This document is designed to help tenure and promotion candidates prepare dossiers to offer the best chance of achieving tenure and promotion. These recommendations do not replace the criteria for tenure and promotion, and should be considered only as helpful suggestions. Official University guidelines for tenure and promotion are published in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in more detail in the Bloomington Academic Guide and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement, and the policies of the Kelley School can be found in “Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure & Annual Pretenure Reviews” (April 28, 2006).

Research Program
To evaluate the strength of a candidate’s research program, the FRC assesses the extent to which candidates are primary contributors to programmatic streams of research that address questions important to their disciplines. The research should have a significant and positive impact on the creation of knowledge in the discipline, and the candidate’s publication record should compare favorably with those of other faculty in the discipline. Candidates must target and be successful at publishing in the top journals in their and related disciplines, and it is important that the unique and incremental contribution of each article be highlighted. (e.g., simply re-packaging similar findings for multiple articles, and using similar data for more than one article can reduce the perceived contribution of subsequent articles in a sequence). Further, a candidate’s research program consists not only of published papers (e.g., journal articles, research monographs, research books), but also includes papers under publication consideration, working papers, works in process, funded grants, and grant applications. Those evaluating the research record (e.g., Department/Integrated Faculty, FRC, Deans, Campus Committees) are concerned about both the accomplishments of the candidate as well as the candidate’s potential to maintain a high-quality research program in the future. In promotion cases accomplishment is weighted more heavily than potential; in tenure cases both accomplishment and potential are important. Candidates who provide information helpful in assessing the strength and quality of the total research program increase the likelihood that their research programs will be evaluated highly. Below we offer some ideas about how to collect and present relevant information.

- **Primary Contributor.** Candidates should show that they are significant authors on their papers, and have established some level of independence from prior mentors and dissertation committee members. Information helpful in making this assessment includes: sole authored papers, high-level publications in which mentors are not co-authors, and letters from co-authors describing the role and importance of the candidate’s contributions to the research projects. In addition, in fields where it is not strictly alphabetical, order of authorship can also be an indication of a candidate’s contribution to the research. Therefore, candidates should clearly indicate the meaning of the order of authorship for each paper.
• **Programmatic Research Addressing Important Questions.** While the quality and quantity of individual research papers is important, it is crucial for the candidate’s research statement to: (a) clearly describe how his/her papers build on each other to produce a programmatic stream of research; and (b) explain why this research stream is important to the discipline. These statements should summarize the relevant body of knowledge in the discipline and how the research program of the candidate contributes to it. Often charts and outlines that summarize and classify articles into research areas can help the FRC make this assessment. External reviewers, who can comment thoughtfully and knowledgably about the programmatic nature of the research, should be chosen by the candidate and the candidate’s department chair because the FRC expects external reviewers to comment on the candidate’s research program and its impact on the body of knowledge in the area.

• **Significant and Positive Impact.** Evidence of the scholarly impact of a candidate’s research may come from several sources including comments from the external reviewers, citation counts, and research awards. Although citation counts can be helpful in assessing the impact of the candidate’s research program, we recognize that they are imperfect measures of research impact and that they may be more useful in promotion than in tenure cases (because a reasonable number of cites can only accumulate with the passage of time). In addition, because there are many ways to conduct citations analyses using any or all of several different data bases (e.g., Web of Science, Google Scholar, etc.) and there are few benchmarks available against which a given number of citations can be meaningfully compared, citation analyses must be thoughtfully executed and well documented to be useful.

• **Comparisons across Faculty.** To establish a strong research record the number and nature of the publications should compare favorably with faculty in the same discipline at peer institutions who have been conducting research for approximately the same time period. Consequently, candidates should prepare cohort comparisons that normally consist of a chart summarizing the publication records of the candidate and successful individuals at a similar career stage at comparable institutions. In addition, in those disciplines where previously published norms are available for use as a benchmark, candidates may also wish to comment on how their own publication rate compares to all others in their discipline at a similar career stage. Finally, external reviewers can also provide useful information by commenting on how they think the candidate’s record compares to other faculty in the same discipline from the same graduating class.

• **Unpublished Research.** The status of papers under review, working papers, and work in progress should be clearly described. Reviewer and editor letters concerning papers under review can be helpful, and the stage of working papers and work in progress (e.g., idea stage, data collection stage, first draft, ready to submit, target journals, etc.) should be disclosed. This work should be discussed in the research statement and their contribution to the programmatic theme should be highlighted.
Teaching Program
To evaluate the strength of a candidate’s teaching program, the FRC assesses the nature and difficulty of the candidate’s teaching assignments, the candidate’s course performance, the level and quality of curriculum development required to complete the teaching assignments, and a number of other factors related to the education of students in the discipline outside the preparation and delivery of assigned courses. Candidates that provide information helpful in assessing the strength and quality of the total teaching program increase the likelihood that their teaching programs will be evaluated highly. Below we offer some ideas about how to collect and present relevant information.

• **Teaching Assignments.** Teaching assignments can range from a single course taught to multiple sections of undergraduate students requiring little curriculum development to multiple courses taught to students from various levels (undergraduate and graduate) requiring extensive curriculum development. Ceteris Paribus, teaching assignments that involve more different courses, more levels of the curriculum, higher levels of the curriculum, and more course development will be judged more highly. Candidates with relatively easy teaching assignments will be expected to perform higher on the various measures of teaching performance than candidates with more difficult teaching assignments.

• **Course Performance.** Student course evaluations represent an important measure of teaching performance. Candidates receiving high scores on questions involving both teaching effectiveness and course rigor will be evaluated higher than candidates with high scores on either dimension alone. An important benchmark in assessing whether candidates are receiving high scores is the distribution of scores for similar courses in the Kelley School of Business. Evaluators also pay close attention to the number of students who complete the course evaluation. Assessments may decline in cases where a large number of students registered for the course do not complete the evaluation. Course performance evaluations by faculty (peer reviews) and School of Business teaching support personnel can also provide helpful information, and innovative and creative course delivery techniques should also be described by the candidate. Teaching awards (department, school, university, and national) should be listed and clearly described.

• **Curriculum Development.** Evidence of extensive and innovative curriculum development will be viewed positively by evaluators. The creation of new courses, major revisions of existing courses, and the development of new programs represent examples.

• **Outside Evidence.** Developing a case for an “outstanding” record in teaching requires much more than good teaching evaluations. It requires that the candidate develop a national or international reputation as a high-quality educator in the discipline. Evidence of such a reputation can include textbook writing, educational research, case writing and publications, presentations dealing with educational issues at regional and national meetings, significant curriculum development (e.g., creation of a new program), successful introduction of new teaching pedagogy, developing teaching paradigms adopted by other universities, national teaching awards, and extensive involvement with doctoral students outside the classroom (e.g., dissertations) and in certain cases programs outside the normal teaching assignments.
Support for an “outstanding” teaching record should also appear in the letters from the external reviewers.

**Service Program**

To evaluate the strength of a candidate’s service program, the FRC assesses the nature and level of the candidate’s contributions to the candidate’s department, the Kelley School of Business, Indiana University, the business community, and government as well as the candidate’s academic discipline and profession. Below we offer some ideas about how to collect and present relevant information.

- **Department Service.** Departmental administrative positions (e.g., department chair), service on departmental committees (especially as chairperson), participation in departmental research and education workshops, and providing collegial support to members of the department, all represent examples of departmental service.

- **Kelley School Service.** School-level administrative positions (e.g., program chair), service on school-level committees (especially as chairperson), directors of research centers and institutes and MBA academies as well as providing collegial support to members of the School outside the department represent examples of School-level service.

- **Indiana University Service.** University-level administrative positions (e.g., BFC), service on university-level committees, and providing collegial support to members of Indiana University outside the Kelley School represent examples of university-level service.

- **Business Community and Government Service.** Administrative positions in business community and local, state, and federal government service organizations, and service on community and government service committees represent examples of community service.

- **Academic Discipline Service.** Administrative positions in an Academic Association (e.g., American Accounting Association), service on association committees, and service as research journal editor and on editorial boards represent examples of academic discipline service.

- **Professional Organization Service.** Administrative positions in professional organizations (e.g., American Institute of CPAs), and service on professional organization committees represent examples of professional organization service. Membership on boards of directors is another example.
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INTRODUCTION

The two-campus (Bloomington/Indianapolis) organization of the Kelley School of Business requires that evaluation of professional competence for the purpose of recommending promotion or granting tenure be conducted in accordance with an explicit set of criteria and procedures.

The evaluation criteria of research, teaching, and service are common to all campuses of Indiana University. Judgments of competence and achievements are made after consideration of the combination of activities assigned to the individual during the period under evaluation. In the Kelley School of Business a common set of criteria apply to its faculty members at the Bloomington and Indianapolis locations. Applicable procedures, however, vary slightly by location. Department chairs and candidates for promotion or tenure are given documentation describing relevant campus procedures to guide preparation of dossiers. The dossiers prepared for the evaluations described in succeeding sections document the totality of duties assigned. Evaluations by the Kelley School of Business' Faculty Review Committee, the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Dean reflect whatever differences as might be found at either location. Specific procedures and timetables differ slightly as a function of the involved faculty member's appointment. Such appointments may take three forms: (1) the faculty member is based on the Bloomington campus; (2) the faculty member is based on the Indianapolis Campus; (3) the faculty member has a joint Bloomington/Indianapolis appointment. The general criteria for promotion, tenure, and pretenure reviews are described in the following section. Specific timetables and procedures relevant to candidates' appointment (Bloomington, Indianapolis, joint--Bloomington/Indianapolis) are then described in succeeding sections.

GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION

The criteria and procedures for promotion in the Kelley School of Business are set forth in general terms in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in more detail in the Bloomington Academic Guide and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement. As applied specifically to the Kelley School of Business, these criteria and procedures are as follows (see Table 1 for a summary of promotion procedures).

**Criteria**

Promotion of tenure-track faculty members in the Kelley School of Business is recommended on the basis of three criteria: teaching, research, and service. For clinical ranks, promotion is on the basis of teaching and service. To be eligible for promotion, a faculty member is normally expected to excel in rank in at least one of these categories and to have performed in rank at least satisfactorily in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university over time. In all cases, the candidate's total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank constitutes recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.
The criterion in regard to teaching is precisely as articulated in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement. Recognizing that effective documentation of excellence in teaching is difficult, faculty members are required to use and retain the Kelley School of Business teaching evaluation forms each semester. In addition, it is the responsibility of the chairperson to ensure that other measures of teaching quality or innovation in classroom work are acquired over time. Particularly valuable are periodic colleague evaluations resulting from class visitation and/or team teaching. Unsolicited student letters or other indications of excellence collected over several years add measurably to the credibility of performance on this dimension. Textbook writing, teaching publications, doctoral committee assignments, classroom simulations, computer classroom applications, and curricular development are also important. Other potential factors include evidence of teaching exposure across programs and courses, consistency across time, and external recognition for teaching excellence.

The criterion with regard to research and creative activity is normally applied in terms of the quality and quantity of pure and applied research reported in published articles, monographs, books, public testimonies, and other media. Creative work can take other forms such as creations of new forms of business organizations, new ways of measuring productive effectiveness, or other advances in the knowledge and practice of business. Even in these situations, however, the results of the creative activity are normally summarized in writing and published.

For clinical faculty, research cannot be included as a basic category of evaluation. However, research in support of teaching and service should be considered part of the teaching and service dossiers, and other forms of research may be considered as evidence of intellectual engagement in the professional field that is generally indicative of long-term intellectual contributions valuable in classroom settings and to the campus in general.

