensive time commitment associated with a relevant service activity may be a helpful indicator of the value of that activity. Factors such as the Lecturer’s/Senior Lecturer’s having taken a leadership role in relevant service activities would also come into play here, though a leadership role is not considered essential. Evidence of the value of the candidate’s service in support of teaching may come from the candidate’s own statements in the candidate’s dossier and from other persons with knowledge of those activities.

Although significance in terms of both quantity and quality of the candidate’s service in support of teaching is normally to be expected in order for the meaningful evidence standard to be met, there may be cases in which evidence of very valuable service contributions causes the quality

dimension to offset what might otherwise have appeared to be a quantity shortfall. In such cases, the meaningful evidence standard could still be met.

If the meaningful evidence standard is not met (in the judgment of the department chair, equivalent supervisor, voting-eligible faculty, or persons or committees involved in later stages of the review process), one or more of the following would normally be the reason(s):

* 1. The Lecturer/Senior Lecturer’s record of service in support of teaching reflects minimal involvement in such activities.
	2. The Lecturer/Senior Lecturer’s record of service in support of teaching reflects contributions of limited value.
	3. The Lecturer/Senior Lecturer has declined to accept assignments of service activities that support teaching.
	4. The Lecturer/Senior Lecturer has failed to work effectively in collaboration with colleagues on courses when such collaboration is expected within the department or area.
1. *Sample Service Criteria*

*Excellent*. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission, values, and goals of the School through his/her service activities (ideally including significant public service), provides effective leadership on significant activities and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its impact. The faculty member has received external awards, honors or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate, the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to develop support for service activities. The faculty member’s activities, including scholarship of service, contribute substantially beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University.

*Highly Satisfactory*. The evidence exists that the faculty member consistently exceeds the standard of Satisfactory, but does not meet the qualifications for Excellence. Typically, a highly satisfactory record is focused mainly on department, school, campus-level, regional service, and efforts and contributions that enhance the School’s service mission, values, and goals. Such a record reflects a significant number and range of student, department, school, or campus service activities of the sorts listed above in the description of the excellent service rating. The highly satisfactory record also contains evidence that certain service activities required a significant time commitment.

*Satisfactory*. The evidence establishes that the faculty member is a good academic citizen and contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees (as requested by the department), dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions. The faculty member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School.

*Unsatisfactory*. The faculty member fails to contribute constructively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. The candidate has undertaken few service activities, rejected customary service assignments, failed to complete service assignments he or she accepted, completed accepted assignments poorly, or is frequently absent without good reason. The candidate is unwilling or unable to collegially participate in events and seminars, or demonstrates a habit of avoidance. The faculty member’s activities are inconsistent with, or demonstrate unwillingness to contribute to, the School’s service mission, values, and goals. The candidate has failed to show improvement after being placed on notice that the candidate’s or her service performance was falling below the standards of acceptability. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

* Failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University;
* Failure to demonstrate contributions to the School’s service mission, values, and goals;
* Irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings;
* Failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings;
* Generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions.

# Appendix 1. Campus Policies:

**Selected Specific Policies:**

* [University Policy ACA 12:](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-12-general-provisions-academic-appointments/index.html) General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments
* [University Policy ACA-14](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-14-classification-academic-appointments/index.html): Classification of Academic Appointments

* [University Policy ACA-18](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-18-regulation-clinical-lecture-appointments/index.html): Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments [University Policy ACA-21](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-21-faculty-librarian-annual-reviews/index.html): Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews

* [University Policy ACA-22](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-22-reappointment-non-reappointment-probationary-period/index.html): Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period.
* [University Policy ACA-25](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-25-annual-reports-faculty-librarians/index.html): Annual Reports for Faculty and Librarians

* [University Policy ACA-38](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-38-faculty-librarian-promotion/index.html): Faculty and Librarian Promotions

* [University Policy ACA-52](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-52-permanent-separations-academic-appointees/index.html): Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees
* [IUPUI Faculty Guide](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/FCContent/Html/Media/FCContent/handbook/facultyguide2019-20.pdf) (Updated July 1, 2019): See pages 13 (Faculty Governance), 36 (The Academic Appointee), 48 (Reviews and Reappointment Procedures), 64 (Emeritus Policy), 67 (Grievances), and 82 (Policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment)
* IU [Faculty Work](https://iu.box.com/s/xdvq5a5qlm0iwliqmeoh5ytd9wcofh52): This is a policy that governs all faculty and describes how they are to work.
* IUPUI 2020-21Promotion and Tenure Guidelines: Faculty should refer to the most recent P&T Guidelines when considering promotion. [https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) [PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

# Related Policies:

* [University Policy ACA-33](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-33-code-academic-ethics/index.html): Code of Academic Ethics (lecturer/senior lecturer/teaching professor appointments must adhere to this policy as well.)

# Appendix 2. Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus\*

**Kelley School of Business - Indianapolis**

This table is offered as a comprehensive, but not exhaustive list of exemplars of dissemination to others. These categories are not intended to be a check list but rather show that types of activities that reflect dissemination to others.[21](#_bookmark20) Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are both academics and professionals. Thus, publicly disseminated and peer review of scholarship (publications, presentations, workshops) may include both the academic community and the professional community with whom Lecturers interact.

Lecturers are promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturers are promoted to the rank of Teaching Professor on the basis of an excellence in Teaching Excellent case or a Teaching Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Excellent case. Dissemination of service is not required of Lecturers and therefore not shown in this Appendix.

