**KELLEY SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

**CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE, PROMOTION,**

**& ANNUAL PRE-TENURE REVIEWS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

**March, 1995**

**Revised: May 1, 2000**

**Revised: September 15, 2003**

**Revised: April 17, 2006**

**Revised: February 20, 2021**

# CONTENTS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Topic | Page Number |
| Introduction | 2 |
| General Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Pre-tenure Reviews | 3 |
| General Criteria and Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor | 12 |
| Research, Teaching, and Service Ratings  Table 1: Summary of Relevant Documents for Tenure and Promotion | 19  27 |
| Table 2: Summary of Promotion and Tenure Procedures | 28 |
| Table 3: Summary of Pre-tenure Evaluation Process | 29 |

**INTRODUCTION**

This document describes criteria and procedures for the evaluation of tenure-probationary and tenured faculty members at the Kelley School of Business who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion. These criteria and procedures provide guidance on the application of University policies on tenure (ACA-37, Faculty and Librarian Tenure) and promotion (ACA-38, Faculty and Librarian Promotions), as well as relevant campus-specific policy documents, at the Kelley School of Business. This document first describes general principles applying to both tenure and promotion and then provides separate information relevant to the tenure and promotion processes. Table 1 of this document provides a summary of relevant documents for tenure and promotion at the University, campus, and Kelley School levels.

Indiana University policy states tenured and tenure-probationary faculty members (hereafter referred to as “tenure-track faculty”) have responsibilities in the areas of teaching, research, and service (ACA-12, General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments).

Accordingly, tenure-track faculty members who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion are evaluated on their performance and contributions in these three areas. The evaluation of performance in the areas of research, teaching, and service is common to all campuses of Indiana University. Thus, while faculty appointments at the Kelley School of Business are campus- specific, the common set of evaluation criteria for performance in research, teaching, and service apply to all tenure-track faculty members who hold an appointment at either the Bloomington or Indianapolis campus of the Kelley School.

Faculty members’ performance and contributions in the three areas are evaluated in accordance with four available ratings established by campus policies. On the Bloomington campus, the available ratings are Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory for research and service, and Excellent, Very Good, Effective, and Ineffective for teaching. On the Indianapolis campus, the available ratings are Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory for all three performance areas.0F As a Core School, the Kelley School treats as equivalent the ratings of Very Good and Highly Satisfactory, Effective and Satisfactory, and Ineffective and Unsatisfactory. This document’s later section titled “General Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Pre-Tenure Reviews” explains the Kelley School’s expectations regarding the ratings a candidate’s performance and contributions must receive in order to warrant a favorable tenure decision. The document’s section titled “General Criteria and Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor” explains the Kelley School’s expectations regarding the ratings a candidate’s performance and contributions must receive in order to warrant a promotion to Full Professor. These expectations apply equally to candidates on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, i.e., candidates on the two campuses are held to equivalent standards to receive a particular rating.

1

Voting at the Kelley School in tenure and/or promotion cases initiates with the campus- specific department and then proceeds to the Faculty Review Committee – Tenure Track

1 For descriptions of the ratings, see this document’s section titled “Research, Teaching, and Service Ratings.”

(hereafter “Faculty Review Committee” or “FRC”). 2 Faculty members must be “materially engaged” in the review process in order to vote on a candidate’s case. Tenured faculty members in each department at the Kelley School must follow campus policies when defining “material engagement” for their department. The Dean of the Kelley School provides a vote for candidates from both the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses, based in part on input from the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the candidate’s respective campus. Voting levels are hierarchical, with each succeeding level having access to the votes and memoranda of the prior levels. Table 2 of this document provides a summary of the procedures and voting process for promotion and tenure decisions.
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# GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PRE-TENURE REVIEWS

Indiana University reviews tenure-probationary3 faculty members for a recommendation of tenure (or non-reappointment) no later than the candidate’s sixth year of probationary service counted toward tenure (ACA 37, Faculty and Librarian Tenure). 4 The sixth year is the typical year for the tenure review process to take place. In special cases, however, a candidate may be considered for tenure prior to his or her sixth year of probationary service. The Kelley School faculty believe such decisions should be made only with the full concurrence of the candidate, the relevant Department Chairperson, and Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research at the relevant campus, as well as strong support from the tenured faculty members within the candidate’s department. All candidates considering a petition for tenure prior to their sixth year must be aware of the potential critical consequences of such a decision. Simply stated, a person may have a full tenure review once, and once only. Should a candidate who completes a full tenure evaluation prior to the candidate’s sixth year of service ultimately be unsuccessful, no
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2 As of academic year 2020-21, the departments at the Kelley School-Bloomington are Accounting, Business Economics & Public Policy, Business Law & Ethics, Finance, Management & Entrepreneurship, Marketing, and Operations & Decision Technologies. The Kelley School-Indianapolis is considered an integrated department for certain purposes, including governance of the tenure and promotion process. The Faculty Review Committee-Tenure Track consists of an appointed faculty member from each of the seven departments in Bloomington and the one department in Indianapolis, for a total of eight appointees. At least five members must be Full Professors, with the remaining members being tenured Associate Professors. The Dean of the Kelley School of Business appoints members of the Faculty Review Committee – Tenure Track with input from the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research from the relevant campus. If the department or the Faculty Review Committee names or configurations change, this document’s references to “department” or “Faculty Review Committee – Tenure Track” will continue to apply to the departments or review committee in their renamed or reconfigured forms.

3 When faculty members are hired for full-time (non-visiting) positions, they receive an initial 3-year appointment, contingent on the effective performance of their duties in research, 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 tenure.

4 Faculty members’ years of probationary service toward tenure may differ from their total years of service at Indiana University due to delays in starting the tenure clock or interruptions in the tenure clock. All such delays and interruptions require approval from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs-Bloomington or the Chief Academic Officer-IUPUI. Faculty members should see the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on their campus for further detail.

further petition can be considered in subsequent years. 5 Instead, a candidate who was not successful in the early petition will be terminated from the University. In this case, the faculty member typically has one final academic year of employment due to a reappointment made in the year prior to the faculty member’s unsuccessful application for tenure.
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In all cases, Indiana University tenure policy provides that tenure is campus-specific (ACA-37, Faculty and Librarian Tenure). Thus, a candidate at the Kelley School with a Bloomington appointment is granted tenure for the Bloomington campus and a candidate with an Indianapolis appointment is granted tenure for the Indianapolis campus.

**Criteria**

Research, teaching, and service represent the responsibilities of tenure-track faculty (ACA 12 - General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments). Moreover, these responsibilities form the foundation of the Kelley School’s mission and associated mission statement.5F Accordingly, these three performance areas provide the basis for evaluating a candidate for tenure at the Kelley School of Business. Indiana University policy offers four paths a candidate may select for tenure: excellence in research, excellence in teaching, excellence in service, or a fourth path composed of presenting a case of overall excellence based on a balance of contributions across the three areas – research, teaching, and service. Candidates choosing excellence in one performance area must demonstrate “excellent” performance and contributions for that area and at least “effective/satisfactory” performance for the other two areas. A candidate choosing overall excellence based on balanced contributions must demonstrate at least “very good/highly satisfactory” performance in all three areas of research, teaching, and service.
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University policy also states each unit should provide a statement reflecting the unit’s perception of the relative importance of research, teaching, and service in receiving favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

The Kelley School places great weight on research for tenure decisions and expects candidates for tenure to select the “excellence in research” path to receive a favorable endorsement for tenure. This expectation reflects the importance of research to the Kelley School mission and the responsibility of tenure-track faculty to lead the research activities of the School. Thus, candidates for tenure at the Kelley School are expected to demonstrate “excellent” performance and contributions in research, at least “effective/satisfactory” performance and contributions in teaching, and at least “satisfactory” performance and contributions in service.

The Kelley School is committed to a number of values in fulfilling the research, teaching, and service elements of its mission, including: ethical conduct; excellence and professionalism; personal initiative and responsibility; full engagement in the Kelley mission; ongoing innovation;

5 Candidates petitioning for tenure prior to their sixth probationary year may withdraw their request at any time prior to the decision at the executive level (ACA 37, Faculty and Librarian Tenure). A candidate who has withdrawn a petition for tenure should then wait until the candidate’s sixth probationary year to re-initiate the tenure process.

6 The mission statement of the Kelley School is provided on the webpage, [https://kelley.iu.edu/about/index.cshtml,](https://kelley.iu.edu/about/index.cshtml) along with its vision statement, values statement, and associated goals. While research, teaching and service are enduring elements of the Kelley School mission, the School may update and amend aspects of its vision statement, mission statement, values statement, and associated goals over time.

collaboration, civility, respect and collegial conduct; diversity and inclusiveness; and just and equitable recognition for performance. The Kelley School’s mission and values will be considered when evaluating a candidate’s research, teaching and service performance and contributions for tenure. Most of these values, including a candidate’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, may be reflected in any or all three areas of research, teaching, and service. However, the Kelley School includes “collegiality” as a consideration in evaluating a candidate’s performance and contributions *only* in the service area, reflecting the importance of working rapport among the Kelley community needed for the long-run effectiveness of the Kelley School in the research, teaching, and service elements of its mission.

To demonstrate “excellence” in research, a tenure candidate should be well on the way toward achieving a national and/or international reputation for excellence in research in the candidate’s research field(s). A candidate should have a programmatic body of research that demonstrates the candidate’s independent research contributions and has had or is expected to have significant impact on the research field. This body of research should demonstrate progress beyond a candidate’s dissertation work and beyond research conducted with faculty members from the candidate’s dissertation-granting institution. The body of research should also prominently feature publications of superior quality in sought-after publication outlets of a high- profile and influential nature.

Within a candidate’s body of research, quality of research outputs and impact of research are considered more important than quantity, although a candidate’s level of research productivity is an important input to the tenure decision. Assessments of productivity (and ultimate tenure decisions) should not be influenced in any way by the presence of approved delays or interruptions in a candidate’s probationary period. Potential indicators of quality and impact of research may include, but are not limited to, items such as academic and media citations, research awards, peer-reviewed presentations at conferences, presentations at universities or business/government organizations, journal editor positions and editorial board memberships, inclusion of publications in doctoral syllabi at other universities, impact on business/government/non-governmental organization practices or regulations, and external grants. External grants with a programmatic research theme may supplement a candidate’s research record, but do not substitute for a candidate’s publication record, and are not required for tenure.

A major consideration in the tenure decision is the potential of the candidate to continue to develop professionally (i.e., tenure is forward-looking in considering the potential future contributions of the candidate). Thus, the candidate should have a strong foundation of research- in-progress and a comprehensive plan for future research of high merit. Consideration also is given to the compatibility of the candidate's professional talents possessed or capable of being developed with the anticipated long-term needs of the Kelley School.

For complete descriptions of the ratings available for use in assessing tenure candidates’ performance and contributions in research, teaching, and service, see this document’s later section titled “Research, Teaching, and Service Ratings.”

**Procedures**

This section describes the procedures used to assess progress toward tenure and to make tenure recommendations. The tenure process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the candidate’s campus (Bloomington or Indianapolis). As an overview of the process, the procedures call for an annual review of performance up to the sixth year of service, with the tenure review and decision made during the sixth probationary year. Various groups and individuals review the candidate’s performance throughout this process, including the Department Chairperson and other tenured faculty members of the candidate’s department, the Faculty Review Committee, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the Bloomington or Indianapolis campus, and the Dean of the Kelley School. The assessments of all groups and individuals are reflected in memos. Copies of memos associated with the pre-tenure review process are provided to the candidate, Department Chairperson, and Dean’s Office. The Dean’s Office retains copies of all memos related to the tenure review, which are available for the candidate to view upon request.

The specific tenure and pre-tenure processes vary slightly as a function of the candidates' appointment—Bloomington or Indianapolis. A general description of the process is shown below. For Indianapolis, the Department Chairperson role in the tenure and promotion process is carried out by the research coordinator(s) and faculty report to the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research.

1. **Annual Notification**

The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the Bloomington [Indianapolis] campus sends a notice annually to Department Chairpersons calling attention to the review process for all tenure-probationary faculty members and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Executive Associate Dean's Office. The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the Bloomington [Indianapolis] campus also annually notifies all tenure- probationary faculty members of the procedures and the relevant deadlines for their specific review.

1. **Pre-tenure Reviews**
   1. The Kelley School has a comprehensive program of pre-tenure reviews, with written pre-tenure reviews conducted annually in the Spring Semester for the first five years of a candidate’s tenure probationary period.6F These reviews evaluate a candidate’s performance and contributions in research, teaching, and service. The review process both provides feedback to candidates about their progress toward
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7Pre-tenure reviews are conducted during a faculty member’s years of service counted toward tenure. Pre-tenure reviews are not conducted during the year in which a faculty member has a “clock stop,” unless requested by the candidate. However, departments continue to conduct an annual review and make a reappointment decision (if relevant) during a faculty member’s “clock stop” year.

tenure and serves as the foundation for the reappointment decision in years 2 - 5 of the probationary period.

* 1. A summary of the timeline and procedures for pre-tenure reviews is described below and summarized in Table 3 of this document. Candidates should refer to further written guidance from the Dean’s Office for details of the process and materials they should submit each year.
  2. For the first two years of the candidate's tenure probationary period, the respective department conducts the pre-tenure review in the Spring Semester. In the probationary faculty member’s second year, a reappointment decision must also be made. The Department Chairperson conducts a vote of the department’s tenured faculty on whether to recommend reappointment of the candidate. In addition to the required written review referred to above, the Department Chairperson in Bloomington [Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research in Indianapolis] reports the results of the reappointment vote to the Dean’s Office.
  3. For candidates in the third year of their tenure probationary period, the procedure for department review and reappointment occurs in the Spring Semester and is the same as the second-year procedure noted above. After the department review, Faculty Review Committee members also conduct a review of the candidate’s performance and contributions in the areas of research, teaching, and service. A minimum of five FRC members (including the FRC representative from the candidate’s department) participate in the review and discussion, ensuring at least four FRC members participate in the vote and reappointment recommendation.8
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These Faculty Review Committee reviews are included in the subsequent probationary period review materials to ensure departmental faculty members are aware of FRC recommendations and potential concerns. Prior review materials are not included in the tenure dossier materials unless requested by the candidate.

* 1. For candidates in the fourth year of their tenure probationary period, the procedure for the department and Faculty Review Committee review and reappointment decision occurs in the Spring Semester. The fourth-year review follows the procedure used in the preceding year, with the exception that all eight members of the FRC (including the FRC representative from the candidate’s department) participate in the review process, ensuring at least seven FRC members participate in the vote and reappointment recommendation. These Faculty Review Committee reviews are included in the subsequent probationary period review materials to ensure departmental faculty members are aware of FRC recommendations and potential concerns. Prior review materials are not included in the tenure dossier materials unless requested by the candidate.

8Starting with the initial FRC reviews and continuing at all subsequent reviews, the departmental representative member participates in the discussion but does not vote again because that member cast a vote at the departmental level.

* 1. For candidates in the fifth year of their tenure probationary period (the "dress rehearsal" year), the Faculty Review Committee does not participate in the review process. The procedure for the department review and reappointment decision occurs in the Spring Semester and follows the procedure used in the preceding year. For fifth year reviews, the candidate and the candidate’s Department Chairperson assemble a complete dossier containing all pertinent tenure material, including materials for review by external reviewers. The Faculty Review Committee reviews from the fourth year are included in the fifth-year review materials provided to the department to ensure departmental faculty members are aware of FRC recommendations and potential concerns. Prior review materials are not included in the tenure dossier materials unless requested by the candidate.

1. **Tenure Review**
   1. During the sixth year, the candidate and the candidate’s Department Chairperson prepare and submit a complete dossier, including letters solicited by the Dean’s Office from external reviewers outside of Indiana University. Pre-tenure review memos should not be included in the tenure dossier unless requested by the candidate.
   2. The procedure for soliciting external review letters for the candidate’s formal tenure review begins in the late Spring of a candidate’s fifth year. The Department Chairperson submits the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who the Department Chairperson and the candidate recommend to write a letter of evaluation for the tenure candidate’s dossier. These names are submitted to the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research. Ten names of recommended external reviewers, along with an associated “information sheet” for each recommended reviewer, are submitted in order to ensure the completed tenure dossier includes at least six external review letters. The candidate recommends five external reviewers, and the Department Chairperson recommends five external reviewers. The candidate’s and Department Chairperson’s lists must not share names in common. To ensure a high response rate, Department Chairpersons should contact potential reviewers in advance and only submit the names of individuals who have agreed to write evaluations. The candidate must not contact potential reviewers. The Dean’s Office chooses a subset of the reviewers (typically eight) from whom to request review letters; the other reviewers are requested to submit letters only if one or more of the reviewers initially requested to write fails to submit a review letter.

It is critically important for Department Chairpersons and tenure candidates to select external reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate’s performance area, have no past ties with the candidate that may influence their assessments, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. Criteria for selection of reviewers include a reviewer’s rank, titled positions held, quality of the reviewer’s institution,

editorial positions, administrative positions such as Department Chairperson or Associate Dean, and relationship with the candidate. Persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or who are coauthors, for example, would be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

* 1. The tenured faculty members of the relevant department review the candidate’s dossier, including the external review letters, in late summer/early fall of the candidate’s sixth year. If there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members with research expertise in the candidate’s basic discipline, the Dean chooses faculty members from another Kelley School department such that there are three tenured Associate or Full Professors with specific research expertise in the basic discipline (hereafter referred to as “research experts”) to evaluate the candidate’s dossier and summarize the pros and cons of the research record. 9
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These research experts participate in the departmental discussion, but their assessment is not separately memorialize in the dossier materials or vote, unless there are fewer than three departmental faculty members eligible to vote, in which case the research experts also participate in the faculty vote in order to meet a minimum of three votes at the departmental level. As is the case with all other departmental faculty members, the views of research experts appear as anonymous components of the departmental faculty discussion in the memo summarizing this discussion.

At the meeting called to discuss the candidate’s case, the tenured faculty members assess the candidate’s record and performance. Choosing from the four possible ratings identified earlier in this document, the tenured faculty members vote individually on the appropriate ratings to be assigned to the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. In addition, the tenured faculty members vote individually on whether to recommend, or not recommend, the candidate receive tenure. One faculty member prepares a representative memo summarizing the discussion and votes of the tenured faculty. The memo, which is then included in the candidate’s dossier, must provide reasons for any negative votes recommending against tenure. Individual faculty members cannot include separate memos or letters in the dossier; all faculty members’ views, except for the Department Chairperson, are summarized in the department memo. All faculty members who participated in the discussion, including research experts (if applicable), may review the department memo to ensure their views are reflected. The Department Chairperson is responsible for ensuring all faculty members who participated in the discussion, including research experts (if applicable), have access to the department memo and their feedback is reflected in the memo.

9 Basic discipline as discussed here and in the section on promotion to Full Professor mirrors the existing Kelley departmental structure on the Bloomington campus. As of August 2020, there are seven distinct departments/functional areas. In the event the departmental structure changes in the future, the definition of basic discipline as discussed here will change accordingly. If there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s basic discipline throughout the Kelley School, the Dean will add research experts from other closely related disciplines within Indiana University as needed.

The Department Chairperson prepares a separate memo for the candidate’s dossier, which summarizes the Department Chairperson’s personal views, assessments, and recommendation. The Bloomington Department Chairperson or Indianapolis Executive Associate Dean Faculty & Research then notifies the candidate of the recommendation of the department.

* 1. The full Faculty Review Committee next reviews the candidate’s dossier, including the external review letters, and the department’s and Department Chairperson’s memos. At a meeting called for the purpose of discussing the candidate’s case, the Faculty Review Committee members assess the candidate’s record and performance. Choosing from the four possible ratings identified earlier in this document, the Faculty Review Committee members vote individually on the appropriate ratings to be assigned to the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. In addition, the Faculty Review Committee members vote individually on whether to recommend, or not recommend, the candidate receive tenure. One faculty member prepares a representative memo summarizing the discussion and votes of the Faculty Review Committee. Other voting members review and approve the memo as appropriately reflecting the discussion and votes of the Committee. The memo must provide reasons for any negative votes recommending against tenure. Individual Faculty Review Committee members cannot include separate memos or letters in the dossier; all members’ views are summarized in the Committee’s memo.

Faculty Review Committee members who are in the same department as the candidate participate in the discussion and vote at the department level. They do not participate in the Faculty Review Committee vote although they may participate in the Committee’s discussion of the candidate’s record.

* 1. The Dean of the Kelley School and the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research for the candidate’s campus then review the candidate’s dossier, including the external review letters, the department’s memo, the Department Chairperson’s memo, and Faculty Review Committee’s memo. The Dean, with input from the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research from the relevant campus, assesses the candidate’s research, teaching, and service, and makes a recommendation tenure be granted or denied. The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research at the relevant campus notifies the candidate and Department Chairperson of the recommendations of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee.

The full dossier is then forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs [Office of Academic Affairs – IUPUI] for review by the tenure advisory committee, the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs- Bloomington [Chief Academic Officer-IUPUI], and the Provost-Bloomington [Chancellor-IUPUI]. Final approval of the tenure decision rests with the President of the University and Board of Trustees.

* 1. If the department’s tenured Professors, and/or the Department Chairperson, and/or the members of the Faculty Review Committee conclude a particular candidate should not be recommended for tenure during a given year, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the relevant campus will advise the candidate that the candidate has the option to continue the review process with the campus-level and executive-level reviews. A candidate’s dossier is forwarded through the appropriate tenure processes, irrespective of unfavorable Department or Chairperson endorsements that might be added to it, unless withdrawn by the candidate. Candidates petitioning for tenure may withdraw the request at any time prior to the decision at the executive level.
  2. All notices of non-reappointment of tenure probationary faculty members are issued in strict conformance with Indiana University policy (ACA-22, Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period), as well as relevant campus policy.

# GENERAL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Indiana University reviews tenure-probationary faculty members for promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously with the tenure decision, unless the faculty candidate already possesses the Associate Professor title through the candidate’s initial appointment. Thus, faculty members under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor should refer to the preceding information about tenure decision criteria and procedures.

There is no pre-determined timeline for considering a faculty member’s promotion to Full Professor; however, since the promotion decision focuses on a candidate’s performance and contributions in rank, sufficient time must have passed for a candidate to demonstrate sustained performance and meaningful contributions in rank.9F The faculty at the Kelley School believe the decision for considering a promotion to Full Professor should be made after consultation among the candidate, the relevant Department Chairperson, and Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research at the relevant campus, as well consideration of whether there is strong support from the Full Professor faculty members within the candidate’s department. Department Chairpersons typically recommend a faculty member be considered for promotion to Full Professor, although any faculty member (including the candidate) may make this recommendation to the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the candidate’s campus.
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A candidate at the Kelley School with a Bloomington appointment receives promotion on the Bloomington campus. Likewise, a candidate with an Indianapolis appointment is granted promotion on the Indianapolis campus.

**Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

Research, teaching, and service represent the responsibilities of tenure-track faculty members (ACA 12 - General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments). Moreover, these responsibilities form the foundation of the Kelley School’s mission and associated mission statement. Accordingly, these three performance areas provide the basis for evaluating tenured Associate Professor candidates for promotion to Full Professor at the Kelley School of Business. Indiana University policy offers four paths a candidate may select for promotion to Full Professor: excellence in research, excellence in teaching, excellence in service, or a fourth path composed of presenting a case of overall excellence based on a balance of contributions across the three areas – research, teaching, and service. Candidates choosing excellence in one performance area must demonstrate “excellent” performance and contributions for that area and at least “effective/satisfactory” performance for the other two areas. A candidate choosing overall excellence based on balanced contributions must demonstrate at least “very good/highly satisfactory” performance in all three areas of research, teaching, and service. University policy also states each unit should provide a statement reflecting the unit’s perception of the relative

10 Technically, the term for the highest tenure-track rank is “Professor.” This document uses the term “Full Professor” to distinguish clearly this highest rank from the ranks of Associate Professor and Assistant Professor.

importance of research, teaching, and service in receiving favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

While the Kelley School places significant weight on research for tenure-track faculty members, it recognizes faculty members may take different paths to contributing to the Kelley School’s mission post-tenure. Candidates for Full Professor at the Kelley School are expected to demonstrate “excellent” performance and contributions in one of the three areas and at least “effective/satisfactory” performance and contributions in the remaining two areas. In appropriate cases in which the candidate has demonstrated a balance of strong contributions across all three performance areas such that the result is excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University, a candidate may pursue a “balanced case” as the basis for promotion to Full Professor at the Kelley School. To be promoted on a balanced case, the candidate must demonstrate at least “very good/highly satisfactory” performance and contributions in each of the three areas. This latter basis for promotion to Full Professor is commonly referred to as the “balanced-case” basis.

The Kelley School is committed to a number of values in fulfilling the research, teaching, and service elements of its mission, including: ethical conduct; excellence and professionalism; personal initiative and responsibility; full engagement in the Kelley mission; ongoing innovation; collaboration, civility, respect and collegial conduct; diversity and inclusiveness; and just and equitable recognition for performance. The Kelley School’s mission and values will be considered when evaluating a candidate’s research, teaching and service performance and contributions for promotion to Full Professor. Most of these values, including a candidate’s commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, may be reflected in any or all three areas of research, teaching, and service. However, the Kelley School includes “collegiality” as a consideration in evaluating a candidate’s performance and contributions *only* in the service area, reflecting the importance of working rapport among the Kelley community needed for the long run effectiveness of the Kelley School in the research, teaching, and service elements of its mission.

To demonstrate “excellence” in research for promotion to Full Professor, a candidate should have achieved a position of national and/or international leadership and prominence in the candidate’s research field(s), with a documented and robust record of achievement and distinctions. A faculty member should have a body of research that demonstrates the candidate’s independent research contributions and has had significant impact on the research field. This body of research should demonstrate growth in quantity and depth/quality of contributions beyond the faculty member’s research record at tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

The body of research should also prominently feature publications of superior quality in sought- after publication outlets of a high-profile and influential nature. In addition, the candidate should have a solid plan for future research of high merit. Within a candidate’s body of research, quality of research outputs and impact of research are considered more important than quantity, although a candidate’s level of research productivity is an important input to the promotion decision.

Potential indicators of quality and impact of research may include, but are not limited to, items such as academic and media citations, research awards, peer-reviewed presentations at conferences, presentations at universities or business/government organizations, journal editor

positions and editorial board memberships, inclusion of publications in doctoral syllabi at other universities, impact on business/government/non-governmental organization practices or regulations, and external grants. External grants with a programmatic research theme may supplement a candidate’s research record, but do not substitute for a candidate’s publication record, and are not required for promotion.

To demonstrate “excellence” in teaching for promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member should have achieved a position of national and/or international leadership in the practice and study of teaching. Thus, while important to the decision, it is not sufficient for a faculty member only to demonstrate teaching excellence within Indiana University for promotion to Full Professor. Indicators of national and/or international leadership may include published instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, cases), pedagogical publications (particularly data-based pedagogical research publications), and presentations on pedagogy at national/international conferences. Promotions to Full Professor on the basis of teaching excellence should reflect exceptional pedagogical, curricular, and instructional innovations since the candidate achieved tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Examples of these innovations include developing new courses and program curriculum, engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning, participating in pedagogical conferences and workshops, and mastering technologies and methods of modern classroom/online presentation and management. At the local Kelley School level, evidence for excellence in teaching includes student evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, teaching across programs and courses, assurance of learning assessments, and internal/external recognition for teaching excellence.

To demonstrate “excellence” in service for promotion to Full Professor, a faculty member should have achieved a position of national and/or international stature resulting from the candidate’s service activities. Distinguished contributions must be evident. Indicators of national and/or international leadership may include published materials, dissemination of service as evidenced by adoption or replication of services, recognition as best practices, and presentations on service at national/international conferences. These distinguished contributions could be administrative or institutional in nature or could arise through outstanding service to a disciplinary endeavor, governmental organization, professional organization, or other entity or cause with national and/or international reach and relevance. As members of a faculty of a professional school, faculty members at the Kelley School recommended for promotion to Full Professor based on excellence in service should have exhibited a high level of professionalism in their service both to the University and to one or more of its external constituencies. In addition, an excellent service record would include significant contributions at the local campus level in service activities such as the following: service on departmental, School, campus, or University committees; efforts to engage students with business professionals or with professional communities; leadership of or participation in departmental, School, or campus activities in support of teaching and student learning; involvement with student groups/clubs that facilitate student learning outside the classroom; and administrative service, if such an opportunity arose.

When a candidate for promotion to Full Professor relies on the balanced-case basis for promotion, the candidate seeks to present an overall record suggesting long-term benefits to the Kelley School and the University that are comparable to the benefits associated with a faculty

member who demonstrates excellence in a single performance area. To establish a balanced case, the candidate must demonstrate at least “very good/highly satisfactory” performance and contributions in each of the three performance areas (research, teaching, and service). 11
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For complete descriptions of the ratings available for use in assessing candidates’ performance and contributions in research, teaching, and service, see this document’s later section titled “Research, Teaching, and Service Ratings.”

**Procedures**

This section describes the procedures through which promotion to Full Professor recommendations are made. The promotion process in the Kelley School of Business is administered by the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the faculty candidate’s campus (Bloomington or Indianapolis). Various groups and individuals review the candidate’s performance throughout the promotion process, including Full Professor faculty members of the candidate’s department, the Full Professor members of the Faculty Review Committee, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the Bloomington or Indianapolis campus, and the Dean of the Kelley School. The assessments of all groups and individuals are reflected in memos. The Dean’s Office retains copies of all memos related to the promotion review, which are available for the candidate to view upon request.

The specific promotion processes vary slightly as a function of the candidates' appointment—Bloomington or Indianapolis. A general description of the process is shown below. For Indianapolis, the Department Chairperson role in the promotion process is carried out by the research coordinator(s) and faculty report to the Executive Associate Dean Faculty & Research.

1. **Annual Notification**

The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the Bloomington [Indianapolis] campus annually sends a notice to Department Chairpersons calling attention to the review process for promotions and indicating the deadline for receipt of department reviews and/or dossier materials in the Executive Associate Dean's Office. The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the Bloomington [Indianapolis] campus also provides annually, to all interested Associate Professors, an explanation of the relevant deadlines and procedures to be followed for promotion to Full Professor. Promotion recommendations may be initiated by the faculty members on their own behalf, by faculty colleagues, or by the Department Chairpersons after consultation with the Full Professor members of the department.

1. **Promotion Review**

11 For IUPUI candidates, campus guidance indicates “[i]t is understood that *peer-reviewed* scholarship is *required* for achieving a highly-satisfactory rating *in each area* of performance in a balanced case.” (pp. 30, 2020-21 IUPUI P&T Guidelines) (emphasis supplied).

* 1. During the spring and summer prior to the promotion review year, the candidate and the candidate’s Department Chairperson prepare and submit a complete dossier, including letters solicited from external reviewers outside of Indiana University.
  2. The procedure for soliciting external review letters for the candidate’s formal promotion review is as follows. In the late Spring of the academic year prior to the promotion review, the Department Chairperson submits to the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the relevant campus the names of individuals outside of Indiana University who the Department Chairperson and the candidate recommend to write a letter of evaluation (i.e., one per reviewer) for inclusion in the promotion candidate's dossier. Ten names of recommended external reviewers, along with an associated “information sheet” for each recommended reviewer, should be submitted in order to ensure the completed promotion dossier includes at least six external review letters. The candidate recommends five external reviewers, and the Department Chairperson recommends five external reviewers. The candidate’s and Department Chairperson’s lists must not share names in common. To ensure a high response rate, Department Chairpersons should contact potential reviewers in advance and only submit the names of individuals who have agreed to write an evaluation. Candidates for Full Professor must not contact potential reviewers. The Dean’s Office chooses a subset of the reviewers (typically eight) from whom to request review letters; the other reviewers are requested to submit letters only if one or more of reviewers initially requested to write fail to submit a review letter.

It is critically important Department Chairpersons and candidates for promotion select external reviewers who are knowledgeable about the candidate’s performance, have no past ties with the candidate that may influence their assessments, and are of the stature and experience to be worthy of being considered an expert in the field. Criteria for selection of reviewers include a reviewer’s rank, titled positions held, quality of the reviewer’s institution, editorial positions, administrative positions such as Department Chairperson or Associate Dean, and relationship with the candidate. Persons who served on a candidate's dissertation committee or who are coauthors, for example, would be inappropriate choices as outside reviewers.

* 1. The Full Professor faculty members of the relevant department review the candidate’s dossier, including the external review letters, in fall of the candidate’s promotion review year. If there are fewer than three Full Professors in the department with research expertise in the candidate’s basic discipline, the Dean chooses faculty members from another Kelley School department such that there are three Full Professors with research expertise in the basic discipline (hereafter referred to as “research experts”) to evaluate the candidate’s dossier and summarize the pros and cons of the research record. 12 The research experts
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12 See footnote 9 for the definition of “basic discipline.”

participate in the departmental discussion, but their assessment is not separately memorialized in the dossier materials or vote, unless there are fewer than three departmental faculty members eligible to vote, in which case the research experts also participate in the faculty vote in order to meet a minimum of three votes at the departmental level. As is the case with all other departmental faculty members, the views of research experts appear as anonymous components of the departmental faculty discussion in the memo summarizing this discussion.

At a meeting called for the purpose of discussing the candidate’s case, the Full Professors assess the candidate’s record and performance. Choosing from the four possible ratings identified earlier in this document, the Full Professors vote individually on the appropriate ratings to be assigned to the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. In addition, the Full Professors vote individually on whether to recommend, or not recommend, the candidate receive promotion. One faculty member prepares a representative memo summarizing the discussion and votes of the Full Professor faculty members. The memo, which is then included in the candidate’s dossier, must provide reasons for any negative votes recommending against promotion. Individual faculty members cannot include separate memos or letters in the dossier; all faculty members’ views, except for the Department Chairperson, are summarized in the department memo. All faculty members who participated in the discussion, including research experts (if applicable), may review the department memo to ensure their views are reflected. The Department Chairperson is responsible for ensuring all faculty members who participated in the discussion, including research experts (if applicable), have access to the department memo and any feedback is reflected in the memo.

The Department Chairperson prepares a separate memo for the candidate’s dossier summarizing the Department Chairperson’s personal views, assessments, and recommendation. The Bloomington Department Chairperson or Indianapolis Executive Associate Dean Faculty & Research then notifies the candidate of the recommendation of the department and Department Chairperson.

* 1. The Full Professor members of the Faculty Review Committee next review the candidate’s dossier, including the external review letters, and the department’s and Department Chairperson’s memos. At a meeting called for the purpose of discussing the candidate’s case, the members of the Faculty Review Committee assess the candidate’s record and performance. Choosing from the four possible ratings identified earlier in this document, the Full Professors vote individually on the appropriate ratings to be assigned to the candidate’s research, teaching, and service. In addition, the Full Professors vote individually on whether to recommend, or not recommend, the candidate receive promotion. One Full Professor member prepares a representative memo summarizing the discussion and votes of the Full Professor members of the Faculty Review Committee. Other voting members review and approve the memo as appropriately reflecting the discussion and votes of the Committee. The memo must provide reasons for any

negative votes recommending against promotion. Individual Faculty Review Committee members cannot include separate memos or letters in the dossier; all members’ views are summarized in the Committee’s memo.

Faculty Review Committee members who are in the same department as the candidate participate in the discussion and vote at the department level. They do not participate in the Faculty Review Committee vote, although they may participate in the Committee’s discussion of the candidate’s record, if such a member is a Full Professor.

* 1. The Dean of the Kelley School and the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research from the candidate’s campus then review the candidate’s dossier, including the external review letters, the department’s memo, the Department Chairperson’s memo, and Faculty Review Committee’s memo. The Dean, with input from the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research from the relevant campus, assesses the candidate’s research, teaching, and service, and makes a recommendation promotion be granted or denied. The Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research at the relevant campus notifies both the candidate and the Department Chairperson of the recommendations of the Dean and the Faculty Review Committee.

The full dossier is then forwarded to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs [Office of Academic Affairs – IUPUI] for review by the promotion advisory committee, the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs- Bloomington [Chief Academic Officer-IUPUI], and the Provost-Bloomington [Chancellor-IUPUI]. Final approval of the promotion decision rests with the President of the University and Board of Trustees.

* 1. If the department’s Full Professors, and/or the Department Chairperson, and/or the Full Professor members of the Faculty Review Committee conclude a particular candidate should not be recommended for promotion during a given year, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research on the relevant campus advises the candidate that they have the option to continue the review process with the campus-level and executive-level reviews. A candidate’s dossier is forwarded through the appropriate promotion processes, irrespective of unfavorable department or Department Chairperson endorsements that might be added to it, unless withdrawn by the candidate. Candidates petitioning for promotion to Professor may withdraw their request at any time prior to the decision at the executive level.
  2. All notices of denial of promotions are issued in strict conformance with Indiana University policy (ACA-38, Faculty and Librarian Promotions), as well as relevant campus policy.

# RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND SERVICE RATINGS

An earlier section of this document lists the ratings established by campus policies for use when a candidate’s performances in research, teaching, and service are being evaluated for purposes of tenure and promotion decisions. As noted earlier, the available ratings on the Bloomington campus are *Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory,* and *Unsatisfactory* for research and service, and *Excellent, Very Good, Effective,* and *Ineffective* for teaching. On the Indianapolis campus, the available ratings are *Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory,* and *Unsatisfactory* for all three performance areas. As a Core School, the Kelley School treats as equivalent the ratings of Very Good and Highly Satisfactory, Effective and Satisfactory, and Ineffective and Unsatisfactory.

Earlier sections of this document also outline the following Kelley School expectations regarding tenure cases and promotion-to-Full-Professor cases:

* Candidates for tenure should demonstrate *excellent* performance in research, at least *effective/satisfactory* performance in teaching, and at least *satisfactory* performance in service.
* Candidates for promotion from tenured Associate Professor to Full Professor are typically expected to demonstrate *excellent* performance in one of the three performance areas (research, teaching, and service) and at least *effective/satisfactory* performance in the remaining two areas, but in special cases, a candidate for promotion to Full Professor may qualify on the basis of a balanced case. A balanced case requires a demonstration of at least *very good/highly satisfactory* performance in each of the three performance areas.
* The Kelley School’s commitment to its mission, values, and goals is reflected in various performance evaluation assessments, including the consideration of a faculty member for tenure and/or promotion. Activities that enhance the Kelley School’s mission, values, and goals are recognized as part of a candidate’s performance, contributions, and achievements in research, teaching, or service. Activities contrary to the Kelley School’s mission, values, and goals may be considered as evidence of ineffective/unsatisfactory performance, contributions, and achievements.

This section of the document adds explanatory detail regarding the previously listed ratings, as applied by the Kelley School in tenure and promotion cases.

1. **Research Ratings and Related Explanations 13**
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The explanations below highlight the importance of a candidate’s national and/or international research *reputation/leadership*, which reflects the *impact* of a candidate’s research and arises in large part from the *quality* and *quantity* elements of a candidate’s research. The quality and impact of research outputs are considered more important than quantity, and the quantity of publications cannot substitute for quality and impact. However, the candidate’s level of research productivity (quantity), typically measured by the number of published academic

13 This section’s explanation of the *excellent* rating for research corresponds closely to the discussions of research ratings in the document’s earlier sections on tenure cases and promotion-to-Full-Professor cases.

journal articles, is an important consideration in the assessment of research ratings and a tenure and/or promotion decisions.

External review letters serve as an important source of information about a candidate’s research reputation/leadership, and their research impact, quality, and productivity. Potential indicators of productivity also may include, but are not limited to, analyses of the number of a candidate’s academic journal article publications (or subsets of those publications) relative to tenure or promotion candidates in the candidate’s basic discipline at peer or better institutions. Potential indicators of quality and impact of research may include, but are not limited to, items such as academic and media citations, research awards, peer-reviewed presentations at conferences, presentations at universities or business/government organizations, journal editor positions and editorial board memberships, inclusion of publications in doctoral syllabi at other universities, external grants, and evidence of research contributions consistent with the Kelley School’s mission, values, and goals.

With the above general comments as a foundation, the following paragraphs provide specific descriptions of each of the research ratings that may be assigned.

***Excellent*** (tenure cases*).* The candidate is well on the way toward achieving a national and/or international reputation for excellence in research in the candidate’s research field(s). The candidate has a programmatic body of research that demonstrates independent research contributions and has had, or is expected to have, significant impact on the research field. This body of research demonstrates progress beyond the candidate’s dissertation work and beyond research conducted with faculty members from the candidate’s dissertation-granting institution. The body of research also prominently features publications of superior quality in sought-after publication outlets of a high-profile and influential nature. External grants with a programmatic research theme may supplement a candidate’s research record, but do not substitute for a candidate’s publication record, and are not required for tenure. The candidate also has a strong foundation of research-in-progress and a comprehensive plan for future research of high merit (because the tenure determination is forward-looking in important respects).

***Excellent*** (promotion-to-Full-Professor cases). The candidate has achieved a position of national and/or international leadership and prominence in the candidate’s research field(s), with a documented and robust record of achievement and distinctions. The candidate has a body of research that demonstrates the candidate’s independent research contributions and has had significant impact on the research field. This body of research demonstrates significant growth in quantity and depth/quality of contributions beyond the candidate’s research record at the time of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate’s publications are consistently of the highest quality and regularly appear in sought-after publication outlets of a high-profile and influential nature. External grants with a programmatic research theme may supplement a candidate’s research record, but do not substitute for a candidate’s publication record, and are not required for promotion. In addition, the candidate has a solid plan for future research of high merit.

***Very Good*** [Bloomington] **/ *Highly Satisfactory* [**Indianapolis] (tenure cases)***.*** The candidate has made progress toward achieving a national and/or international reputation in

research in the candidate’s research field(s). The candidate’s research reveals independent contributions and the potential for meaningful impact on the research field. The research record includes high-quality publications in prominent publication outlets, but does not reach the level of an excellent pre-tenure record in terms of consistency in research quality and impact, frequency of placement in high-profile publication outlets, and/or level of productivity. The candidate has a research plan that suggests the potential for valuable future contributions. A rating of *very good/highly satisfactory* is appropriate when the candidate’s record easily surpasses the *satisfactory* level but does not rise to the level of *excellent*.

***Very Good*** [Bloomington] **/ *Highly Satisfactory*** [Indianapolis] (promotion-to-Full- Professor cases)***.*** Since being granted tenure, the candidate has made further progress toward achieving a national and/or international reputation in research in their field(s). The candidate’s research reveals independent contributions and has had meaningful impact on the research field. The post-tenure research record includes high-quality publications in prominent publication outlets but does not reach the level of an excellent post-tenure record in terms of consistency in research quality and impact, frequency of placement in high-profile publication outlets, and/or level of productivity. The candidate has a research plan that suggests the potential for valuable future contributions. A rating of *very good/highly satisfactory* is appropriate when the candidate’s record easily surpasses the *satisfactory* level but does not rise to the level of *excellent*.

***Satisfactory*** (tenure cases and promotion-to-Full-Professor cases). The candidate’s research performance--pre-tenure in tenure cases or post-tenure in promotion-to-Full Professor cases--suggests potential for eventual achievement of a national and/or international reputation in research in their field(s). The candidate’s research efforts reveal independent research contributions. Publications within the candidate’s record are of good quality but may not be as consistently high in quality as would be expected in order for a rating higher than *satisfactory* to be warranted. The publication outlets in which the candidate’s publications appear tend to be well-respected but are less frequently at the level of prominence seen in research records meriting a rating higher than *satisfactory*. The candidate’s level of productivity may also be lower than what would typically be expected for a rating higher than *satisfactory* to be warranted. Examination of the candidate’s research record leads to the conclusion the record is acceptable but below the level of *very good/highly satisfactory*.

***Unsatisfactory*** (tenure cases and promotion-to-Full-Professor cases). The candidate’s research performance—pre-tenure in tenure cases or post-tenure in promotion-to-Full-Professor cases—is at an unacceptable level. A rating of *unsatisfactory* typically stems from one or more of the following: the candidate has very few (or no) publications; the candidate’s publications tend not to be in respected publication outlets; the candidate has little or no work in progress and apparently no well-thought-out plan of research; the candidate otherwise shows few signs of potential for conducting high-quality research on a consistent basis; and the candidate’s activities are inconsistent with, or demonstrate unwillingness to contribute to, the Kelley School’s research mission, values, and goals.

1. **Teaching Ratings and Related Explanations 14**
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The explanations below highlight the importance of a candidate’s national and/or international teaching *reputation/leadership*, which reflects the *impact* of a candidate’s teaching activities and arises in large part from the *quality* and *quantity* elements of a candidate’s teaching activities. The quality and impact of teaching outputs are considered more important than quantity, and the quantity of teaching activities cannot substitute for quality and impact.

However, the quantity of a candidate’s teaching activities is an important consideration in the assessment of teaching ratings and tenure and/or promotion decisions.

External review letters serve as an important source of information about a candidate’s teaching reputation/leadership, and their teaching impact, quality, and productivity. Potential indicators of national and/or international reputation/leadership may include, but are not limited to, published instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, cases, grants, and similar materials), peer- reviewed pedagogical scholarship and publications (particularly data-based pedagogical research publications), presentations on pedagogy at national/international conferences, academic citations, teaching awards, editorial positions and editorial board membership at teaching- focused journals, teaching-related grants, contributions to local/national/international media related to teaching and pedagogy, blogs/podcasts, and evidence of teaching contributions consistent with the Kelley School’s mission, values, and goals.

Potential indicators of teaching quality and impact include, but are not limited to, teaching innovations, such as developing new courses and program curriculum, engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning, participating in pedagogical conferences and workshops, and mastering technologies and methods of modern classroom/online presentation and management. Potential indicators for teaching quality and impact at the local Kelley level include, but are not limited to, the following: student evaluations suggesting sustained high- quality classroom performance; assurance of learning data analysis and actions; peer evaluations offering well-developed analyses of the candidate’s teaching and rate it highly; teaching across programs and/or in multiple courses; internal/external awards and other recognition for teaching excellence; and evidence of contributions supporting the Kelley School’s teaching mission, values, and goals.

With the above general comments as a foundation, the following paragraphs provide specific descriptions of each of the teaching ratings that may be assigned.

***Excellent*.** The candidate has achieved a position of national and/or international leadership in the practice and study of teaching. Thus, while important to the decision, it is not sufficient for a candidate only to demonstrate teaching excellence within Indiana University. The

14 The teaching ratings described in this section are written for promotion-to-Full-Professor cases. The descriptions for each teaching rating apply to tenure cases as well; with the understanding tenure candidates should be “well on their way” to achieving the criteria, in contrast to having already achieved the criteria as is expected for promotion-to-Full Professor cases. The explanation of the *excellent* rating is consistent with the discussion of ratings in an earlier section of the document, but adds further detail.

candidate demonstrates leadership in teaching activities that occur external to the University and/or have clearly identified national and/or international impact.

The candidate’s teaching record reflects exceptional pedagogical, curricular, and instructional innovations. (When promotion to Full Professor is sought on the basis of teaching excellence, the innovations must have taken place since the candidate achieved tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.) The candidate’s teaching record also demonstrates exceptional performance in rank in teaching at the local Kelley School level in terms of high- quality sustained classroom performance based on strong student evaluations and peer assessments, teaching across multiple programs and/or multiple courses, and other teaching contributions supporting the Kelley School’s teaching mission, values and goals.

***Very Good*** [Bloomington] ***/ Highly Satisfactory*** [Indianapolis]**.** The candidate has carried an appropriate teaching load in terms of the number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed by the candidate’s department. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments should suggest the candidate, though not an outstanding instructor, fulfills teaching responsibilities well. Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues also view the candidate’s teaching favorably. The candidate has made meaningful contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy that is recognized beyond Indiana University. A rating of *very good/highly satisfactory* is appropriate when the candidate’s teaching record easily surpasses the *effective/satisfactory* level but does not reflect what would be necessary for a rating of *excellent*.

***Effective*** [Bloomington] ***/ Satisfactory*** [Indianapolis]**.** The candidate has carried the assigned teaching load. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments indicate the candidate is performing his or her instructional responsibilities at an acceptable level. Peer evaluations and other relevant evidence support the conclusion the instructor’s teaching, though adequate to fulfill instructional responsibilities and further the Kelley School’s teaching mission, does not warrant a rating of *very good/highly satisfactory* or *excellent*. A rating of *effective/satisfactory* may also be appropriate if particular problems with the candidate’s teaching have been identified, and the candidate has taken appropriate steps to address the problems and bring the candidate’s teaching quality to an acceptable level.

***Ineffective*** [Bloomington] ***/ Unsatisfactory*** [Indianapolis]**.** The candidate’s contributions to the Kelley School’s instructional mission are at an unacceptable level. A rating of *ineffective/unsatisfactory* typically stems from some or all of the following:

* Results from the student evaluation instruments generally indicate the candidate is not an effective teacher and/or there are significant student complaints about course organization, delivery, and/or teaching effectiveness.
* When problems have been identified, the candidate has demonstrated an unwillingness or inability to craft effective responses to address the problems, and there is a discernible lack of improvement over time and/or an inability to bring the teaching up to an acceptable level on a regular basis.
* Peer assessments confirm the candidate’s teaching quality falls below an acceptable level.
* The candidate demonstrates an inability to prepare a course that was new to them.
* The candidate demonstrates unwillingness or an inability, despite appropriate requests, to undertake assignments that would be helpful in addressing teaching needs at the department and/or School level.
* The candidate demonstrates unwillingness to participate in professional development to enhance their pedagogy or disciplinary knowledge and professional development to support the Kelley School’s teaching mission, values, and goals.
* The candidate demonstrates unwillingness or an inability to effectively work with others on the curriculum design in the candidate’s course area.
* The candidate has not completed instruments, analysis, and actions requested for assurance-of-learning purposes.
* The candidate is frequently absent without good reason or routinely is unavailable to meet with students during office hours or designated meetings.
* The candidate creates, fosters, or tolerates an unwelcoming or hostile classroom environment for students or particular groups of students.
* The candidate’s teaching and/or interactions with students is contrary to the Kelley School’s teaching mission, values and goals.

1. **Service Ratings and Related Explanations 15**
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The explanations below note the importance of *quality* and *quantity* elements in candidates’ service records. *Quality* takes into account such factors as the apparent value or importance of a certain service activity and the candidate’s role in that particular service activity. *Quantity* takes into account the number of service activities and the time commitment associated with those activities. A service record that seems substantial in terms of number of such activities and/or time commitment involved should satisfy the quantity element of the evaluation. As the preceding sentence suggests, the quantity element may be satisfied by a record of relevant service activities that may not seem extensive in terms of number of activities but is significant in terms of the time commitment involved or the importance of the service task. 16 On the other hand, the quantity element may be lacking when the list of relevant service activities seems both short and reflective of only minor time commitments.

15F

Potential indicators of national and/or international leadership may include, but are not limited to, published articles or other materials that are service-related (particularly peer- reviewed scholarship), published books/chapters/manuals, service awards, service-related best practices recognition, the receipt of service-related grants, presentations on service at

15 The service ratings described in this section are written for promotion-to-Full-Professor cases. The description for each service rating applies to tenure cases as well, with the understanding that tenure candidates should be “well on their way” to achieving the criteria, in contrast to having already achieved the criteria as is expected for promotion-to-Full-Professor cases. The explanation of the *excellent* rating is consistent with the discussion of that rating in an earlier section of the document but adds further detail. 16 Although a service record worthy of a highly favorable evaluation would normally be expected to reflect significance in terms of both quantity and quality, 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.

national/international conferences, contributions to local/national media, blogs/podcasts, grants, editorships, community leadership, and contributions that enhance the Kelley School’s service mission, values, and goals.

Indicators of significant contributions at the local campus level in service activities include, but are not limited to, service on department, Kelley School, campus, or University committees; efforts to engage students with business professionals or with professional communities; leadership of or participation in departmental, School, or campus activities that support teaching and student learning; involvement with student groups/clubs that facilitate student learning outside the classroom; administrative service, if such an opportunity arose; and evidence of service contributions consistent with the Kelley School’s mission, values, and goals.

With the above general comments as a foundation, the following paragraphs provide specific descriptions of each of the service ratings that may be assigned.

***Excellent*.** To demonstrate excellence in service, a candidate should have achieved a position of national and/or international stature resulting from the candidate’s service activities. Distinguished contributions must be evident. These distinguished contributions could be administrative or institutional in nature, or could arise through outstanding service to a disciplinary endeavor, governmental organization, professional organization or journal, or some other entity or cause with national and/or international reach and relevance. As members of a faculty of a professional school, faculty members at the Kelley School recommended for promotion to Full Professor based on excellence in service should have exhibited a high level of professionalism in their service to the University and to one or more of its external constituencies.

An excellent service record also may include, but is not limited to, significant contributions at the local campus level in service activities such as the following: service on department, Kelley School, campus, or University committees; efforts and contributions that enhance the Kelley School’s service mission, values, and goals; efforts to engage students with business professionals or with professional communities; leadership of or participation in departmental, School, or campus activities that support teaching and student learning; involvement with student groups/clubs that facilitate student learning outside the classroom; and administrative service, if such an opportunity arose.

***Very Good*** [Bloomington] ***/ Highly Satisfactory*** [Indianapolis]**.** In terms of quantity and quality, the candidate’s service record is strong, commendable, and recognized beyond the Kelley School. However, the record does not rise to the level necessary for a rating of *excellent* because it lacks the national stature element. Typically, a *very good/highly satisfactory* record reflects a significant number and range of student, department, School, or campus service activities of the sorts listed above. The *very good/highly satisfactory* record also contains evidence that certain service activities required a significant time commitment. Extended high- level service within the School in roles such as Department Chairperson or Program Chairperson roles may lead to recognition for a rating of *very good/highly satisfactory*. Such a rating is consistent with the notion that the candidate’s service contributions have significantly exceeded the *satisfactory* level.

***Satisfactory.*** The candidate’s service record is adequate in terms of quantity and quality, but not strong enough to warrant any higher rating. The candidate has completed assigned service responsibilities and has done so in an acceptable manner. However, the candidate’s record contains little or no evidence of instances in which his or her service performance exceeded minimum acceptability expectations for pre-tenure or tenured faculty members.

***Unsatisfactory.*** The candidate’s service record falls short of minimum standards of acceptability in terms of quantity and quality. The candidate has undertaken few service activities, rejected customary service assignments, failed to complete service assignments the candidate accepted, completed accepted assignments poorly, or is frequently absent without good reason. The candidate demonstrates an unwillingness or inability to collegially participate in events and seminars or demonstrates a habit of avoidance. The candidate’s activities are inconsistent with, or demonstrate unwillingness to contribute to, the Kelley School’s service mission, values, and goals. 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 for

pre-tenure or tenured faculty members.

**Table 1: Summary of Relevant Documents for Tenure and Promotion**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Bloomington | Indianapolis |
| University Documents - Tenure | ACA-12 – General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments  ACA-22 – Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period ACA-37 – Faculty and Librarian Tenure | |
| University Documents – Promotion | ACA-12 – General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments ACA- 38 – Faculty and Librarian Tenure | |
| Campus Documents – Tenure and Promotion | Bloomington Faculty Council – Principles and Policies on Tenure and Promotion  Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Reviews at Indiana University Bloomington, Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty & Academic Affairs | Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers  [https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/PromotionTenure/guidelines-and-standards) [Affairs/PromotionTenure/guidelines-and-](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/PromotionTenure/guidelines-and-standards) [standards](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/PromotionTenure/guidelines-and-standards) |
| Kelley School Documents – Tenure and Promotion | Kelley School of Business – Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion, & Annual Pre-tenure Reviews for Tenure-Track Faculty  Faculty Review Committee – Dossier Preparation Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty | |

**Table 2: Summary of Promotion and Tenure Procedures**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Faculty Appointment | |
| Bloomington | Indianapolis  The Department Chairperson role in  the promotion process is carried out by the research coordinator(s) |
| External Review Letter Recommendations | Department Chairperson prepares list of 5 potential external reviewers.  Candidate prepares list of 5 potential external reviewers. | Department Chairperson prepares list of 5 potential external reviewers.  Candidate prepares list of 5 potential external reviewers. |
| Solicitation of External Review Letters | Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research – Bloomington selects external reviewers from the lists and  solicits evaluations, in writing, from each designated external reviewer. | Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research – Indianapolis selects external reviewers from the lists and  solicits evaluations, in writing, from each designated external reviewer. |
| Administrative Advising and Responsibility for Dossier Preparation | Department Chairperson | Department Chairperson |
| Dossier Evaluation (Department Level) | (1a) Tenure - Tenured faculty  (1b) Promotion to Associate – Tenured Associate & Full Professors  (1c) Promotion to Full – Full Professors  (2) Department Chairperson | (1a) Tenure – Tenured faculty  (1b) Promotion to Associate – Tenured Associate & Full Professors  (1c) Promotion to Full – Full Professors  (2) Department Chairperson |
| Dossier Evaluation (School Level) | (1) Faculty Review Committee (Full Professor members only for promotions to Full Professor)  (2) Dean, with input from Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research  – Bloomington | 1. Faculty Review Committee (Full Professor members only for promotions to Full Professor) 2. Dean, with input from Executive Associate Dean of Faculty & Research   - Indianapolis |
| Dossier Evaluation (Campus Level) | 1. Bloomington Tenure and/or Promotion Advisory Committee 2. Vice Provost of Faculty & Academic Affairs - Bloomington 3. Provost | 1. IUPUI Tenure & Promotion Committee 2. Chief Academic Officer – IUPUI 3. Chancellor - IUPUI |
| Dossier Evaluation (University Level) | (1) President; (2) Board of Trustees | |

**Table 3: Summary of Pre-tenure Evaluation Process**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Years on Tenure 'Clock' | Bloomington | Indianapolis  The Department Chairperson role in the promotion process is carried out by the research coordinator(s) |
| 1st Year 2nd Year | Review by department’s tenured faculty members (including department  Chairperson) | Review by department’s tenured faculty members (including research  coordinator) |
| 3rd Year 4th Year | Review by (1) department’s tenured faculty members (including department  Chairperson), and (2) Faculty Review Committee | Review by (1) department’s tenured faculty members (including research  coordinator), and (2) Faculty Review Committee |
| 5th Year 'Dress Rehearsal' | Review by department’s tenured faculty members (including department  Chairperson) | Review by department’s tenured faculty members (including research  coordinator) |