As used in the Kelley School of Business, the criterion in regard to service is fairly broad. Service by the faculty member to the University, to the business community, to government, and to professional organizations is considered. Being members of a faculty of a professional school, individuals recommended for promotion are expected to have exhibited a high level of professionalism in their service both to the University and to one or more of its external constituencies. Differentiation in the application of promotion criteria among academic ranks is as stated in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement.

It should also be noted that promotion of a faculty member to associate professor prior to the sixth year tenure decision point should be pursued only in especially meritorious cases. Promotion to associate professor is based on accomplishment and not on potential or promise. A faculty member needs to achieve a level of performance that meets the requirements for the associate professor level versus merely being "on track" for eventual tenure. In effect, the required evidence of accomplishment for such a promotion must be equivalent to that required for awarding associate rank to someone being hired from outside the University. Thus, the early promotion to associate professor is expected to be an unusual case. If a candidate wishes to be considered for promotion to associate professor prior to attaining six years toward tenure, the decision to proceed should be made in consultation and agreement among the candidate, the
department chairperson, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research before the preparation of a dossier. For candidates who have not been promoted to associate professor prior to the tenure decision, Indiana University policy provides that promotion to associate professor accompanies an award of tenure.

As previously noted, the exact procedures to which the Kelley School of Business adheres depend on the nature of a candidates' appointment. Each appointment with regard to promotion is discussed in turn.

**Promotion: Faculty Member with a Bloomington Appointment**

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, or by the department chairperson after consultation with the tenured members of the department (or department tenure and promotion committee). Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

(1) In the late Spring or early summer, department chairpersons are asked to identify those faculty members who are likely to be considered for promotion in the following year. In addition, they are asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

Criteria for the selection of outside reviewers include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(2) Prior to the start of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to each department chairperson announcing when promotion dossiers are due in the Associate Dean's office. The deadline for promotion recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(3) Each department chairperson prepares a dossier for each promotion candidate. The dossier is prepared with the knowledge and with the active cooperation of the candidate. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and any other relevant materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person who is constructing the dossier. The chairperson is expected to consult with the Department Faculty Advisory Committee in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion. For tenure decisions and promotion decisions on tenure-track faculty, the Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenured faculty at that rank and above. For promotion decisions on clinical faculty, the Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenure-track and clinical faculty at that rank or above.
Outside letters will be requested by the Associate Dean's Office. Approximately half these names should be recommended by the candidate. In order to be sure that the return rate is high, department chairs are asked to contact potential reviewers in advance and not to submit their names unless they have agreed to write an evaluation. It is critically important that chairs and candidates for tenure and promotion select reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate’s performance, have no past ties with the candidate or explicitly state what they are, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research selects names from these lists and solicits an evaluation, in writing, from each of the designated outside reviewers.

(4) If the department advisory committee and/or the department chairperson conclude that a particular faculty member should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the faculty member will be advised that he/she has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation. He/she is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable department or chairperson endorsements that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

(5) All promotion recommendations, including those initiated by faculty members themselves, are sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research forwards them to the Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. Members of the FRC must recuse themselves from voting in cases from their department (or the Indianapolis integrated faculty). However, they may vote at the departmental level. This Committee evaluates each tenure-track faculty dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service) and each clinical faculty dossier with regard to the two criteria (teaching and service). The Committee then prepares a written statement indicating in detail whether in its collective judgment the candidate should or should not be promoted. The Committee's statement is then sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(6) With respect to each promotion dossier receiving a favorable endorsement by a majority vote of the Faculty Review Committee, the Dean enters his/her own evaluation of the candidate, forwards the dossier to the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office, and notifies the relevant department chairperson to indicate the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee to the candidate. The forwarding of the dossier and notification of the candidate are accomplished on or before the published deadline for dossier submission established by the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office forwards the dossier to the Bloomington campus Promotions Committee which, after review of the dossier, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office then makes a recommendation to the Provost.

(7) Final approval of a promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(8) With respect to each promotion dossier reviewed but not favorably endorsed by the Faculty Review Committee, the candidate is advised by the Dean and/or the candidate's
department chairperson of the absence of favorable endorsement by the Faculty Review Committee. At that time, the candidate then decides whether he/she wishes to withdraw his/her recommendation (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee. If the latter, the Dean adds his/her personal evaluation to the dossier and it is forwarded to the appropriate Dean of the Faculties Office.

(9) The total process is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research in the Kelley School of Business, whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the dossiers are secure.

Promotion: Faculty Member with an Indianapolis Appointment

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, or by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis after consultation with the tenured members of the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty. Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

(1) In the late Spring or early summer, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis is asked to identify those faculty members who are likely to be considered for promotion in the following year. In addition, he or she is asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(2) Prior to the start of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis announcing when promotion dossiers are due to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The deadline for promotion recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(3) The Associate Dean, Indianapolis prepares a dossier for each candidate for promotion. The dossier is prepared with the knowledge and with the active cooperation of the candidate. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and any other relevant materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person who is constructing the dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis is expected to consult with the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion. For tenure decisions and promotion decisions on tenure-track faculty, the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenured faculty at that rank and above. For promotion decisions on clinical faculty, the
Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of all tenure-track and clinical faculty at that rank or above.

Outside letters will be requested by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research then selects names from these lists and solicits an evaluation, in writing, from each of the designated outside reviewers.

(4) If the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and/or the Associate Dean, Indianapolis concludes that a particular faculty member should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the faculty member will be advised that he/she has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation. He/she is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee or Associate Dean, Indianapolis endorsements that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

(5) All promotion recommendations, including those initiated by faculty members themselves, are sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. Such recommendations must be accompanied by a report from the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and a review by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research delivers these materials to the Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. Members of the FRC must recuse themselves from voting in cases from their department (or the Indianapolis integrated faculty). However, they may vote at the departmental level. This Committee evaluates each tenure-track dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service) and each clinical faculty dossier with regard to teaching and service. The Committee then prepares a written statement indicating in detail whether in its collective judgment the candidate should or should not be promoted. The Committee's statement is then sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(6) With respect to each promotion dossier receiving a favorable endorsement by a majority vote of the Faculty Review Committee, the Dean enters his/her own evaluation of the candidate, forwards the dossier to the Dean of the Faculties Office of the Indianapolis campus, and notifies the Associate Dean, Indianapolis to indicate the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee to the candidate. The forwarding of the dossier and notification of the candidate are accomplished on or before the published deadline for dossier submission established by the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office forwards the dossier to the Indianapolis Tenure and Promotion Committee which, after review of the dossier, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office then makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.

(7) Final approval of a promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(8) With respect to each promotion dossier reviewed but not favorably endorsed by the Faculty Review Committee, the candidate is advised by the Dean and/or the Associate Dean,
Indianapolis of the absence of favorable endorsement by the Faculty Review Committee. At that time, the candidate then decides whether he/she wishes to withdraw his/her recommendation (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee. If the latter, the Dean adds his/her personal evaluation to the dossier and forwards it to the Dean of the Faculties Office, Indianapolis.

(9) The total process is administered by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the dossiers are secure.

Promotion: Faculty Member with a Joint Indianapolis/Bloomington Appointment

Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty member on his/her own behalf, by a faculty colleague, the department chairperson (after consultation with the Department Faculty Advisory Committee), or by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis (after consultation with the tenured members of the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee). Once begun, the recommendation is processed through all steps in the evaluation procedure, unless formally withdrawn by the faculty member under consideration.

(1) In the late Spring or early summer, the department chairperson with the assistance of the Associate Dean, Indianapolis is asked to identify those faculty members with joint appointments who are likely to be considered for promotion in the following year. In addition, the chairperson is asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names who he or she would like to have included.

Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(2) Prior to the start of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to the respective faculties (Indianapolis, Bloomington) announcing when promotion dossiers are due. The deadline for promotion recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(3) The Associate Dean, Indianapolis has the responsibility for preparing the promotion dossier for faculty members with joint appointments. The dossier is prepared with the knowledge and with the active cooperation of the candidate. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and any other relevant materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person who is constructing the dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis is expected to consult with the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee in arriving at his/her recommendations concerning promotion.
Outside letters will be requested by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research then selects names from these lists and solicits an evaluation, in writing, from each of the designated outside reviewers.

(4) If the Department Faculty Advisory Committee, the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, the department chairperson, or the Associate Dean, Indianapolis or any subset of these parties concludes that a particular faculty member should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the faculty member will be advised that he/she has the option to initiate his/her own recommendation. He/she is also informed that such an individually initiated recommendation will be forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable Faculty Advisory Committee, Associate Dean, Indianapolis, department chairperson, or Faculty Review Committee endorsements that might be added to it, unless subsequently withdrawn by the candidate.

(5) All promotion recommendations, including those initiated by faculty members themselves, are sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. In the case of faculty members with joint appointments, there will be four such reports. These will be comprised of a report from the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and a review by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. Also, there will be a report from the Department Faculty Advisory Committee and the department chairperson. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research delivers these materials to the Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. Members of the FRC must recuse themselves from voting in cases from their department (or the Indianapolis integrated faculty). However, they may vote at the departmental level. This Committee evaluates each tenure-track dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service) and each clinical faculty dossier with regard to teaching and service. The Committee then prepares a written statement indicating in detail whether in its collective judgment the candidate should or should not be promoted. The Committee's statement is then sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(6) With respect to each promotion dossier receiving a favorable endorsement by a majority vote of the Faculty Review Committee, the Dean enters his/her own evaluation of the candidate, forwards the dossier to the Dean of the Faculties Office of the Indianapolis campus, and notifies the Associate Dean, Indianapolis to indicate the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee to the candidate. The forwarding of the dossier and notification of the candidate are accomplished on or before the published deadline for dossier submission established by the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office forwards the dossier to the Indianapolis Tenure and Promotion Committee which, after review of the dossier, makes a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculties Office. The Dean of the Faculties Office then makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.

(7) Final approval of a promotion rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(8) With respect to each promotion dossier reviewed but not favorably endorsed by the Faculty Review Committee, the candidate is advised by the Dean and/or the Associate Dean,
Indianapolis of the absence of favorable endorsement by the Faculty Review Committee. The candidate then decides whether he/she wishes to withdraw his/her recommendation (for the current year) or to send it forward without the favorable endorsement of the Faculty Review Committee. If the latter, the Dean adds his/her personal evaluation to the dossier and forwards it to the Dean of the Faculties Office, Indianapolis.

(9) The total process is administered by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research whose task it is to see that relevant deadlines are publicized, adhered to, and that the dossiers are properly safeguarded.

GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PRETENURE REVIEWS

The criteria and procedures relevant to tenure recommendations are generally comparable to those relating to promotion and are consistent with the provisions in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and the Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement (see Table 1 for a summary of tenure procedures, Table 2 for pretenure procedures). The major consideration in the tenure decision is the potential of the candidate to continue to develop professionally.

In all cases, Indiana University tenure policy provides that tenure shall be campus-specific. A candidate with a Bloomington appointment, then, is granted tenure for the Bloomington campus. A candidate with an Indianapolis appointment or a joint (Indianapolis/Bloomington) appointment is granted tenure for the Indianapolis campus.

Criteria

Teaching, research (or other creative work), and service are used in evaluating tenure eligibility of faculty members in the Kelley School of Business. Additionally, attention is given to the compatibility of the candidate's professional interests with the anticipated long-term needs of the School. Also, consideration is given to the needs of the institution for the kinds of professional talents possessed or capable of being developed by the faculty member whose tenure prospects are being evaluated.

Finally, the criterion of collegiality is also brought into the tenure evaluation. Since many faculty members believe that the long-run effectiveness of a faculty depends in part on the working rapport among the professors who comprise it, collegiality becomes an additional criterion against which to develop tenure recommendations.

Procedures

The procedures through which progress toward tenure and tenure recommendations are made are described in this section. In summary, the procedures call for an annual review of performance up to the sixth year of service during which the final decision is made. A candidate may be considered for tenure prior to his or her sixth year of service. Such a decision should be made only with the full concurrence of the candidate, the relevant chairperson, and Associate
Dean of Faculty and Research. It would also be expected that the decision for "early" tenure would be with the strong support of the department tenure and promotion committee or formally constituted department faculty advisory committee. All candidates considering a petition for tenure prior to the sixth year must be aware of the potential critical consequences of such a decision. Simply stated, a person may be considered for tenure once, and once only. There are no exceptions. Should a candidate be unsuccessful in an early petition for tenure, no further petition can be considered in subsequent years. Instead, a faculty member who was not successful in the early petition will be terminated from the University. This outcome is, of course, not different for anyone who will have been denied tenure.

As with promotion, the general tenure and pretenure processes vary slightly as a function of the candidates' appointment-- Bloomington, Indianapolis, Joint (Indianapolis/Bloomington). Each is described in turn.

**Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Members with a Bloomington Appointment**

(1) Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to each department chairperson calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are nontenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Associate Dean's Office. All non-tenured faculty members are informed that the review is being undertaken and are notified of the procedures to be followed and the relevant deadlines. The deadline for tenure recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(2) For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted at the department level only. The review, conducted by the department tenure and promotion committee, includes the categories of research, teaching, and service. The department chairperson prepares a memorandum summarizing this review, provides a copy to the faculty member, and discusses the contents of the review with the faculty member. The department chairperson obtains the faculty member's signature as an indication of receipt of the copy. A faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. The memorandum is then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research where it is placed in the faculty member's pretenure file.

(3) In the third and fourth years of credit toward tenure, the procedure for department review of the candidate is identical to the preceding two years. At this point, however, a summary of the review along with supporting materials is sent forward through the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research for review by the Faculty Review Committee. These materials, along with the department's earlier pretenure memoranda, serve as the basis for the Committee's assessment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Committee will prepare a memorandum summarizing its review and distribute it to the faculty member, department chairperson, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. A copy is also retained in the faculty member's pretenure file. These reviews will be important inputs in determining whether the candidate will be reappointed during the pretenure period.
During the fifth year of progress toward tenure (the "dress rehearsal" year) a complete dossier is prepared by the candidate and his/her department chairperson. The dossier contains all pertinent tenure material except the solicited outside letters. During the sixth year a complete dossier, including letters solicited from outside Indiana University, is prepared and submitted. The chairperson is expected to consult with colleagues and include in the dossiers for the fifth and sixth years information about colleague reaction which may include letters or memoranda from such colleagues.

The procedure for soliciting outside letters for the formal tenure review is as follows. In the late Spring or early summer, the department chairpersons are asked to identify those faculty members who are to be considered for tenure in the following year. In addition, they are asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included. In order to ensure that there are at least six complete outside letters in the file, eight to ten names, with an associated “information sheet” should be submitted to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. Approximately half these names should be recommended by the candidate. In order to be sure that the return rate is high, department chairs are asked to contact potential reviewers in advance and not to submit their names unless they have agreed to write an evaluation.

It is critically important that chairs and candidates for tenure and promotion select reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate’s performance, have no past ties with the candidate or explicitly state what they are, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, and relationships with the candidate. Persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

The dossier, as described in previous sections, of each nontenured faculty in his/her third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service is reviewed by the same Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. This Committee evaluates each dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service).

Each year the Faculty Review Committee reviews each pretenure dossier submitted and prepares a written evaluation. Two copies of this evaluation are distributed to the respective department offices and the third to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. One department copy is returned to the chairperson's file, the other is delivered to the faculty member under review. This is usually accomplished early in the spring semester, the exact timing being dependent on the workload and schedule of the Faculty Review Committee.

With respect to each individual who is completing three or four years toward tenure, the department chairperson delivers and discusses with the individual the content of the written evaluation prepared by the Faculty Review Committee and also discusses the individual's plans for future contributions. The department chairperson may invite the Dean and/or Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to participate in the discussion. The discussion should be completed as
soon as practical after the receipt of the evaluation from the Faculty Review Committee but in no event later than the end of the spring semester.

(9) The department chairperson then signs the evaluation and secures the individual's signature on the form provided, attesting that the individual has seen and discussed the evaluation; such a signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the department files; a copy is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research places the signed copy in the faculty member's pretenure file, to be used by the Faculty Review Committee in subsequent pretenure reviews. Pretenure reviews should not be included in the tenure dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate.

(10) For individuals who are in their fifth year toward tenure, a "dress rehearsal" review will be made on the basis of dossier materials that the faculty member under review submits to the committee and materials submitted by the department. Department chairpersons should urge individuals in their fifth year to present to the Associate Dean's Office a complete dossier which the Faculty Review Committee may use in its deliberations. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and other materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person preparing the dossier. The memorandum prepared by the Faculty Review Committee should be used by the department chairperson to provide a basis for a candid discussion with the individual faculty member regarding his or her future promise within the School. As in the case of third and fourth year reviews, the chairperson and candidate both sign the memorandum on the attached form. Three copies of the memorandum should be prepared and distributed, one to the faculty member, one to the department chairperson's file, and one to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(11) For each individual completing the sixth year toward tenure, the Faculty Review Committee reviews the dossier prepared by the candidate and the department chairperson. Also included in the Committee assessment are the letters of evaluation from reviewers outside Indiana University. After this review the Committee makes a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. As in the case of promotion recommendations, the recommendation is by majority vote.

(12) The written recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee is presented along with the dossier to the Dean, who then adds in writing his/her own specific recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research notifies the department chairperson of the recommendation of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee and asks him/her to indicate the progress at that point to the tenure candidate. Notification occurs at or before the deadline for tenure dossier submission published by the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office.

(13) The full dossier is then forwarded to the Bloomington Dean of the Faculties Office, which forwards it to the Bloomington tenure committee. After reviewing the recommendation of the tenure committee, the Dean of the Faculties Office forwards its recommendation to the Provost.
Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

As with promotion recommendations, the tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

All notices of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty members are issued in strict conformity to the stipulations in the Academic Handbook and the Bloomington Academic Guide.

**Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with an Indianapolis Appointment**

1. Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are nontenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Associate Dean's Office. All non-tenured faculty members are informed that the review is being undertaken and are notified of the procedures to be followed and the relevant deadlines. The deadline for tenure recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

2. For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted by the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee only. The review includes the categories of research, teaching, and service. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis prepares a memorandum summarizing this review, provides a copy to the faculty member, and discusses the contents of the review with the faculty member. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis obtains the faculty member's signature as an indication of receipt of the copy. A faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. The memorandum is then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research where it is placed in the faculty member's pretenure file.

3. In the third and fourth years of credit toward tenure, the procedure for review by the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty of the candidate is identical to the preceding two years. At this point, however, a summary of the review along with supporting materials is sent forward through the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research for review by the Faculty Review Committee. These materials, along with the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Review Committee's earlier pretenure memoranda, serve as the basis for the Committee's assessment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Committee will prepare a memorandum summarizing its review and distribute it to the faculty member, department chairperson, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. A copy is also retained in the faculty member's pretenure file. These reviews will be important inputs in determining whether the candidate will be reappointed during the pretenure period.

4. During the fifth year of progress toward tenure (the "dress rehearsal" year) a complete dossier is prepared by the candidate and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. The dossier contains all pertinent tenure material except the solicited outside letters. During the sixth year a complete dossier, including letters solicited from outside Indiana University, is prepared and submitted.
The Associate Dean, Indianapolis is expected to consult with colleagues and include in the
dossiers for the fifth and sixth years information about colleague reaction which may include
letters or memoranda from such colleagues.

(5) The procedure for soliciting outside letters for the formal tenure review is as follows.
In the late Spring or early summer, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis is asked to identify those
faculty members who are to be considered for tenure in the following year. In addition, he or she
is asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to
write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate's dossier. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis
will also have invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included.

Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution,
relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside
reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation.
Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with
the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(6) The dossier, as described in previous sections, of each nontenured faculty in his/her
third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service is reviewed by the same Faculty Review Committee.
This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members
appointed by the Dean. This Committee evaluates each dossier with regard to the three criteria
(research, teaching, service).

(7) Each year the Faculty Review Committee reviews each pretenure dossier submitted
and prepares a written evaluation in three copies, with two copies to be distributed to the
Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the third to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. One
copy is returned to Associate Dean, Indianapolis' file, the other is delivered to the faculty
member under review. This is usually accomplished early in the spring semester, the exact
timing being dependent on the workload and schedule of the Faculty Review Committee.

(8) With respect to each individual who is completing three or four years toward tenure,
the Associate Dean, Indianapolis delivers and discusses with the individual the content of the
written evaluation prepared by the Faculty Review Committee and also discusses the individual's
plans for future accomplishments. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis may invite the Dean and/or
Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to participate in the discussion. The discussion should
be completed as soon as practical after the receipt of the evaluation from the Faculty Review
Committee but in no event later than the end of the spring semester.

(9) The Associate Dean, Indianapolis then signs the evaluation and secures the faculty
member's signature on the form provided, attesting to the fact that the individual has seen and
discussed the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the
Associate Dean, Indianapolis' files; and a copy is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and
Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research places the signed copy in the faculty
member's pretenure file, to be used by the Faculty Review Committee in subsequent pretenure
reviews. Pretenure reviews should not be included in the tenure dossier unless specifically
requested by the candidate.
(10) For individuals who are in their fifth year toward tenure, a "dress rehearsal" review will be made on the basis of dossier materials that the faculty member under review submits to the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee and materials submitted by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. The Associate Dean, Indianapolis should urge individuals in their fifth year to present a complete dossier which the Faculty Review Committee may use in its deliberations. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and other materials not known to or generally available to the person preparing the dossier. The memorandum prepared by the Faculty Review Committee should be used by the Associate Dean, Indianapolis to provide a basis for discussing with the individual faculty member his or her prospective position within the School. As in the case of third and fourth year reviews, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis and the candidate both sign the memorandum on the attached form. Three copies of the memorandum should be prepared. The distribution of these memoranda is as follows: one to the faculty member, one to the Associate Dean, Indianapolis' file, and one to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(11) For each individual completing the sixth year toward tenure, the Faculty Review Committee reviews the dossier prepared by the candidate and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis. Also included in the Committee assessment are the letters of evaluation from reviewers outside Indiana University. After this review the Committee makes a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. As in the case of promotion recommendations, the recommendation is by majority vote.

(12) The written recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee is presented along with the dossier to the Dean, who then adds in writing his/her own specific recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research notifies the Associate Dean, Indianapolis of the recommendation of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee and asks him/her to indicate the progress at that point to the candidate for tenure. Notification occurs at or before the deadline for tenure dossier submission published by the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office.

(13) The full dossier is then forwarded to the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office, which forwards it to the Indianapolis tenure and promotion committee. After reviewing the recommendation of the tenure committee, the Dean of the Faculties Office forwards its recommendation to the Chancellor.

(14) Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(15) As with promotion recommendations, the tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis.

(16) All notices of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty members are issued in strict conformity to the stipulations in the Academic Handbook and the Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement.
Tenure and Pretenure Reviews: Faculty Member with a Joint Appointment (Indianapolis/Bloomington)

(1) Prior to the beginning of the fall semester a notice is sent from the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to each department chairperson calling attention to the review process for all faculty members who are nontenured, and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Associate Dean's Office. All non-tenured faculty members are informed that the review is being undertaken and are notified of the procedures to be followed and the relevant deadlines. The deadline for tenure recommendations is also listed in the School calendar distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the academic year.

(2) For the first two years of the faculty member's tenure probationary period, the annual review is conducted by the department and the Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee only. These reviews include the categories of research, teaching, and service. The department chairperson and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis prepare memoranda summarizing these reviews, copies of which are provided to the faculty member. The department chairperson and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis discuss the respective contents of these reviews with the faculty member. The department chairperson and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis obtain the faculty member's signature on these reviews as an indication of receipt of the copies. A faculty member's signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with these evaluations. The memoranda are then forwarded to the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research where they are placed in the faculty member's pretenure file.

(3) In the third and fourth years of credit toward tenure, the procedure for department and Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee review of the candidate is identical to the preceding two years. At this point, however, a summary of these reviews along with supporting materials is sent forward through the office of the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research for initial review by the Faculty Review Committee. These materials, along with the department's and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis' earlier pretenure memoranda, serve as the basis for the Committee's assessment in the areas of research, teaching, and service. The Committee will prepare a memorandum summarizing its review and distribute it to the faculty member, department chairperson, the Associate Dean, Indianapolis, and the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. A copy is also retained in the faculty member's pretenure file. These reviews will be important inputs in determining whether the candidate will be reappointed during the pretenure period.

(4) During the fifth year of progress toward tenure (the "dress rehearsal" year) a complete dossier is prepared by the candidate and his/her department chairperson. The dossier contains all pertinent tenure material except the solicited outside letters. During the sixth year a complete dossier, including letters solicited from outside Indiana University, is prepared and submitted. The chairperson is expected to consult with colleagues and include in the dossiers for the fifth and sixth years information about colleague reaction which may include letters or memoranda from such colleagues.

(5) The procedure for soliciting outside letters for the formal tenure review is as follows. In the late Spring or early summer, the department chairpersons are asked to identify those
faculty members who are to be considered for tenure in the following year. In addition, they are asked to forward the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who will be asked to write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate's dossier. The chairperson will have also invited the candidate to submit names that he/she would like to have included. In order to ensure that there are at least six complete outside letters in the file, eight to ten names, with an associated “information sheet” should be submitted to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

It is critically important that chairs and candidates for tenure and promotion select reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate’s performance, have no past ties with the candidate or explicitly state what they are, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. Criteria for selection of a reviewer include outside reviewers' rank, their institution, relationships with the candidate, and rationale for seeking their input. The credibility of outside reviewers is rightly conditioned by their objectivity and capacity for dispassionate evaluation. Accordingly, persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or are coauthors with the candidate, for example, would generally be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

(6) The dossier, as described in previous sections, of each nontenured faculty in his/her third, fourth, fifth, or sixth year of service is reviewed by the same Faculty Review Committee. This is a public committee consisting of six tenured Kelley School of Business faculty members appointed by the Dean. This Committee evaluates each dossier with regard to the three criteria (research, teaching, service).

(7) Each year the Faculty Review Committee reviews each pretenure dossier submitted and prepares a written evaluation. Two copies of this evaluation are distributed to the respective department offices and the third to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. One department copy is returned to the chairperson's file, the other is delivered to the faculty member under review. This is usually accomplished early in the spring semester, the exact timing being dependent on the workload and schedule of the Faculty Review Committee.

(8) With respect to each individual who is completing three or four years toward tenure, the department chairperson delivers and discusses with the individual the content of the written evaluation prepared by the Faculty Review Committee and also discusses the individual's plans for future contributions. The department chairperson may invite the Dean and/or Associate Dean of Faculty and Research to participate in the discussion. The discussion should be completed as soon as practical after the receipt of the evaluation from the Faculty Review Committee but in no event later than the end of the spring semester.

(9) The department chairperson then signs the evaluation and secures the individual's signature on the form provided on the back of the evaluation, attesting that the individual has seen and discussed the evaluation; such a signature does not necessarily indicate concurrence with the evaluation. A copy is given to the faculty member; a copy is retained in the department files; a copy is sent to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research places the signed copy in the faculty member's pretenure file, to be used by
the Faculty Review Committee in subsequent pretenure reviews. Pretenure reviews should not be included in the tenure dossier unless specifically requested by the candidate.

(10) For individuals who are in their fifth year toward tenure, a "dress rehearsal" review will be made on the basis of dossier materials that the faculty member under review submits to the committee and materials submitted by the department. Department chairpersons should urge individuals in their fifth year to present to the Associate Dean's Office a complete dossier which the Faculty Review Committee may use in its deliberations. It is particularly important for the candidate to provide dossier materials from his/her private files in the area of teaching evaluations and other materials not known to or generally unavailable to the person preparing the dossier. The memorandum prepared by the Faculty Review Committee should be used by the department chairperson to provide a basis for a candid discussion with the individual faculty member regarding his or her future promise within the School. As in the case of third and fourth year reviews, the chairperson and candidate both sign the memorandum on the attached form. Three copies of the memorandum should be prepared and distributed, one to the faculty member, one to the department chairperson's file, and one to the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research.

(11) For each individual completing the sixth year toward tenure, the Faculty Review Committee reviews the dossier prepared by the candidate and the department chairperson. Also included in the Committee assessment are the letters of evaluation from outside Indiana University. After this review the Committee makes a written recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. As in the case of promotion recommendations, the recommendation is by majority vote.

(12) The written recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee is presented along with the dossier to the Dean, who then adds in writing his/her own specific recommendation that tenure be granted or denied. The Associate Dean of Faculty and Research notifies the department chairperson of the recommendation of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee and asks him/her to indicate the progress at that point to the tenure candidate. Notification occurs at or before the deadline for tenure dossier submission published by the appropriate Dean of the Faculties Office.

(13) The full dossier is then forwarded to the Indianapolis Dean of the Faculties Office, which forwards it to the campus promotion and tenure committee. After reviewing the recommendation of the tenure committee, the Dean of the Faculties Office forwards its recommendation to the Chancellor.

(14) Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and the Board of Trustees.

(15) As with promotion recommendations, the tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Associate Dean of Faculty and Research and the Associate Dean, Indianapolis.
(16) All notices of nonreappointment of nontenured faculty members are issued in strict conformity to the stipulations in the Academic Handbook, Bloomington Academic Guide, and the Indiana University/Purdue University Academic Handbook Supplement.
# Table 1: Summary of Promotion and Tenure Procedures

## PROMOTION & TENURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Appointment</th>
<th>Bloomington</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
<th>Joint Indianapolis/Bloomington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside Letter Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>List of potential outside reviewers prepared by the department chairperson.</td>
<td>List of potential outside reviewers prepared by Associate Dean, Indianapolis with the cooperation of the Bloomington department chairperson.</td>
<td>List of potential outside reviewers prepared by the department chairperson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate also provides list of potential outside reviewers.</td>
<td>Candidate also provides list of potential outside reviewers.</td>
<td>Candidate also provides list of potential outside reviewers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solicitation of Outside Letters</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean of Faculty and Research selects outside reviewers from the lists and solicits evaluations, in writing, from each designated outside reviewer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Advising and Responsibility for Dossier Preparation</strong></td>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td>Associate Dean, Indianapolis</td>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dossier Evaluation (Department level)</strong></td>
<td>(1) Department promotion and tenure committee; (2) department chairperson</td>
<td>(1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee; (2) Associate Dean, Indianapolis</td>
<td>(1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee; (2) Associate Dean, Indianapolis; (3) Department promotion and tenure committee; (4) department chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dossier Evaluation (School level)</strong></td>
<td>(1) Faculty Review Committee; (2) Dean</td>
<td>(1) Faculty Review Committee; (2) Dean</td>
<td>(1) Faculty Review Committee; (2) Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dossier Evaluation (Campus Level)</strong></td>
<td>(1) Bloomington Tenure and/or Promotion Committee; (2) Bloomington Dean of Faculties; (3) Provost</td>
<td>(1) Indianapolis Tenure &amp; Promotion Committee; (2) Indianapolis Dean of Faculties; (3) Chancellor</td>
<td>(1) Indianapolis Promotion and Tenure Committee; (2) Indianapolis Dean of Faculties; (3) Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) President; (2) Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of Pretenure Evaluation Process

**PRETENURE EVALUATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years on Tenure 'Clock'</th>
<th>Bloomington</th>
<th>Indianapolis</th>
<th>Joint Indianapolis/Bloomington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year 2nd Year</td>
<td>Review by department promotion and tenure committee</td>
<td>Review by Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and (2) department promotion and tenure committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year 4th Year</td>
<td>Review by (1) department promotion and tenure committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee</td>
<td>Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee</td>
<td>Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, (2) department promotion and tenure committee, and (3) Faculty Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Year 'Dress Rehearsal'</td>
<td>Review by (1) department promotion and tenure committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee</td>
<td>Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, and (2) Faculty Review Committee</td>
<td>Review by (1) Indianapolis Integrated Faculty Advisory Committee, (2) department promotion and tenure committee, and (3) Faculty Review Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This document refers to many IU and IUPUI Policies / Guidelines, which affect clinical faculty and which are frequently updated, and therefore, the document provides guidance for clinical faculty. Clinical faculty should make sure that they have the most current versions of the documents.

Various Indiana University (IU) policies refer to clinical faculty. For example,

- The prefix “Clinical” is used for appointees whose primary duties are teaching students and residents/fellows and providing professional service in the clinical setting. Titles: Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, Assistant Clinical Professor; or Clinical Senior Lecturer and Clinical Lecturer. (IU Policy ACA-14)

- Clinical faculty may be involved in research that derives from their primary assignment in clinical teaching and professional service; however, continued appointment and advancement in rank must be based on performance in teaching and service. ... Clinical faculty may contribute to the research efforts of a unit through their clinical work, but they are not expected to do individual research. (IU Policy ACA-18, Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments).

Business is an applied discipline. The Kelley School of Business strongly believes that clinical faculty contribute to the learning environment in the School through teaching, service, scholarly activity, mentoring, and contacts with businesses, governments, professional societies, and other organizations.

**Discussion of the Terms Research, Creative Activity, and Scholarly Activity**

Appendix 2 includes a discussion of the terms research, creative activity, and scholarly activity. These terms are used in various IU Policies and IUPUI P&T standards. These terms include requirements for dissemination of scholarship, including peer-reviewed scholarship. Clinical faculty will need to consult with Kelley Indianapolis Executive Dean about appropriate scholarly activities.

---

2 The Academic Handbook has been replaced with IU Policies. [https://policies.iu.edu](https://policies.iu.edu) / [https://policies.iu.edu/categories/academic-faculty-students.html](https://policies.iu.edu/categories/academic-faculty-students.html)
activity documentation for annual reviews and promotion. Appendix 3 provides a scholarship matrix that provides examples of various types of scholarship which should assist clinical faculty.

**Difference in IU Bloomington and IUPUI Campus Clinical Faculty Promotion Requirements**

While both IUB and IUPUI (effective for 2018-19) provide that a clinical faculty member can be promoted as a balanced case (highly satisfactory in both teaching and service), IUPUI P&T policies have an explicit requirement for peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching and service for a successful balanced case. Similarly, to be considered excellent in teaching or service, the faculty member must have peer-reviewed scholarship to support that area, either scholarship of teaching or scholarship of service. 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, pedagogical work, conference presentations, blogs, etc. (See Appendix 3 for examples.) Accordingly, clinical faculty will need to meet the campus-specific requirements for promotion.

**DISCUSSION OF CLINICAL FACULTY POLICIES**

I. RESPONSIBILITIES

Clinical faculty members are required to contribute in the areas of teaching and service, but not research. Normally they should excel in either teaching or service, and be at least satisfactory in the other area. Additionally, on both the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths across both teaching and service that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.

The standard teaching load for clinical faculty is 18 credit hours, or the equivalent, per academic year. In addition, clinical faculty are expected to contribute to the service mission of the Kelley School of Business. Although research is not included as a basic responsibility of clinical faculty,

---

3 This draft reflects the IUPUI Approved Balanced Case for promotion for Clinical Faculty in 2018-19. [https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/PTGuidelinesCLEANfuture.pdf](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/PTGuidelinesCLEANfuture.pdf)

4 Balanced case: In some circumstances, faculty may present a record of highly satisfactory performance across all areas sufficient to demonstrate comparable long-term benefits to the University. If so, tenure-track faculty have the option of presenting a balanced case dossier across all three areas of endeavor (teaching, research, service) while clinical-track faculty have the option of presenting a balanced case across two areas of endeavor (teaching, service). It is understood that peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving a highly-satisfactory rating in each area of performance in a balanced case. However, the promotion and/or tenure standards in many departments/units encourage the choosing of one area of excellence. Faculty should be aware of the requirements of their department/unit. (pp. 29-30, 2018-19 IUPUI P&T Guidelines). Note that for a balanced case, IUPUI clinical faculty must demonstrate scholarly activity in both teaching and service.
scholarship related to the faculty member’s teaching and/or service in an academic setting will be considered as evidence of teaching or service excellence, and other types of scholarship may be considered as evidence of intellectual engagement in the professional field that is indicative of long-term intellectual contributions valuable in classroom settings (see Appendix 2 and 3 for further discussion).

Both undergraduate and graduate students at the Kelley School of Business are routinely involved in outreach activities in the business community. Accordingly, clinical 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. Clinical faculty may hold all administrative positions in the Kelley School of Business, except appointments where they would be involved in making tenure, promotion, or faculty hiring decisions involving tenure-related positions.

II. APPOINTMENT

In order to be designated as a clinical faculty member, a person generally will be expected to have the following characteristics: extensive business or government experience; contacts with businesses, individuals, and other organizations that will contribute to the learning environment, internships, and placement of students within the Kelley School of Business; exceptional classroom potential; and an ability to work with students in one-to-one and small group settings. In addition, clinical faculty generally will be expected to hold a terminal degree (PhD or JD), although this requirement may be waived when a person’s other qualifications are particularly strong. Clinical faculty also must initially meet (and maintain) faculty qualification standards, as defined jointly by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, the Higher Learning Commission, and the Kelley School of Business. Appointment to the rank of clinical faculty is not a natural progression for individuals holding lecturer or senior lecturer status.

Clinical faculty can be appointed at the assistant, associate, or full levels. Pursuant to Indiana University policy: Initial clinical appointments should be at the level appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual. The process of appointment with probationary status or appointment with long-term contract shall go through the ordinary procedures for faculty appointments. (IU Policy ACA-18). Hiring votes for clinical faculty positions at the department level should include both tenure-track and clinical faculty.

A. Probationary Period

Depending on their experience, clinical faculty generally will be hired for an initial three-year contract and will be on probationary status for a maximum period of six years. Clinical faculty appointments during this probationary period shall be governed by the same policies and procedures with regard to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during their probationary period; however, clinical faculty shall not be evaluated on research or research-related activities. On the IUPUI campus, the clinical faculty member will be evaluated on scholarship of teaching or scholarship of service related to the
faculty member’s declared area of excellence. *Clinical faculty 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.* (IU Policy ACA-18).

During the probationary period, clinical faculty should receive annual written evaluations from their department chair or equivalent supervisor. *Clinical faculty 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.* (IU Policy ACA-21) To ensure that courses are being taught in a competent manner by qualified individuals, this evaluation should employ the customary measures of classroom effectiveness. In general, the evaluation should be based on the instructor’s teaching contributions, as well as a review of service contributions. At a minimum, the teaching evaluation should include results on student evaluation forms. It may also include: course development; peer evaluations of teaching; grading standards; instructional leadership; participation in various training programs; scholarship related to teaching; grants; and any other examples of pedagogical training and improvement that are deemed appropriate. The evaluation of service should consider contributions in areas such as: leadership in the development, design, and management of academic programs; administrative assignments; fostering contacts with the business community; recruiting activities; coordination of multi-section courses; working with student groups; scholarship related to service; grants; significant service to the university, profession, or community, etc.

B. Post-Probationary Period

IU policies provide for a long-term contract for clinical faculty in the post-probationary period.

*Clinical appointees are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as clinical faculty shall be given long-term contracts after a probationary period of not more than seven years. The exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the dean and the faculty governance body within each school using clinical appointments and be approved by the chancellor/provost, but the mechanism should be a long-term contract of not less than five years or be some equivalent, such as a rolling three year contract. The criteria for granting long-term contracts after a probationary period shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that clinical faculty shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts or their equivalent.* (IU Policy ACA-18).

The review process for clinical faculty to move from the probationary period to the post-probationary period should follow the normal faculty procedures used in the Kelley School of Business for tenure-track faculty with the exception that for clinical faculty research activities or productivity will not be a criterion. However, scholarship related to teaching and service will be
considered. Thus, before any decision is made within the department or School, the clinical faculty member should be notified that he or she is under such consideration and that within a reasonable period of time, such as four to six weeks, he or she should prepare a dossier for review.

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, other measures of teaching effectiveness and innovation and service contributions. Indianapolis faculty should also include evidence related to the scholarship of teaching and/or service. Because the clinical appointments primarily are related to teaching and service, the dossier should clearly demonstrate the faculty member’s participation in School and campus 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 clinical faculty member describing his or her philosophy of teaching and service contributions.

These dossier materials then will be reviewed by the tenure-track and clinical faculty members of comparable rank in the candidate’s department, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor, and the Faculty Review Committee, who will provide a recommendation to the Dean of the Kelley School of Business as to whether the candidate should be appointed to a multi-year contract. A multi-year contract is typically for five years. If the decision is for non-reappointment, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year. Because of the difference in the requirements for the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses for Clinical promotion, the Executive Associate Dean Faculty and Research on the IUPUI campus will appoint a separate Clinical Faculty Review Committee to review the promotion materials of Clinical Faculty on the Indianapolis campus.

Prior to the last year of any post-probationary term of appointment, the department chair or equivalent supervisor will evaluate the clinical faculty member’s performance and make a recommendation to the Dean regarding whether the clinical faculty member should be reappointed for another multiyear contract. Reappointment should not occur for clinical faculty who do not demonstrate excellence in teaching or service on either the Bloomington or Indianapolis campuses, or a balanced case of highly satisfactory performance in both teaching and service activities. If the decision is for non-reappointment, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year.

Dismissal of clinical faculty after the probationary policy is addressed in IU Policy ACA 18. 

After the probationary period, dismissal of a clinical faculty member holding a longer term contract which has not expired may occur because of closure or permanent downsizing of the program in which the faculty member teaches and serves; otherwise, dismissal of such clinical faculty shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, or financial exigency. Non-reappointment of clinical faculty to a new contract term may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the clinical
program. Non-reappointment decisions regarding clinical faculty holding a long-term contract after the probationary period must be made with faculty consultation through processes established by the school’s faculty governance institutions. The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance institutions includes cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of clinical faculty.

C. Promotion

Promotion should go through the normal faculty procedures used in the Kelley School of Business for tenure-track faculty with the exception that for clinical faculty, research activities or research productivity will not be a criterion (however, scholarly activity will be used at IUPUI and may be used at IUB to support the case). The candidate will be reviewed by the tenure-track and clinical faculty members of comparable rank in the candidate’s department, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor, and the Faculty Review Committee, which will provide a recommendation to the Dean of the Kelley School of Business. Clinical faculty may be awarded promotion on the basis of a teaching, service, or balanced case on both the Bloomington and IUPUI campuses. For Indianapolis faculty, scholarship related to teaching and scholarship related to service is required to be considered for determining excellence, and scholarship in both teaching and service is required to support a balanced case.

Before any decision is made within the department or School, the clinical faculty member should be notified that he or she is under such consideration and that within a reasonable period of time, such as four to six weeks, he or she may submit materials relevant to such consideration for review by the appropriate department or area supervisor (IU ACA-22). Promotion requires the preparation of a dossier. The documentation in a dossier for promotion within the clinical ranks is similar, but not identical, to the documentation presented in the teaching and service sections of dossiers of tenure-track faculty. For IUPUI, dossier preparation is discussed in the most current IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guideline. Letters from external reviewers will be solicited for clinical faculty members seeking promotion.

Criteria for Promotion (IU Policy ACA-38)

Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion criteria. Promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual’s contribution to the school/campus mission. The relative weight attached to the criteria above should and must vary accordingly. A candidate for promotion [or tenure] should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be at least satisfactory (research/creative activity; service) or effective (teaching) in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university. In all cases the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is a

---

5 Note that while research is not a category in which clinical faculty are rated, in accordance with Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) policy, research activity may be used to meet criteria for teaching and service.
recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater
responsibilities and accomplishments.

If the decision is not to promote the faculty member and move to a post-probationary period, IU
Policy ACA-22 describes the notice requirement and the process to review the non-reappointment
decision.

III. ANNUAL REVIEW

IU Policy ACA-21 describes the policy of annual review, and IU Policy ACA-25 describes the
requirement for faculty to prepare an annual report. Clinical faculty should receive annual written
evaluations from their principal administrator (IU ACA-21). In general, the evaluation should be
based on teaching contributions, as well as a review of service contributions. The teaching
evaluation should be based upon consideration of: student and/or peer evaluations of teaching;
course development efforts; the creation of cases and other original teaching materials;
instructional leadership; participation in various training programs; scholarship related to teaching;
and any other examples of pedagogical training and improvement that are deemed appropriate.
The evaluation of service should be based upon contributions in the following areas: leadership in
the development, design and management of academic programs; administrative assignments;
fostering contacts with the business community; recruiting activities; coordination of multi-section
courses; working with student groups; significant service to the university, profession, or
community; scholarship related to service; etc. Reappointment of probationary clinical faculty
should be predicated on satisfactory performance on these annual evaluations.

In addition to their teaching and service contributions at Kelley Indianapolis, full-time Clinical
faculty with terminal degrees (e.g., PhD, JD) are expected to achieve Scholarly Academic (SA)
status, [as defined jointly by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
(AACSB)\(^6\) and the Kelley School of Business], as quickly as possible after their initial
appointment.\(^7\) The basis for qualification is described in the Indiana University Kelley School
of Business Policy on Faculty Qualifications. Progress toward SA, PA, SP, or IP qualification
will be taken into consideration by department chairpersons or equivalent supervisors when
determining contract renewals following the initial contract, for annual performance reviews,
and for annual salary decisions.

\(^6\) 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.

\(^7\) To achieve SA or PA status a faculty member must have a terminal degree (e.g., Ph.D. or JD).
Faculty without a Ph.D. or JD, may be considered for SP or IP.
APPENDIX 1. IUPUI Campus and IU Policies:

Selected Specific Policies:
- University Policy ACA 12: General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments
- University Policy ACA-14: Classification of Academic Appointments
- University Policy ACA-18: Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments
- University Policy ACA-21: Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews
- University Policy ACA-22: Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period.
- University Policy ACA-25: Annual Reports for Faculty and Librarians
- IUPUI Faculty Guide (Updated July 1, 2016): See pages 13 (Faculty Membership on the IFC), 28 (Bylaw Article IV.A.1 – Faculty Grievances), 63 (Classification – who can be an associate dean?), and 86 (Emeritus Policy)
- IU Faculty Work: This is a policy that governs all faculty and describes how they are to work.
- IUPUI 2018-19 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines: Clinical Faculty should refer to the most recent P&T Guidelines when considering promotion.
  https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/PTGuidelinesCLEANfuture.pdf

Related Policies:
- University Policy ACA-12: General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments (This policy refers to clinical appointments, but isn’t specifically about them.)
- University Policy ACA-33: Code of Academic Ethics (Clinical appointments must adhere to this policy as well.)
APPENDIX 2. DISCUSSION OF TERMS RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY, SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY

The following statement in the 2018-19 IUPUI P&T standards pertains to clinical faculty.

Clinical faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching or service and satisfactory in the other area. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence.

The question for clinical faculty is what constitutes scholarship. Scholarship is not defined in IU Policies or in the IUPUI P&T document. However, in the P&T document, the guidelines provide descriptions of areas of excellence and expectations for various faculty categories. For example, for promotion to tenure-track associate / full professor, the standard for excellence is stated as:

Associate: Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. Emerging national reputation.
Full: Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. (p.36).

Note that research is not mentioned, but peer reviewed scholarship is mentioned.

For promotion to clinical associate or full professor, the standard of excellence is stated as:

Associate: Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence.
Full: Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered. (37)

Research is not mentioned, but peer reviewed scholarship is mentioned.

Documentation of research and scholarly activity is discussed 2018-19 IUPUI P&T standards (41-42), and suggested standards for evaluating research and scholarly activity are discussed (43).
APPENDIX 3. Clinical Faculty Promotion and Scholarship Matrix, Kelley School of Business Indianapolis

This appendix contains excerpts from the latest IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines (2018-2019), and a Scholarship Matrix provides examples of types of scholarly activity.

IUPUI 2018-19 Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Provide the Expectations Related to Promotion.

*Clinical faculty are required to be excellent in either teaching or service and satisfactory in the other area. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence.* (p. 30)

To be considered excellent in teaching or service on the IUPUI campus, the faculty member must have *peer-reviewed scholarship* to support that area, either scholarship of teaching or scholarship of service. Beginning in 2018-19, the IUPUI 2018-19 P&T Guidelines provide for an IUPUI clinical faculty to be considered on a balanced case. To support a balanced case, the faculty member will need peer-reviewed scholarship in both teaching and service areas.

Standard for Excellence (over and above a record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work) (p. 37).

- Advancement to Clinical Associate Professor: *record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship* in area of excellence.
- Advancement to Clinical Professor: *record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship* in area of excellence.

*In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate’s work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination. Candidates and department chairs (or deans) may wish to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may better fit with standards in the field.* (p. 19)
This following **Scholarship Matrix** is offered as a comprehensive, but not exhaustive list of scholarship exemplars from the schools that have clinical track faculty. Examples of types of activities are shown in Bold below. These categories are not intended to be a check list but rather to show types of activities that reflect scholarship of teaching or service. As noted in the previous sections, peer-reviewed scholarship is required for clinical promotion at IUPUI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Representative Clinical Faculty Scholarship Related To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Dissemination 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, clinical faculty are expected to focus on a broader range of activities including presentations, publications in both peer and non-peer reviewed journals, professional publications, books, book chapters, cases, grants, cases, and service learning. The different ways in which clinical faculty may choose to engage in the dissemination of their scholarship are described below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations – Clinical faculty members will make presentations related to pedagogical techniques or application of discipline specific material related to the faculty members teaching. Clinical faculty members engage largely in departmental seminars and local/regional/national conferences. These may include invited presentations by companies, colleges, or professional organizations. Some presentations may be made at national and international conferences.</td>
<td>Presentations – Clinical faculty members will make presentations related to their service through participation in a center, colleges, non-profit or industry. Clinical faculty members engage largely in departmental seminars and local/regional/national conferences. These may include invited presentations by companies, colleges, or professional organizations. Some presentations may be made at national and international conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications – The expectation is that IUPUI clinical faculty members will engage in scholarly activity and disseminate evidence of that activity, and some of the scholarly activity will lead to publications. Because the teaching load and service engagement load for clinical faculty are higher than tenure-track faculty, the numbers of publications should be fewer than that expected for tenure-probationary faculty, and a wider array of outlets should be considered. In each case, evidence of greater readership or audience dissemination will be</td>
<td>Publications – The expectation is that IUPUI clinical faculty members will engage in scholarly activity and disseminate evidence of that activity, and some of the scholarly activity will lead to publications. Because the teaching load and service engagement load for clinical faculty are higher than tenure-track faculty, the numbers of publications should be fewer than that expected for tenure-probationary faculty, and a wider array of outlets should be considered. In each case, evidence of greater readership or audience dissemination will be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
- Cases related to the discipline taught by the faculty member. Cases may be on local companies, provided primarily to our students or to national audiences.
- Textbooks or other books related to the discipline
- Chapters of textbooks or other books related to the discipline
- Faculty may prepare pedagogical materials used as ancillaries to textbooks or as journal publications.
- 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. While quotes are examples of excellent service, for publication the primary writer should be the faculty member.
- Web pages or other electronic aids to facilitate learning and instructional techniques.
- Assessments of effects pedagogy on students’ knowledge and skills disseminated in conference papers or other venues.
- Other materials reflecting scholarly activity

The more a clinical faculty member can document how others use the materials, the stronger the argument for impact. Evidence of impact should focus on breadth, thematic and coherent content, and be related to professional goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>viewed favorably; however, this emphasis should not discourage specialization. Publications may include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Journal articles (peer or non-peer reviewed) related to their service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reports and grants related to their service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contributions to local and national news media outlets. While quotes are examples of excellent service, for publication the primary writer should be the faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Web pages or other electronic aids to facilitate service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Service contributions to the academy in the faculty member’s area that are evidenced by reports or other written dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contributions to the unit and IUPUI that are evidenced by reports or other written dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The more a clinical faculty member can document how others use the materials, the stronger the argument for impact. Evidence of impact should focus on breadth, thematic and coherent content, and be related to professional goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Obtaining Grants Related to Teaching Activities.</strong> Competitive grants that support teaching activities can be seen as scholarship because the applications are often subject to peer-review. These are even more powerful when the grant supports the clinical faculty member to study and disseminate what is learned from the grant activity.</th>
<th><strong>Obtaining Grants Related to Service Activities.</strong> Competitive grants that support service activities can be seen as scholarship because the applications are often subject to peer-review. These are even more powerful when the grant supports the clinical faculty member to study and disseminate what is learned from the grant activity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshops.</strong> Being asked to facilitate and organize in-service workshops with other academics or professionals 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. Workshops can be internal to the School, internal to the campus, or external to the campus.</td>
<td><strong>Workshops.</strong> Being asked to facilitate and organize in-service workshops with other academics or professionals can be viewed as scholarship because this is public dissemination of techniques or discipline specific material. Workshops can be internal to the School, internal to the campus, or external to the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Learning</strong> engages local businesses and non-profit organizations, disseminates teaching techniques, and engages the community in the educational process, while promoting students for future employment in the community, and documentation of impact can be viewed as public dissemination.</td>
<td><strong>Service Learning</strong> engages local businesses and non-profit organizations, disseminating services and engaging the community in the educational process, while promoting students for future employment in the community, and documentation of impact can be viewed as public dissemination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials</strong> that are innovative and used beyond campus: videos, CDs, modules with reviews or data that demonstrate impact can be viewed as public dissemination.</td>
<td><strong>Materials</strong> that are innovative and used beyond campus: videos, CDs, modules with reviews or data that demonstrate impact can be viewed as public dissemination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serving on Boards.</strong> Being asked to serve on boards of businesses or non-profits can be viewed public dissemination of techniques or discipline specific material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running or Establishing Programs for the University or Professional Organizations</td>
<td>engages university administration, faculty, and practitioners in service and engages the community in the educational process. Presentations and reports on establishing or changing programs disseminates the concepts locally and perhaps regionally and nationally as other programs may adopt or follow the practices of our new programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion from Assistant to Associate and Promotion from Associate to Full</strong></td>
<td>No quantitative guidelines are used in total or in any one category. The faculty member should demonstrate how the scholarship of teaching reflects and supports the teaching mission. The faculty member should provide evidence of excellence and impact. For promotion from Associate to Full, the faculty member should demonstrate a significant additional contribution since being promoted to Associate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion from Assistant to Associate and Promotion from Associate to Full</strong></td>
<td>No quantitative guidelines are used in total or in any one category. The faculty member should demonstrate how the scholarship of teaching reflects and supports the teaching mission. The faculty member should provide evidence of excellence and impact. For promotion from Associate to Full, the faculty member should demonstrate a significant additional contribution since being promoted to Associate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy 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. See Appendix 3 for specific differences in policies/procedures between the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses regarding Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Teaching Professors.

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 (except for clinical appointees, Professor of Practice appointees, and except in instances where adjunct appointments are appropriate . . . .). Titles: Teaching Professor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer.” Classification of Academic Appointments (University Policy ACA-14)\(^1\)

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.\(^2\)

Business is an applied discipline. The Kelley School of Business strongly believes that Lecturer/Senior

\(^1\) IU Policies are found at: [https://policies.iu.edu/](https://policies.iu.edu/) and [https://policies.iu.edu/categories/academic-faculty-students.html](https://policies.iu.edu/categories/academic-faculty-students.html)

\(^2\) 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.
Lecturer/Teaching Professor faculty contribute to the learning environment in the School through teaching, service, scholarly activity, mentoring, and contacts with businesses, governments, professional societies, and other organizations.

I. LECTURERS

A. Responsibilities

Lecturers 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. Often these teaching responsibilities will be focused on introductory-level undergraduate courses. However, when their degrees, credentials, or experience so warrant and when department chairpersons or equivalent supervisors so recommend, Lecturers may teach advanced courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels. 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.

In addition to their contributions to the teaching mission of the Kelley School and the University, Lecturers 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.) Pursuant to Indiana University policy, however, “Lecturers/Teaching Professors are not eligible for academic administrative appointments at and above the department chair level.” Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments (University Policy ACA-18).

B. Appointment to Rank of Lecturer

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.3

3 Under Kelley School policy, hiring of a Lecturer 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
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.

1. Appointments During the Probationary Period

When Lecturers 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 Lecturer’s sixth year in the Lecturer rank. (Further information on non-probationary long-term appointments and promotions to Senior Lecturer appears later in this section and in the Senior Lecturer section of this document.)

Continued strong performance by the Lecturer 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 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 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.

2. “Visiting” Appointment

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.

4 The full probationary period, therefore, is the period between the initial appointment as a Lecturer and the awarding of a long-term 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.

C. **Dismissal within the Probationary Period**

1. **Non-Reappointment**

   Following the period of the initial appointment, the Kelley School of Business or the relevant department may decide to exercise its 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.”

As further explained in University Policy ACA 52:5

   “For lecturers, faculty members, and librarians on full-time appointments, notice of non-reappointment shall be given in writing in accordance with the following standards:

   1. Not later than February 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
   2. Not later than November 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year

---

5 At the time this statement was drafted, ACA-52 had not been revised to use the reference to lecturers/teaching professors.
appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
3. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.”

2. **Discharge for Cause:**

As explained in *University Policy ACA 52* “Dismissal shall mean the involuntary termination of a tenured faculty member’s or librarian’s appointment prior to retirement or resignation, or the termination of the appointment of a non tenured faculty member or librarian prior to the expiration of the term of appointment. Dismissal is thus to be distinguished from the non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member. Dismissal shall occur only for reason of (a) incompetence, (b) serious personal or professional misconduct, or (c) extraordinary financial exigencies of the University.”

D. **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 performances in teaching and service will be carefully considered when decisions are made on reappointments during the probationary period and at later stages of the review process.

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. 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.

---

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 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 are evaluated for reappointment.

7 See this document’s Section II(C) (Promotion to Senior Lecturer).
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 include the following.\(^8\)

- Student evaluation scores and comments
- Peer observations/evaluations of teaching
- Letters received from students (particularly unsolicited)
- Teaching awards and other teaching recognition received
- Leadership of or participation in the development of School or departmental instructional goals and objectives
- Participation in curriculum development and innovation
- Development of new course materials for use in an instructor’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
- Participation in teaching and learning development activities at the School, University, or peer professional group level
- 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
- Evidence of service in support of teaching (see further discussion below)
- Mentoring of students
- 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.

\(^8\) 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.
- Maintenance (or acquisition) of professional certification in the field in which the faculty member teaches (e.g., JD, CPA, CFA)

Because service in support of teaching is an important component of a Lecturer’s (Senior Lecturer’s/Teaching Professor’s) teaching record,9 the following list provides examples10 of forms that service in support of teaching may take:

- Service on committees whose work pertains to the teaching mission of the department, the Kelley School, or the University
- Recognition received for service activities (both internal and external)
- Leadership of or participation in departmental activities in support of teaching/learning (e.g., curriculum design and development, course development, and the like)
- 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
- Participation in Kelley School or University workshops and programs dealing with pedagogy
- Engagement in School/University activities and events in support of the teaching mission, including activities designed to attract students to the Kelley School and recognize accomplishments of Kelley students
- Leadership of or participation in professional service activities related to the teaching mission of the department, the Kelley School, or the University
- Engagement in service to the community in ways that call upon a faculty member’s professional expertise as a teacher or pedagogical scholar.

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 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...
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.

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

Post-probationary period, Lecturers (Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors) receive either a 5-year appointment or a 3-year rolling appointment. This new appointment replaces any previous Lecturer (Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor) appointments then in existence.

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

“Lecturers/teaching professors are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as lecturers shall be given long-term contracts after a probationary period of not more than seven years. The exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the dean and the faculty governance body within each school using Lecturer/Teaching Professor appointments and be approved by the chancellor/provost, but the mechanism should be a long-term contract of not less than five years or be some equivalent, such as a rolling three-year contract. The criteria for granting long-term contracts after a probationary period shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that lecturers/teaching professors shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts or their equivalent.”

1. **Initial Multi-Year Long-Term Appointment.**

*Long-term appointment criteria.* 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, other measures of teaching effectiveness and innovation and service

---

11 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. Promotion to Senior Lecturer is discussed subsequently in this document.
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 his or her philosophy of teaching and service contributions.

A candidate seeking a non-probationary long-term appointment must have a teaching record that is exceeds the standard of satisfactory and is making significant progress toward the promotion standards of Senior Lecturer as described in Section II(C), which requires a teaching rating of excellent, and service in support of teaching that serves as meaningful evidence of an excellent teaching record. In addition to their teaching and service contributions, full-time Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors are expected to achieve 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 department chairperson or equivalent supervisor as to whether the candidate should be appointed to a multi-year appointment. The recommendation of the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor and the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee shall be reported to the Dean’s Office, which makes the final decision on whether a renewal 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. The process by which faculty can make comments is discussed subsequently in this document.

2. **Renewal of Multi-Year, Long-Term Appointments.** An initial long-term appointment is subject to renewal for either a 5-year appointment or a 3-year rolling appointment under

---

12 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.
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 department chairperson or equivalent supervisor shall 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 department chairperson or equivalent supervisor 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 satisfactory in teaching and service as defined in Section IV.

Prior to making the recommendation on whether a renewal appointment is warranted, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor shall solicit input from the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee regarding the Senior Lecturer’s teaching and service contributions. (Examples of appropriate considerations in evaluating teaching and service contributions are identified in Section II(C)(2) of this document.) The recommendation of the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor and the Lecturer Faculty Review Committee shall be reported to the Dean’s Office, which makes the final decision on whether a renewal long-term appointment should be granted.

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. 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.

3. 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)(1). In addition, factors such as funding constraints and changing programmatic needs may lead to a non-renewal decision. If the Kelley School or the relevant department declines

---

13 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.
14 See University Policy ACA-18. According to ACA-18, a non-renewal decision may also be based on the same grounds.
to renew a 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. The following guidelines regarding non-reappointment decisions can be found in Sections 3b and 3c of University Policy ACA-22:

“3b. The faculty member or librarian shall be notified as soon as possible of any decision by a department, school, program, division, or library unit not to recommend reappointment or tenure, and the individual shall be notified within stated deadlines of a decision by the University not to reappoint him or her.

3c. At the time that a faculty member or librarian is notified of a negative recommendation on reappointment or tenure, he or she shall be provided with a written statement of the “Policies Governing Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period,” and the Academic Handbook statement on criteria for tenure, to insure that he or she be fully informed of his or her rights.”

Candidates that do not make strong contributions in teaching and in service that supports teaching will not be renewed. Strong contributions include exceeding the standard of satisfactory in teaching and service as defined in Section IV. Any decision for non-reappointment may be reviewed upon request. Guidelines are available in University Policy ACA-22, Section 4.

**Dismissal.** “After the probationary period, dismissal of a lecturer/teaching professor holding a longer term contract which has not expired may occur because of closure or permanent downsizing of the program in which the faculty member teaches and serves; otherwise, dismissal of such lecturer/teaching professor shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, or financial exigency. Non-reappointment of lecturers/teaching professors to a new contract term may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the academic unit’s program. Non-reappointment decisions regarding lecturers/teaching professors holding a longer-term contract after the probationary period must be made with faculty consultation through processes established by the school’s faculty governance institutions. The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance institutions includes cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of lecturers.” University Policy ACA-18.

**Procedure.** In the academic year prior to the last year of any post-probationary term 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.
of appointment, the department chair or equivalent supervisor 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 department chair or equivalent supervisor 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 in *University Policy ACA 52*, “Dismissal shall mean the involuntary termination of a tenured faculty member’s or librarian’s appointment prior to retirement or resignation, or the termination of the appointment of a non-tenured faculty member or librarian prior to the expiration of the term of appointment. Dismissal is thus to be distinguished from the non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member. Dismissal shall occur only for reason of (a) incompetence, (b) serious personal or professional misconduct, or (c) extraordinary financial exigencies of the University.”

II. **SENIOR LECTURERS**

A. **Responsibilities**

Senior Lecturers, like Lecturers, perform key roles in furthering the teaching mission of the Kelley School. The specific teaching responsibilities of Senior Lecturers vary, but are influenced significantly by their educational and professional background as well as their record of teaching experience. They may teach introductory-level undergraduate courses or, as needed by the relevant department or program, advanced courses at the undergraduate and graduate level. Senior Lecturers may also have organizational and oversight responsibility for the courses in which they teach. The standard teaching load for Senior 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.

In addition to their contributions to the teaching mission of the Kelley School and the University, Senior Lecturers are expected to participate in service in support of the teaching mission. This may include, but is not limited to, service on relevant Kelley School committees.
Senior Lecturers are also expected to meet and maintain faculty qualification standards as defined jointly by the AACSB, the HLC, and the Kelley School.

B. Initial Appointment and Initial Non-Probationary Appointment

As noted earlier in this document, initial appointments of candidates in the Lecturer (Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professors) faculty classification normally are at the Lecturer rank, with promotion to Senior Lecturer. On occasion, however, a candidate’s experience and accomplishments may warrant an initial appointment at the Senior Lecturer rank or Teaching Professor rank pursuant to campus guidelines.

Even when a candidate receives an initial appointment at the Senior Lecturer rank, successful completion of a probationary period is ordinarily expected in order for the candidate to be eligible for a non-probationary long-term appointment. All provisions of Sections I(B)(1) and I(C) in this document, and all University and Kelley School policies noted in those sections, also govern appointments, reappointments, and non-reappointments of candidates initially appointed at the Senior Lecturer rank. The same probationary period applicable to Lecturers, as described earlier in Sections I(B)(1) and I(C), applies to candidates appointed as Senior Lecturers under an initial 3-year appointment. This initial appointment serves as a probationary period, which may be extended 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 candidate’s sixth year as a member of the faculty.

When a candidate initially appointed at the Senior Lecturer rank is considered for an initial non-probationary long-term appointment, the timing and procedure match the description set forth above in Section I(E). The standards match the descriptions set forth below in Sections II(C) (Promotion to Senior Lecturer). In order to justify recommending a Senior Lecturer for an initial non-probationary long-term appointment, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor must conclude that the candidate continues to make strong contributions in teaching and in service that supports teaching appropriate for the candidate’s rank of Senior Lecturer.

15 This paragraph and the following paragraph describe the Kelley School’s usual practice regarding candidates appointed at the Senior Lecturer rank (i.e., appointing them with probationary status, as in the more common cases of initial appointments at the Lecturer rank, and then affording them the opportunity to seek a non-probationary long-term appointment). Although it is possible that a candidate could be initially appointed at the Senior Lecturer rank and be granted non-probationary status from the outset, such instances seldom occur.
C. 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 probationary 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 of probation 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 of the probationary period. Promotion decisions for Senior Lecturer 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. A positive promotion decision to Senior Lecturer does not extend or renew a candidate’s current long-term appointment.

2. **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 that their teaching record merits a rating of *excellent*. University and Indianapolis Campus policies also provide that Lecturers (Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors) may be assigned the duty to engage in service activities in support of teaching. 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

---

16 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).
in Appendix 2 (Scholarship and Dissemination on the IUPUI Campus).