# Representative Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor Faculty dissemination to others

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Business | Formal “scholarship of teaching and learning” is more likely to occur at the Teaching Professor level. Scholarship/dissemination includes pedagogical and/or disciplinary content.The different ways in which Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors may choose to engage in the dissemination of their scholarship are described below. Faculty should not be expected to provide examples from all areas, but each area reflects differing types of evidence that may be provided by faculty members.Because the teaching load and service engagement load for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are higher than both clinical and tenure-track faculty, the numbers of dissemination outlets should be fewer and a wider array of outlets is considered.Dissemination to others occurs at many levels. Unlike tenure track faculty, who are expected to meet promotion criteria primarily based on publications in peer reviewed journals recognized for their prominence in the field, Lecturers/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor faculty are expected to focus dissemination to others(academia, profession, community) in the forms of leadership, mentoring, |

21 As noted in the text of these guidelines regarding promotion to Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor, IUPUI P&T Guidelines require a *[r]ecord of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching.* Not all activities must be peer-reviewed. Peer-review can take many forms, and the various types of peer- review are not described in the P&T document.

articles/presentations in area of expertise, or academic and/or professional peer- reviewed scholarship of teaching (publication/ presentation, substantive critique).

Dissemination to academia includes academic publications, presentations, conferences, and communities of practice. Dissemination to the profession includes professional business societies, companies, and businesses.

Dissemination to the community includes media (quotes and articles in local and national newspapers, periodicals, blogs, podcasts, TV, radio), professional societies, and community groups.

# Scholarship of teaching and learning (publication/presentation, substantive critique) include either pedagogical and/or disciplinary materials related to the area of expertise.

* + **Presentations –**faculty members will make presentations related to pedagogical techniques or application of discipline specific material related to the faculty members teaching. Lecturer/Senior Lecturer faculty members engage largely in departmental or professional seminars (frequently for corporate or nonprofit organizations) and local/regional/national conferences. These may include invited or non-invited presentations by companies, nonprofits, colleges, or professional organizations.
	+ **Publications** – faculty members are not required to have publications in academic peer reviewed journals, although peer reviewed journal articles provide evidence of excellence. In each case, evidence of greater readership or audience dissemination will be viewed favorably; however, this emphasis should not discourage specialization. Publications may include:
		- Journal articles (peer or non-peer reviewed) related to the discipline taught by the faculty member
		- Journal articles related to pedagogy
		- Publications in conference proceedings
		- Digital Teaching Repository at IUPUI (<https://theforum.iupui.edu/DTR/index.html>)
		- Cases related to the discipline taught by the faculty member. Cases may be on local companies, provided primarily to our students or to regional/national audiences.
		- Cases related to pedagogy presented to local, regional, or national audiences
		- Faculty may prepare pedagogical materials used as ancillaries to textbooks and classrooms materials.
		- Chapters of textbooks, segments of chapters, or other books related to the discipline (when evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship)
		- Reports and grants related to assessment of learning and evidence of pedagogical development that informs the teaching and learning of other academics.
		- Contributions to local and national news media outlets. Publication where the faculty member is the primary writer is given greater weight. Some common examples include the *Indianapolis Recorder, Indianapolis Business Journal, Inside Indiana Business* (local)*, The Conversation* and *The Wall Street Journal* (national). Media quotes are also examples of dissemination of teaching, but given lesser weight than publications. (when evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship)
		- Web pages, podcasts, blogs, or other electronic aids to facilitate disciplinary learning and/or instructional techniques. (when evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship)
		- Contributions to social media, for example *Inside Indiana Business* (podcast, TV), featured posts (e.g., LinkedIN).
		- Assessments of what effects pedagogy on students’ knowledge and skills disseminated in conference papers or other venues.
	+ **Workshops** include being asked to facilitate and organize in-service workshops with other academics or professionals, which can be viewed as public dissemination of teaching techniques or discipline specific material. FACET membership (not required but example of excellence) or other teaching awards are examples of dissemination. Presentations at companies and executive education are examples of dissemination among professional peers.
	+ **Obtaining Grants.** Competitive grants that support teaching activities can be viewed as evidence of scholarship because the applications are often subject to peer-review. These are even more powerful when the grant supports the lecturer faculty member to study and disseminate what is learned from the grant activity.

Dissemination to others in the form of **Teaching Service Leadership** in

# Appendix 3. Differences in IU Bloomington and IUPUI Campus Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor Faculty Promotion Requirements

* **Academia** includes serving on boards and editorial roles or service for academic societies.
* **Profession** includes serving on boards for companies and engaging local businesses organizations and professional societies as well as disseminating teaching techniques, and engaging business professionals in the educational process while promoting students for future employment in the community.
* **Community** includes serving on boards for community organizations and nonprofits as well as disseminating teaching techniques, and engaging community organizations and nonprofits in the educational process while promoting students for future employment in the community.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IUB Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor Promotion Requirements** | **IUPUI Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor Promotion Requirements** |
|  |  |
| Lecturers are *required* to apply for rank of Senior Lecturer during sixth year of their probationary period. | Lecturers are reviewed for long term appointment after six years of probationary appointment, but they are *not* required to applyfor promotion to Senior Lecturer. |
| Scholarship of teaching is a path to promotion, but other paths may be presented to support the case. | To be considered excellent in teaching, Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Teaching Professor must have a *record of “*peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship relevant to teaching and learning”.[22](#_bookmark21) |
| Standard teaching load for Lecturers/SeniorLecturers/Teaching Professors is 18 hours per year. | Standard teaching load for Lecturers/SeniorLecturers/Teaching Professors is 24 hours per year. |

22 IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines are modified each year. Candidates for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer and from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor should reference the current guidelines (e.g., 2020-21 Guidelines, p. 25). https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02- PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf