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# Guidance Statement on the Clinical Rank in the Kelley School of Business (Indianapolis Campus)

The Kelley School faculty consists of faculty who hold tenure-track, clinical, and lecturer appointments, and all faculty are critical to the Kelley mission. The Kelley faculty have interests in teaching, academic scholarship, and service. The portfolio of faculty interests and skills collectively contribute to the success of the Kelley Indianapolis mission.

The Kelley School has academic appointments at the Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor ranks (hereafter, Clinical faculty). This document refers to many IU and IUPUI polices which provide guidance for Clinical faculty on roles and promotion procedures. Appendix 1 lists the IU and IUPUI policies referenced in this document. The Kelley Policy Statement provides greater interpretation, but is subordinate to the IU and IUPUI policies and may lag the IU and IUPUI policies. The IUPUI policies are the primary documents.[1](#_bookmark0) Such guidelines frequently are updated, and Clinical faculty should therefore make sure that they have the most current versions of the documents.

“The prefix “Clinical” is used for appointees whose primary duties are teaching students and residents/fellows and providing professional service in the clinical setting.” (*IU Policy ACA-14, Classification of Academic Appointments*).

IU Policy ACA-18 outlines rules and procedures regarding the appointment, reappointment, and non-reappointment of Clinical faculty. Clinical faculty appointments and any reappointments are governed by those policies, by all other applicable Indiana University and IUPUI Campus policies regarding faculty appointments and faculty members’ conduct, and by this Kelley School document.

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 through contacts with businesses, governments, professional societies, and other organizations.

1 The Academic Handbook has been replaced with IU Policies. <https://policies.iu.edu/> <https://policies.iu.edu/categories/academic-faculty-students.html>

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

# CLINICAL FACULTY

* 1. **Role and Responsibilities**

Clinical faculty perform an important role in meeting the teaching mission of the Kelley School. Their specific teaching responsibilities vary, depending primarily upon their educational and professional background and upon departmental needs. Teaching responsibilities will be focused on undergraduate and graduate level courses. Clinical faculty may also have organizational and oversight responsibility for the courses in which they teach. The standard teaching load for Clinical faculty will be 18 credit hours per academic year. This load may be adjusted depending on factors such as service responsibilities, 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, Clinical faculty are expected to participate in service. This service may include, but is not limited to, service on relevant Kelley School committees. 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. Eligibility for administrative positions is covered by *IU Policy ACA-18 Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments.* Clinical faculty may hold the positions of Program Chair for various Kelley Indianapolis programs (e.g., undergraduate, MBA, etc.).

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.

# APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS TO CLINICAL FACULTY POSITIONS

* 1. **Qualifications of Candidates; Hiring Decisions**

Clinical faculty will be expected to hold a terminal degree (e.g., PhD, DBA, or JD) within the discipline of teaching. Clinical faculty also must initially meet (and maintain) faculty qualification standards, as defined jointly by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), and the Kelley School of Business. [2](#_bookmark1) Candidates for Clinical faculty positions generally have the following characteristics: extensive business or government experience, or comparable professional experience (for instance, extensive experience in the practice of law), prior academic experience .

Clinical faculty can be appointed at the assistant, associate, or full levels.[3](#_bookmark2) Generally, rank is based on degree, academic experience, and prior performance that exceeds the expectations articulated in Section III Promotion in Rank. Initial appointments at full rank (*i.e.*, Clinical Professor rank), are seldom made. Regardless of the rank at which a Clinical faculty member is initially appointed, successful completion of the probationary period outlined in the immediately following subsection of this document will be expected before he or she receives a non- probationary long-term appointment (*IU Policy ACA-18).*

Kelley School policy requires a vote by appropriate members of the relevant academic department holding long-term appointments on whether to recommend to the Dean’s Office, that a certain candidate be hired for a Clinical faculty position.

* + - Faculty eligible to vote for hiring a clinical assistant professor position are the department’s tenure-related faculty (all ranks) and clinical faculty (all ranks).
    - Faculty eligible to vote for hiring a clinical associate professor position are the department’s tenured faculty, pre-tenure associate professors, clinical associate professors, and clinical professors.
    - Faculty eligible to vote for hiring a clinical professor are the department’s tenured faculty who hold the full rank and clinical faculty who hold the full rank.

Visiting appointments are used to fill 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

2 Generally, the terminal degree is within the area of teaching from an AACSB accredited institution. However, it is important to recognize that some non-business degrees may be relevant for teaching in certain disciplinary areas of business due to the subject matter content. From time to time, the AACSB or HLC change the classifications and definitions of classifying scholarly activity. Kelley School policies are updated to reflect new classifications and definitions. See the Kelley School of Business – Indianapolis policies related to the HLC faculty guidelines (1) Degree Equivalency for Business School Faculty, (2) Tested Experience” as the Equivalent of a Graduate Degree in Business, and (3) Policy on Faculty Qualifications in compliance with AACSB International Accreditation Standards Standard 15.

3 Appointment to a Clinical faculty rank is not a natural progression for faculty members holding a lecturer, senior lecturer, or teaching professor position.

a search. See *University Policy ACA-14*. Visiting clinical appointments typically have the same teaching load as non-visiting Clinical faculty. Voting by department members does not apply to instances in which the Executive Associate Dean makes a recommendation to hire a particular candidate for a visiting clinical faculty position. A visiting appointment normally cannot extend beyond two years. *University Policy ACA-14*.

# The Probationary Period

Clinical faculty members hired for full-time (non-visiting) positions receive an initial 3-year probationary 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. For further information on decisions regarding non-probationary long-term appointments and clinical faculty promotions in rank, see this document’s immediately following subsection (The Post-Probationary Period) and the document’s later Promotions in Rank section.

Continued strong performances by the Clinical faculty member in teaching and service constitute a necessary condition for a favorable reappointment decision during the probationary period. The Clinical faculty member’s teaching and service contributions will be the focus when the Executive Associate Dean prepares the written annual review and makes decisions on reappointments during the probationary period.

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 and maintain Scholarly Academic (SA) status, [as defined jointly by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the Kelley School of Business], as quickly as possible after their initial appointment. [4](#_bookmark3) The basis for qualification is described in the Indiana University Kelley School of Business Policy on Faculty Qualifications.

Although the focus in reappointment decisions during the probationary period is on whether the Clinical faculty member has continued to make strong contributions in teaching and service, 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 Clinical faculty member following the period of the initial 3-year appointment, notice of non-reappointment shall be given in writing at least twelve

4 To achieve Scholarly Academic (SA) or Professional Academic (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 Scholarly Practitioner (SP) or Instructional Practitioner (IP). SA, PA, SP, and IP are terms defined in AACSB documents. 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.

months before the expiration of an appointment.

For purposes of reappointment decisions, the probationary Clinical faculty member’s performance in teaching and service may be evaluated with reference to a number of relevant considerations. The following list of potentially relevant considerations for teaching and service is not meant to be all-inclusive. Neither are they meant to suggest that evidence pertaining to each consideration must be present in a clinical faculty member’s teaching or service record when that record is being evaluated. Considerations that may be taken into account for teaching include the following:

## *Teaching*

* Classroom and course performance
  + A record of sustained high-quality classroom performance as evidenced by student evaluation instruments
  + Peer observations/evaluations that offer well-developed analyses of the candidate’s teaching and rate it highly
  + Evidence of course rigor
  + Letters received from students (particularly unsolicited)
  + Teaching awards and other teaching recognition received
  + Results of instruments used for assurance-of-learning purposes
  + The faculty member creates or fosters a welcoming classroom environment for students or particular groups of students
  + The faculty member’s teaching and/or interactions with students is consistent with the School’s teaching mission, values and goals
  + Mentoring of students
* Curriculum development
  + Leadership of or participation in the development of School or departmental instructional goals and objectives
  + Participation in course or curriculum development or innovation
  + Development of new course materials for use in the faculty member’s own course, if those materials extend beyond basic or routine teaching materials
* Professional development
  + Professional development to support the School’s teaching mission, values, and goals.
  + Participation in teaching and learning development activities at the School,

University, or peer professional group level

* + Participation in Kelley School or University workshops and programs dealing with pedagogy
  + Maintenance (or acquisition) of professional certifications
* Dissemination
  + Development of new teaching materials for use beyond the faculty member’s own course, including textbooks, cases, instructor manuals, student guides, websites, videos, and other teaching media
  + Grants to develop new courses or revise existing ones, or to develop innovative teaching approaches
  + Publication of journal articles devoted to teaching or disciplinary scholarship in either peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed outlets
  + Presentations at local or national conferences about teaching or disciplinary scholarship issues
  + Mentoring of other faculty to help improve their teaching
  + Contributions to local and national news media outlets.
  + Contributions to the public welfare through teaching that calls upon a faculty member’s professional expertise in the discipline or as a teacher. Some examples include engaging students in community service or experiential projects, executive education, and/or significant participation/leadership in professional events or professional associations that focus on the practice of business, management, and related issues. Engagement in out-of-class pedagogical activities (such as advising or supervising students regarding independent studies)

Considerations that may be taken into account for service include the following:

## *Service*

* School and University Service
  + Service on department, Kelley School, or University committees
  + Efforts to engage students with business professionals or with professional communities (including, but not limited to, outreach activities and projects)
  + Leadership of or participation in departmental activities that support teaching and student learning
  + Leadership of or participation in activities that support the teaching mission of the Kelley School or the University
  + The candidate contributes to the School’s service mission, values, and goals.
  + Involvement with student groups/clubs in support of student learning
  + Support for student case competitions, including organizing the event, mentoring the student teams, or judging the competition
  + Administrative service, if such an opportunity arose
  + Engagement in School/University activities and events, including activities designed to attract students to the Kelley School and recognize accomplishments of Kelley students
  + Collegiality reflects the importance of working rapport among the Kelley community needed for the long-run effectiveness of the Kelley School in the research, teaching, and service elements of its mission.
* Community or profession service
  + Engagement in professional service such as leadership roles in academic organizations, reviewing, conference planning teams / track chairs / discussants, etc.
  + Engagement in service to the community in ways that call upon the faculty member’s professional expertise and teaching skills
* Dissemination
  + Grants to develop new programs or revise existing ones
  + Publication of journal articles/cases devoted to service
  + Presentations at local or national conferences about service-related activities
  + Contributions to local and national news media outlets.
* Recognition received for service activities (both internal and external)

**Dismissal within the Probationary Period**

Following the period of the initial appointment, the Executive Associate Dean or Dean may decide to exercise the Dean’s discretionary right to decline reappointment to a full-time clinical faculty position. 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 IU Policy ACA 18 and further explained in IU Policy ACA 52

# The Post-Probationary Period

1. ***Timing of Long-Term Appointment Decision.*** A Clinical faculty member hired with probationary status must undergo consideration for a non-probationary long-term appointment no later than the faculty member’s sixth year as a member of the Clinical faculty. Depending on a number of factors including prior academic experience and performance, the faculty member may be considered for long-term appointment in years four through six. If the process outlined below leads to a decision that the Clinical faculty member should receive a non-probationary long-term appointment, that appointment will supersede the terms of any previous appointment still in existence for the Clinical faculty member. The long-term appointment may be either a 5- year renewable appointment or a 3-year rolling appointment, but normally is the former. A Clinical faculty member who is not approved for a non-probationary long-term appointment will remain on the faculty for an additional year, which will serve as a separation year.
2. ***Relationship Between Long-Term Appointment Decision and Promotion Decision.*** Long-term appointment and promotion decisions are separate decisions, and they may occur at different times. Faculty hired at the clinical assistant or clinical associate professor ranks have the option to pair, or not pair, a promotion request with the long-term appointment decision. Faculty hired at the *clinical professor* rank are already at full rank. Accordingly, the required consideration of the faculty member for a non-probationary long-term appointment would not be accompanied by any promotion-related review. (For further information on clinical faculty

promotions, see Section III of this document.)

A clinical assistant professor or clinical associate professor qualifying for long-term appointment does not necessarily qualify for promotion. The long-term appointment process differs significantly as the promotion process includes external review as well as evaluation at both the campus, and university levels. Additionally, while published scholarship in teaching and service is a requirement for promotion (Section III - B), published scholarship in teaching and service can be considered, but is not required for a long-term appointment. For faculty who already holding a long-term appointment, promotion does not impact the long-term appointment cycle.

1. ***Criteria for Earning Long-Term Appointment.*** University Policy ACA-18 provides that Clinical faculty under consideration for a non-probationary long-term appointment are evaluated on the basis of their performances in teaching and service.

For purposes of long-term appointment decisions, the probationary Clinical faculty member’s performance in teaching and service is evaluated with reference to the list of considerations articulated in Section II(B).

* Classroom and courses performance
* Curriculum development
* Professional development
* School and University Service
* AACSB faculty qualification appropriate for rank and academic degree.

Dissemination, community or professional service, and external recognitions are beneficial for making a case for a long-term appointment but are not required. To earn a long-term appointment, a Clinical faculty member must be making good progress toward either (a) achieving a rating of *excellent* in one category of evaluation (teaching or service) and a rating of at least *satisfactory* in the other category of evaluation; or (b) demonstrating balanced strengths that indicate overall performance whose benefit to the University is comparable to the benefit contemplated under option (a). A Clinical faculty member has three options for the balanced case, Balanced-binned, Balanced Integrative DEI, or Balanced-Integrated.[5](#_bookmark4)

Faculty candidates undergoing consideration for the non-probationary long-term appointment shall choose either option (a) or option (b) as the basis on which they seek the long- term appointment (*i.e*., as the basis of the case). (Discussion of the review process appears in

5 Section IV of this document contains descriptions of the possible ratings that may be assigned to Clinical faculty members’ performance in teaching (*excellent*, *highly satisfactory*, *satisfactory*, or *unsatisfactory*) and the possible ratings that may be assigned to clinical faculty members’ performance in service (*excellent*, *highly satisfactory*, *satisfactory*, or *unsatisfactory*).

Section II(C)(4), below.)

1. ***Long-Term Appointment Decision: Procedure.*** The review process leading to the long-term appointment decision begins at the department level and continues through the steps outlined in the following paragraphs. As noted in Section II(C)(3), the candidate chooses either (a) or (b) as the basis of the case. All evaluating parties who participate in the review process, at whatever stage, assess the candidate’s record in light of the candidate’s chosen basis of the case.

Clinical faculty members who seek an initial non-probationary long-term appointment must prepare a dossier containing materials relevant to the determination of whether they have satisfied the necessary criteria under the chosen basis of the case. (See Section II(C)(3).) Thus, before any decision is made within the department or the Kelley School, Clinical faculty members should be notified that they will be considered for a long-term appointment and that within a reasonable period of time, such as six weeks, they shall submit the dossier for review by the appropriate department. The dossier will also be available to, and relied on, by those who participate in later stages of the review process. The dossier should include

* + Curriculum CV that follows the IUPUI format for promotion or their current CV along with copies of their DMAI during the years of probation
  + Candidate statement in which the candidates describe their philosophy of teaching and accomplishments.
  + Teaching evaluation scores and student comments
  + Syllabi from the prior or current academic year
  + A minimum of two peer evaluations,
  + Evidence of how the faculty member maintained their AACSB Faculty Qualifications,
  + Other evidence of teaching or service chosen by the candidate may be included, but are not required.

These dossier materials will be reviewed by the Clinical Faculty Review Committee and the Executive Associate Dean, which will both provide a written recommendation to the Dean of the Kelley School of Business as to whether the candidate should be appointed to a long-term appointment. If the decision is for non-reappointment, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year.

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

1. ***Renewals of Long-Term Appointments.*** If a Clinical faculty member receives an initial non-probationary long-term appointment under the provisions set forth in the above subsections, the appointment is subject to renewal for either a 5-year appointment or a 3-year

rolling appointment under the provisions outlined below.[6](#_bookmark5) The procedure is as follows.

During the semester prior to the last year of the long-term appointment (whether the initial non-probationary appointment or a renewal appointment), the Executive Associate Dean shall review the materials submitted as part of the annual review process. In order to justify recommending a clinical faculty member for a renewal appointment, the Clinical faculty member:

(a) should be making good progress toward excellence in one of the two areas of responsibility (teaching or service) and at least satisfactory performance in the other area; or (b) should be making good progress toward balanced case as defined in Section III(B); or (c) continuing to make strong contributions that exceed the standard of satisfactory in teaching and service as defined in Section IV. Dissemination, community or professional service, and external recognitions are beneficial for making a case for a long-term reappointment but are not required. In addition, clinical faculty with terminal degrees (e.g., PhD, JD) must continue to maintain Scholarly Academic (SA) status. The recommendation of the Executive Associate Dean shall be reported to the Kelley Dean’s Office, which makes the final decision on whether a renewal long- term appointment should be granted.

1. ***Non-Renewal of Long-Term Appointments****.* Non-renewal of a Clinical faculty member’s long-term appointment may be based on the faculty member’s failure to meet the requirements set forth immediately above. Factors such as funding constraints and changing programmatic needs may also lead to a non-renewal decision.[7](#_bookmark6) If the Kelley School declines to renew a Clinical faculty member’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 relevant appointment will be the separation year. Guidelines regarding non-reappointment decisions can be found in Sections 3b and 3c of University Policy ACA -22.

**Procedure.** If the decision is for non-reappointment, the last year of the appointment will be the separation year. If the Executive Associate Dean is considering non-reappointment as outlined in Section II(C)5, the Executive Associate Dean Faculty and Research may consult the Clinical 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

6 During the period governed by the initial long-term contract and any renewals thereof, the Executive Associate Dean shall continue to provide the Clinical faculty member written annual reviews that evaluate the faculty member’s performance in teaching and service during the preceding year. The annual review requirement thus applies not only during the probationary period but also during the post-probationary period.

7 See *University Policy ACA-18*. According to ACA-18, a non-renewal decision may also be based on the same grounds that would warrant dismissal from the faculty during the period of an unexpired long-term contract. See Section II(C)(7), below.

to the Dean regarding whether the faculty member should be reappointed for another multiyear appointment.

1. ***Dismissal.*** Dismissal of a clinical faculty member prior to the end of a long-term appointment (whether an initial appointment or a renewal appointment) can be found in *University Policy ACA-18.* Procedures for dismissal are similar for non-renewal of long-term appointments described in Section II(C)6.

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

# PROMOTIONS IN RANK

This section outlines policies dealing with promotions in rank for Clinical faculty members.

The policies may match or parallel those set forth in Section II’s treatment of long-term appointment decisions. Besides noting instances in which the same rules identified in Section II govern the promotion context, this section highlights instances in which there are different policies for the promotion context.

# Timing of Promotion Cases

As explained in greater detail in Section II(C)2, long-term appointment and promotion decisions are separate decisions, and may occur at different times. A promotion case may be instituted without being tied to the long-term appointment decision. Faculty members are not precluded from seeking promotion prior to a long-term appointment, especially in the case of a faculty member who held a similar or higher rank at a prior academic institution and exhibits significant performance in-rank at Kelley.

# Criteria for Earning Promotion in Rank

To earn a promotion in rank from clinical assistant professor to clinical associate professor or from clinical associate professor to clinical professor, the Clinical faculty member must meet the criteria specified in this section and Section IV. Clinical assistant professors or clinical associate professors qualifying for long-term appointment do not necessarily qualify them for promotion. Promotion standards are higher as defined in Section III(B). The process also differs significantly as it includes an external review as well as evaluation at both the campus, and university levels. To satisfy the promotion criteria, the Clinical faculty member must either:[8](#_bookmark7)

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

1. Achieve a rating of *excellent* in one category of evaluation (teaching or service) and a rating of at least *satisfactory* in the other category of evaluation; or
2. Demonstrate balanced strengths that indicate overall performance whose benefit to the University is comparable in value to the benefit contemplated under option (a). A Clinical faculty member has three options for the balanced case.
   1. Balanced-Binned: accomplishments distributed among areas, but not necessarily integrated among themselves. The balanced-binned case requires that the Clinical faculty member achieve overall excellence with a rating of at least highly satisfactory in each category of evaluation (teaching and service).
   2. Balanced-Integrative Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: an integration among accomplishments and an overall philosophy and achievement towards DEI. The balanced-integrated DEI case requires that the Clinical faculty member achieve overall excellence with a rating of beyond satisfactory in each category of evaluation (teaching and service). Compared to the binned case, any weakness in one category may be offset by greater strength in another category.
   3. Balanced-Integrative: an integration among accomplishments according to a specified philosophy or focus. The balanced-integrated case requires that the Clinical faculty member achieve overall excellence with a rating beyond satisfactory in each category of evaluation (teaching and service). Compared to the binned case, any weakness in one category may be offset by greater strength in another category.

Candidates undergoing consideration for a promotion in rank shall choose either option

(a) or, instead, option (b1, b2, or b3) as the basis their promotion case. All evaluating parties who participate in the review process, at whatever stage, assess the candidate’s record in light of the candidate’s chosen basis of the case. (Discussion of the promotion review process appears in Section III(C), below.)

For examples of considerations potentially relevant to the determination of whether the Clinical faculty member merits a teaching rating of *excellent* or *highly satisfactory* or *satisfactory*, see the listing in Section IV. That listing of potentially relevant considerations is meant to be illustrative and is not meant to be all-inclusive. Neither is it meant to suggest that evidence pertaining to each of the listed considerations must be present in order for a teaching rating of *excellent* or *highly satisfactory* or *satisfactory* to be warranted.

To be considered excellent in teaching or service on the IUPUI campus, the faculty member must have academic and/or professional *peer-reviewed scholarship* to support that area, either scholarship of teaching or scholarship of service. To support a balanced case, the faculty member needs academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching, service, or both.

In addition to their teaching and service contributions at Kelley Indianapolis, full-time Clinical faculty with terminal degrees (e.g., PhD, JD) who are eligible for Scholarly Academic (SA) status are expected to maintain SA status,[9](#_bookmark8) [as defined jointly by The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the Kelley School of Business]

# Promotion Decisions: Procedure

A Clinical faculty member’s promotion case normally begins after the candidate consults with the Executive Associate Dean. However, the faculty member may choose to initiate a promotion case.

The procedure followed within the Kelley School in Clinical faculty members’ promotion cases differs significantly from the procedure used in cases dealing with whether an initial non- probationary long-term appointment should be awarded. (See Section II(C)(4).)

Promotion cases include an *external reviewer requirement*. When a Clinical faculty member’s promotion case is launched, reviewers from outside the Kelley School and Indiana University will be invited to evaluate the faculty member’s teaching and service records. In light of the stated basis of the promotion case, the external reviewer will be asked to evaluate the candidate using the following scale: excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. (See Section IV’s discussion of promotion criteria.) External reviewers must be at the rank being sought or higher.

The process for identifying external reviewers calls for Executive Associate Dean and the promotion candidate to submit, to the Dean’s Office, separate lists of proposed external reviewers. The Dean’s Office then selects certain persons from each list, invites those persons to serve as external reviewers, and furnishes them materials that pertain to the candidate’s performance in teaching and service. The Dean’s Office also asks each invited external reviewer to furnish, by a certain designated date, a letter that evaluates the promotion candidate’s teaching and service performance and offers an evaluation of the candidate’s performance on teaching and service. The external reviewers’ letters will be included in the candidate’s dossier for review by various committees. (See the following discussion of procedural steps and stages.)

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

9 Faculty whose degree may not make a faculty member eligible for SA status, will be expected to achieve Scholarly Practitioner (SP) status.

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

The candidate’s dossier should follow the IUPUI promotion and tenure guidelines. These guidelines are subject to change, and candidates should review the latest IUPUI promotion and tenure guidelines.

* + CV in the IUPUI format
  + Teaching Evidence: The dossier should include a statement written by the candidate describing the philosophy of teaching. The dossier should also 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.
  + Service Evidence: 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.
  + For candidates seeking promotion based on an area of excellence, the dossier should include evidence of quality dissemination and academic and/or professional peer- reviewed publications in the area of excellence (teaching or service).
  + For candidates seeking promotion on a balanced case, the dossier should include evidence of quality dissemination and academic and/or professional peer-reviewed publications to support the specific type of balanced case.

The Kelley School’s commitment to its mission, values, and goals [10](#_bookmark9) is reflected in various performance evaluation assessments, including the consideration of a faculty member for promotion. Activities that enhance the School’s mission, values, and goals are recognized as part of a candidate’s performance, contributions, and achievements in teaching or service.

The candidate will be reviewed by the candidate’s department, the Executive Associate Dean, and the Clinical Faculty Review Committee, which will provide a recommendation to the Dean of the Kelley School of Business.

* + For candidates considered for Clinical Associate Professor, a Department faculty advisory vote will be taken with qualified colleagues who are eligible to participate; faculty holding long-term appointments with the rank of Associate Clinical, Full Clinical, Associate Professor, and Full Professor.

10 The Kelley School mission statement is available elsewhere and is not included in this document.

* + For candidates considered for Clinical Full Professor, a Department faculty advisory vote will be taken with qualified colleagues who are eligible to participate; faculty holding long-term appointments with the rank of Full Clinical and Full Professor.

To ensure consistency, the voting procedure used by the department shall be identical to the procedure used by the Clinical Faculty Review Committee, described in the paragraph below. 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 Clinical Faculty Review Committee and the Executive Associate Dean.

As part of the promotional process, the Executive Associate Dean will prepare a statement reviewing the candidate’s qualifications after having received input from the candidate’s department colleagues regarding the candidate’s teaching and service contributions.

The Clinical 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 one of the following conditions:

1. Achieve a rating of *excellent* in one category of evaluation (teaching or service) and a rating of at least *satisfactory* in the other category of evaluation; or
2. Demonstrate balanced strengths that indicate overall performance whose benefit to the University is comparable in value to the benefit contemplated under option (a). A Clinical faculty member has three options for the balanced case.
   1. Balanced-Binned
   2. Balanced-Integrative Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)
   3. Balanced-Integrative

The Clinical Faculty Review Committee’s vote shall be documented and supported by a written statement/report. The Department faculty advisory vote, the Executive Associate Dean’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. Once the Dean’s recommendation regarding the promotion case is added to the dossier, it is forwarded to the appropriate campus promotion and tenure committee.

1. ***Decisions Denying Promotion.*** When a candidate for promotion is not promoted, the Executive Associate Dean of Faculty and Research shall meet with the candidate to review the reasons for the non-promotion decision.

# TEACHING AND SERVICE RATINGS APPLICABLE TO PROMOTION DECISIONS REGARDING CLINICAL FACULTY

For promotion, candidates must be assessed as

1. excellent in teaching and at least satisfactory in service, or
2. excellent in service and at least satisfactory in teaching, or
3. demonstrative of balanced strengths that indicate overall performance whose benefit to the University is comparable in value to the benefit contemplated under options a or b.

To be considered excellent in teaching or service, the faculty member must have academic and/or professional *peer-reviewed scholarship* to support that area, either scholarship of teaching or scholarship of service. To support a balanced case, the faculty member needs academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship.

Scholarship is not defined in IU Policies or in the IUPUI P&T document (for reference, see the IUPUI 2020-21 P&T Guidelines). 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 clinical associate professor and clinical professor, the standard for excellence is stated as:

* **To associate:** Candidate will have led or been an essential part of endeavors with distinct and local outcomes. National or international dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of work.
* **To full:** The candidate will have sustained accomplishments and have achieved a national or international reputation through their work).

*“NOTE: Particularly for the 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.”* (p. 22)

Clinical business faculty are both academics and professionals. Thus, publicly disseminated and peer review of scholarship (e.g., publications, presentations, workshops) may include both the academic community and the professional community with whom Clinical faculty interact. Dissemination occurs at many levels. Unlike tenure track faculty[11](#_bookmark10) 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, blogs, material in media

11 The typical teaching load of a clinical faculty is 18 credit hours compared to a tenure track faculty member with a typical teaching load of 12 credits and an opportunity to reduce teaching loads by an additional 3 credit hours.

Because the teaching load and service engagement is greater for clinical faculty than tenure-track faculty, the volume of dissemination may be less and a wider array of outlets is considered.

outlets, and service learning. Teaching scholarship may include both disciplinary scholarship and pedagogical scholarship. Dissemination is evaluated based on its rigor and contribution; thus, significantly greater weight is placed on academically peer-reviewed scholarship.

# Teaching Ratings and Related Explanations

The possible teaching ratings listed below (Excellent, Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory) are the ratings set by IUPUI Campus policy.[**12**](#_bookmark11)This section of the document adds explanatory detail regarding those ratings, as applied by the Kelley School in cases where Clinical faculty seek promotion.[13](#_bookmark12)

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

Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues offer well-developed justifications for concluding that the candidate’s teaching performance is high in quality. The candidate has made valuable contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy. 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 listed in Section II(C)(2) of this document.

The Clinical 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. Teaching leadership may focus primarily on an individual path or may leverage activities across multiple paths.

12 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. The Kelley School treats the campus terms very good/highly satisfactory, effective/satisfactory, and ineffective/unsatisfactory as equivalent.

13 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 descriptions differ and the promotion context (faculty rank) influences what may or must be considered in a determination of whether a certain rating is warranted.

For promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, the candidate is establishing a position of 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. Indicators of leadership may include published instructional and disciplinary materials (e.g., articles, textbooks, cases, grants, and similar materials), pedagogical publications, and presentations at disciplinary and pedagogical conferences. Quality academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving an excellent rating. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

For promotion to Clinical Professor, the candidate has established a position of leadership in the practice and study of teaching. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

***Highly Satisfactory.*** The candidate has carried an appropriate teaching load as noted above (number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed) and teaching contributions support the School’s teaching mission, values and goals. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments (the numerically scored questions as well as the open-ended questions calling for narrative responses) suggest that the candidate, though not an outstanding instructor, fulfills the candidate’s teaching responsibilities well.

Unsolicited student letters express, or other similar indications suggest, that students hold a favorable view of the candidate’s teaching. Peer evaluations by faculty colleagues also view the candidate’s teaching favorably. The candidate has made contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy. A significant number of the considerations listed in Section II(C)(3) of this document indicate that the candidate is performing well in teaching, though not at the level of being outstanding.

For promotion based on a balanced case, quality academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving a *highly satisfactory* rating.

Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

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

***Unsatisfactory***. The contributions to the instructional mission are at an unacceptable level. A rating of unsatisfactory typically stems from one or more of the following:[14](#_bookmark13)

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

# Service Ratings and Related Explanations

14 The text’s list of potentially relevant considerations is not meant to be all-inclusive. One or more is meant to emphasize that evidence pertaining to each of the listed considerations does not need to be present in order for a rating of unsatisfactory to be warranted.

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.[15](#_bookmark14) The quantity element may be lacking when the list of relevant service activities seems both short and reflective of only minor time commitments.

With the general comments above 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 stature resulting from the candidate’s service activities. Distinguished contributions must be evident. Indicators of leadership may include published articles or other materials that are service-related, service awards, service-related best practices recognition, the receipt of service-related grants, 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 journal (examples include editorships, board positions, conference chairs, leadership roles of organizations), or some other entity or cause with regional and/or national reach and relevance.

An excellent service record includes 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 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.

For promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, indicators of leadership may include quality academic or professional peer-reviewed scholarship and presentations, published

15 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.

books/chapters/manuals, contributions to local/national media, blogs/podcasts, grants, editorships, community leadership, and/or other contributions to the dissemination of service contributions. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

For promotion to Clinical Professor, the Clinical faculty member demonstrates reflection, evidence of learning, scholarship in one or more areas, and leadership. Leadership may focus primarily on an individual path or may leverage activities across multiple paths. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

***Highly Satisfactory*.** In terms of quantity and quality, the candidate’s service record is strong, commendable, and recognized beyond the Kelley School. Examples may include academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship and presentations, published books/chapters/manuals, contributions to local/national media, blogs/podcasts, grants, editorships, community leadership, and/or other contributions to the dissemination of service contributions. However, the record does not rise to the level necessary for a rating of *excellent* because it lacks the regional/national stature element. Typically, a *highly satisfactory* record is focused mainly on department, school, campus-level, regional service, and efforts and contributions that enhance the School’s service mission, values, and goals. Such a record reflects a significant number and range of student, department, school, or campus service activities of the sorts listed above in the description of the *excellent* service rating. The *highly satisfactory* record also contains evidence that certain service activities required a significant time commitment. Extended high-level service within the school in roles such as program chair may contribute to recognition for a ranking of *highly satisfactory*. Such a rating is consistent with the notion that the candidate’s service contributions have significantly exceeded the *satisfactory* level.

For promotion based on a balanced case, quality academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is beneficial but not required for achieving a highly satisfactory rating in service. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

***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 service assignments given to the candidate and has done so in an acceptable manner. However, the candidate’s record contains little or no evidence of instances in which the candidate’s service performance exceeded acceptability expectations. Collegiality is a component of service, and it is a necessary condition for the candidate to be considered at least satisfactory in service.

***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 the candidate accepted, completed accepted assignments poorly, or is frequently absent without good reason. The candidate is unwilling or unable to participate collegially in events and

seminars, or demonstrates a habit of avoidance. The faculty member’s activities are inconsistent with, or demonstrate unwillingness to contribute to the School’s service mission, values, and goals. The candidate has failed to show improvement after being placed on notice that the candidate’s service performance was falling below the standards of acceptability. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: [16](#_bookmark15)

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

# Integrated Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Case and Integrated Thematic Case.

DEI candidates are evaluated on Teaching DEI Excellence only, thus teaching and service are not separately rated.

It is up to the candidate to articulate the ‘excellence’ of their activities in terms of aggregate innovation, scope, quality, and outcomes. The absolute number of activities will vary from person to person: one might have a variety of smaller-scale items, another person may have a particular large-scale item; one may tackle a small but very difficult problem; another may address a series of important but less challenging areas.