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

Examples of considerations potentially relevant to the determination of whether the Lecturer has demonstrated teaching excellence include\(^\text{17}\) the following:

- Student evaluation scores and comments
- Peer observations/evaluations of teaching
- Letters received from students (particularly unsolicited)
- Teaching awards and other teaching recognition received
- Leadership of or participation in the development of School or departmental instructional goals and objectives
- Participation in curriculum development and innovation
- Development of new course materials for use in an instructor’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

\(^{17}\) 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.
• 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
• Participation in teaching and learning development activities at the School, University, or peer professional group level
• A record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching is not required for promotion to Senior Lecturer; however peer-reviewed scholarship supports a case of teaching excellence.
  o Publication of journal articles devoted to teaching or disciplinary scholarship
  o Publications in conference proceedings
  o Presentations at local and national conferences regarding teaching or disciplinary scholarship
• Evidence of service in support of teaching (see further discussion below)
• Mentoring of students
• 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.
• Maintenance (or acquisition) of professional certification in the field in which the faculty member teaches (e.g., JD, CPA, CFA)

Examples of considerations potentially relevant to the determination of whether the Lecturer seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer has developed an appropriately strong record of service in support of teaching include the following:

• Service on committees whose work pertains to the teaching mission of the department, the Kelley School, or the University
• Recognition received for service activities that further the teaching mission
• Leadership of or participation in departmental activities in support of teaching/learning (e.g., curriculum design and development, course

18 A record of publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching is required for promotion to Teaching Professor.
19 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 the candidate’s record of service in support of teaching to be rated as sufficiently strong
development, assurance-of-learning processes, and the like)

- 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
- Participation in Kelley School or University workshops and programs dealing with pedagogy
- Engagement in department, Kelley School, or University activities and events in support of the teaching mission, including activities designed to attract students to the Kelley School and recognize accomplishments of Kelley students
- Leadership of or participation in professional service activities related to the teaching mission
- Engagement in service to the community in ways that call upon a faculty member’s professional expertise as teacher or pedagogical scholar

Because it places considerable emphasis on high-quality teaching, the Kelley School expects Lecturers to inquire into both the subject matter of their field and current pedagogy. Accordingly, Lecturers 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 Professional Development Program), as well as peer professional groups focused on subject matter content and pedagogy. Lecturers who are promoted to Senior Lecturer are strongly encouraged to continue engaging, while serving as Senior Lecturers, in the subject-matter and pedagogical inquiries and participation noted above.

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. 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.

3. **Promotion Procedure.** The departmental chairperson or equivalent supervisor may recommend Lecturers for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. 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

---

20 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.
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 his or her 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.

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.”

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.

4. **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.

D. **Performance Reviews**

   **Annual Performance Reviews,** see Section I(D)

E. **Multiyear Appointments**

   See Section I(E)

III. **TEACHING PROFESSOR**

A. **Responsibilities**

Teaching Professor, like Senior Lecturers, perform key roles in furthering the teaching mission of the Kelley School. The specific teaching responsibilities of Teaching Professors vary, but are influenced significantly by their educational and professional background as well as their record of teaching experience. They may teach introductory-level undergraduate courses or, as needed by the relevant department or program, advanced courses at the undergraduate and graduate level. Teaching Professors may also have organizational and oversight
responsibility for the courses in which they teach. The standard teaching load for Teaching Professors will be 24 credit hours per academic year.

In addition to their contributions to the teaching mission of the Kelley School and the University, Teaching Professors are expected to participate in service in support of the teaching mission. This may include, but is not limited to, service on relevant Kelley School committees. (Further information on service responsibilities appears later in this document.) Pursuant to Indiana University policy, however, Teaching Professors are not eligible for academic administrative appointments at and above the department chair level. *University Policy ACA-18.*

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

**B. Initial Appointment and Initial Non-Probationary Appointment**

As noted earlier in this document, initial appointments of candidates in the Lecturer (Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor) faculty classification normally are at the Lecturer (or Senior Lecturer) rank, with later promotion to Teaching Professor. On occasion, however, a candidate’s experience and accomplishments may warrant an initial appointment at the Teaching Professor rank.

Even when a candidate receives an initial appointment at the Teaching Professor rank, successful completion of a probationary period is ordinarily expected in order for the candidate to be eligible for a non-probationary long-term appointment. All provisions of Sections I(B)(1) and I(C) in this document, and all University and Kelley School policies noted in those sections, also govern appointments, reappointments, and non-reappointments of candidates initially appointed at the Teaching Professors rank. The same probationary period applicable to Lecturers, as described earlier in Sections I(B)(1) and I(C), applies to candidates appointed as Teaching Professors under an initial 3-year appointment. This initial appointment serves as a probationary period, which may be extended 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 candidate’s sixth year as a member of the faculty.

When a candidate initially appointed at the Teaching Professors rank is considered for an initial appointment, a candidate’s experience and accomplishments may warrant an initial appointment at the Teaching Professor rank. However, successful completion of a probationary period is ordinarily expected in order for the candidate to be eligible for a non-probationary long-term appointment. All provisions of Sections I(B)(1) and I(C) in this document, and all University and Kelley School policies noted in those sections, also govern appointments, reappointments, and non-reappointments of candidates initially appointed at the Teaching Professors rank. The same probationary period applicable to Lecturers, as described earlier in Sections I(B)(1) and I(C), applies to candidates appointed as Teaching Professors under an initial 3-year appointment. This initial appointment serves as a probationary period, which may be extended 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 candidate’s sixth year as a member of the faculty.
non-probationary long-term appointment, the timing and procedure match the descriptions in Section I(E). The standards match the descriptions in Section III(C) (Promotion to Teaching Professor). For the candidates appointed at the Teaching Professor rank, there is no promotion to seek. In order to justify recommending a Teaching Professor for a renewal appointment, the department chairperson or equivalent supervisor must conclude that the candidate continues to make strong contributions in teaching and in service that supports teaching appropriate for the candidate’s rank of Teaching Professor (see Section III(C)).

C. 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. 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 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:

22 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 excellence in classroom teaching while in rank as a Senior Lecturer;
2. 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
3. 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 his or her 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 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
   a. Developing curriculum at the school level or beyond
   b. Engaging in program development at the school level or beyond
   c. Developing teaching materials that are used at the school level or beyond
   d. Developing innovative teaching approaches that are used across the school curriculum, in other campus units, or at institutions outside Indiana University
   e. Developing cases, textbooks, and other instructional materials used by instructors outside the candidate’s area
   f. Presenting on curricular development issues at conferences

2. Mentoring and Peer Assessment
   a. Engaging in training programs to gain a thorough understanding of peer review of teaching (e.g., FACET peer review training)
   b. Conducting peer review of teaching for faculty outside of the candidate’s area
   c. Engaging in thought leadership and innovations in approaches to peer assessment and mentoring
   d. Mentoring faculty outside the candidate’s area on sound and/or high-impact pedagogical practices

---

23 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.
e. 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
f. Developing and presenting pedagogical workshops for faculty outside the candidate’s area
g. Taking on a leadership position in a pedagogy-oriented organization

3. Leadership in Activities Related to Substantive Teaching Field
   a. Developing and delivering curriculum related to teaching field in a professional certification, continuing education, or executive education program
   b. Presenting to business or professional organizations on issues related to teaching field
   c. Participating in media interviews about issues related to teaching field
   d. Publishing articles in professional journals and practitioner books/chapters on issues related to teaching field
   e. Reviewing or serving on editorial board of professional journals in the teaching field
   f. Serving on and demonstrating leadership in activities related to the teaching field for professional organizations and community committees

4. Scholarship in Support of Teaching and Learning Peer reviewed scholarship is required for the promotion to Teaching Professor.
   a. Applying for or receiving grants that support the scholarship of teaching and learning
   b. Publishing articles, books, book chapters on teaching and learning
   c. Presenting on scholarship of teaching and learning
   d. Reviewing for scholarly pedagogical journals

3. **Promotion Procedure.** For promotion to Teaching Professor, the procedures are the same as in Section II(C)(3) (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.

4. **Decisions Denying Promotion.** See Section II(C)(4)

D. **Performance Reviews**

   See Section I(D)

E. **Multiyear Appointments**

   24 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.)
IV. TEACHING RATINGS APPLICABLE TO PROMOTION CASES

The possible teaching ratings listed below (Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory) are the ratings set by Indianapolis Campus policy. 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. For promotion, candidates must be assessed as excellent in teaching, at least satisfactory in service in support of teaching, and have publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship as defined in the IUPUI Promotion standards.

A. Possible Ratings and Related Explanations

**Excellent.** The candidate has carried a teaching load that is appropriate for his or her department or area (considering number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed). 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 sufficiently strong to lend support to the conclusion that the candidate is an outstanding instructor. 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. Contributions are recognized beyond his/her individual course(s). Further evidence of the candidate’s strong teaching record stems from a significant number of the considerations

---

25 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.

26 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.
listed in Section II(C)(2) of this document. As a necessary component of his or her 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.

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(C)(2)) 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 in the senses noted above (number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed). 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 his or 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 II(C)(2) 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. 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 his or her 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

27 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(C)(2) of this document.
identified, the candidate has taken appropriate steps to address the problems and bring his or her 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 evaluations confirm that the faculty member’s teaching quality falls below an acceptable level.
- The faculty member has been unable to prepare a course that was new to him or her.
- The faculty member is unwilling or unable, despite appropriate requests, to undertake assignments that would be helpful in addressing teaching needs at the department and/or School level.
- The faculty member does not conduct the class in the appropriately assigned format (in-class, hybrid, on-line).
- The faculty member is unwilling or unable 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 has engaged in little or no service in support of teaching, despite appropriate assignments of such service tasks.

**B. 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.

C. 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 his or her 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 II(C)(2) 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 II(C)(2) may also be treated as service in support of teaching.

D. 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 II(C)(2) 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 his or her 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.

E. Sample Service Criteria

**Excellent.** The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission 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.

**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 candidate has failed to show improvement after being placed on notice that his 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 public service mission of the School;
- 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**: General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments
- **University Policy ACA-14**: Classification of Academic Appointments
- **University Policy ACA-18**: Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments
- **University Policy ACA-21**: Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews
- **University Policy ACA-22**: Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period.
- **University Policy ACA-25**: Annual Reports for Faculty and Librarians
- **University Policy ACA-28**: Faculty and Librarian Promotions
- **University Policy ACA-52**: Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees

- **IUPUI Faculty Guide (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**: This is a policy that governs all faculty and describes how they are to work.
- **IUPUI 2019-20 Promotion 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-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**: 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. 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 excellence in teaching; accordingly, examples of dissemination to others of service are not shown in this Appendix.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Formal “scholarship of teaching and learning” is more likely to occur at the Teaching Professor level. Scholarship/dissemination includes pedagogical and/or disciplinary content.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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, articles/presentations in area of expertise, or peer-reviewed scholarship of teaching (publication/ presentation, substantive critique).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

28 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.
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](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
• 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, and The Conversation. Media quotes are also examples of dissemination of teaching, but given lesser weight than publications.
• Web pages, podcasts, blogs, or other electronic aids to facilitate disciplinary learning and/or instructional techniques.
• 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IUB Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor Promotion Requirements</th>
<th>IUPUI Lecturer/Senior Lecturer/Teaching Professor Promotion Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion evaluations occur at school level only. Negative decisions are reviewed by campus.</td>
<td>Promotion evaluations occur at school and campus level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers are <strong>required</strong> to apply for rank of Senior Lecturer during sixth year of their probationary period.</td>
<td>Lecturers must be reviewed for promotion after six years of probationary appointment, but they are <em>not</em> required to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of teaching is not required for promotion, but may be presented to support the case.</td>
<td><strong>To be considered excellent in teaching, lecturers must have a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching.</strong>[^29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard teaching load for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors is 18 hours per year.</td>
<td>Standard teaching load for Lecturers/Senior Lecturers/Teaching Professors is 24 hours per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^29]: 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. 37). [https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AACcontent/Html/Media/AACcontent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-future-year-final.pdf](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AACcontent/Html/Media/AACcontent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-future-year-final.pdf)