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

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

16 The text’s list of potentially relevant considerations is not meant to be all-inclusive. One or more is meant to emphasize that evidence pertaining to each of the listed considerations does not need to be present in order for a rating of unsatisfactory to be warranted.

with college prep, Upward Bound, etc.

* + - Applied work by faculty or by students guided by faculty, within the community that advances equity and other DEI goals, e.g. clinics of various sorts for underserved populations.
    - Design of study-abroad programs / internationalization of curricula that enhance cultural literacy.
    - Professional services directed at improvements for marginalized populations.
    - Community engagement in partnership with diverse and marginalized groups.
    - Publicly or community-engaged scholarship with diverse, marginalized or underrepresented groups and issues.
    - Significant unit service work related to DEI e.g. chairing committees and developing or providing DEI programming.
    - National service related to DEI
    - Policy work related to DEI

**For the Integrated Thematic Case** the signature activities should advance a particular aspect of the Kelley School Mission that enhances the reputation of both IUPUI and Kelley, but need not be classified or be based within traditional teaching categories. Activity categories exemplified in the DEI Integrated Case provide a guideline for the candidate in organizing their case. The category should be clearly articulated and discussed with the candidate’s department chair or equivalent supervisor.

# The remaining portion applies to both the Integrated Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Case and Integrated Thematic Case.

**A rating of Excellent is based on the following**

The candidate has carried an appropriate teaching load as noted above (number of courses/sections taught, course sizes, and willingness to teach new courses, as needed) and teaching contributions support the School’s teaching mission, values and goals. The results obtained from student evaluation instruments (the numerically scored questions as well as the open-ended questions calling for narrative responses) suggest that the candidate 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 and provide evidence that the candidate incorporates Integrated practices or activities into the classroom. The candidate has made contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy related to the Integrated case. A significant number of the considerations listed in Section II(C)(3) of this document indicate that the candidate is performing well in teaching

In terms of quantity and quality, the candidate’s service record is strong, commendable, and

recognized beyond the Kelley School. Examples may include peer-reviewed scholarship and presentations, published books/chapters/manuals, contributions to local/national media, blogs/podcasts, grants, editorships, community leadership, and/or other contributions to the dissemination of service contributions related to the Integrated case. The record is focused mainly on department, school, campus-level, regional service, and efforts and contributions that enhance the School’s service mission, values, and goals related to the Integrated case. Such a record reflects a significant number and range of student, department, school, or campus service activities of the sorts listed above in the description of the *excellent* service rating. The record also contains evidence that certain service activities required a significant time commitment. Extended high-level service within the school in roles such as program chair may contribute to recognition for service. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its impact related to the Integrated area. Where appropriate, the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to develop support for service activities. The faculty member’s activities contribute substantially beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University.

For promotion to Associate Clinical Professor, the candidate is establishing a position of leadership in their Integrated area. The candidate must demonstrate excellence beyond the Kelley School. Indicators of leadership may include published instructional and disciplinary materials (e.g., articles, textbooks, cases, grants, and similar materials), pedagogical publications, and presentations at disciplinary and pedagogical conferences. Quality academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving an excellent rating. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

For promotion to Clinical Professor, the candidate is establishing a position of leadership in their Integrated area. The candidate must demonstrate excellence beyond the Kelley School and IUPUI. Quality academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required for achieving an excellent rating. Dissemination to others is further defined in Appendix 2.

# APPENDIX 1. IUPUI Campus and IU Policies:

**Selected Specific Policies:**

* [University Policy ACA 12](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-12-general-provisions-academic-appointments/index.html) General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments
* [University Policy ACA-14](http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/academic-appointment-review/Classification-of-academic-appointments.shtml): Classification of Academic Appointments
* [University Policy ACA-18](http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/academic-appointment-review/Regulation-of-clinical-and-lecture-appointments.shtml): Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments [University Policy ACA-21](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-21-faculty-librarian-annual-reviews/index.html) Faculty and Librarian Annual Reviews
* [University Policy ACA-22](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-22-reappointment-non-reappointment-probationary-period/index.html) Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period.

[University Policy ACA-25](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-25-annual-reports-faculty-librarians/index.html) Annual Reports for Faculty and Librarians

* [University Policy ACA-38](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-38-faculty-librarian-promotion/index.html): Faculty and Librarian Promotions
* [University Policy ACA-52](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-52-permanent-separations-academic-appointees/index.html): Permanent Separations for Academic Appointees
* [IUPUI Faculty Guide](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/FCContent/Html/Media/FCContent/handbook/facultyguide2019-20.pdf) (Updated July 1, 2019): See pages 13 (Faculty Governance), 36 (The Academic Appointee), 48 (Reviews and Reappointment Procedures), 64 (Emeritus Policy), 67 (Grievances), and 82 (Policy on Conflict of Interest and Commitment)
* IU [Faculty Work](https://iu.box.com/s/xdvq5a5qlm0iwliqmeoh5ytd9wcofh52): This is a policy that governs all faculty and describes how they are to work.
* IUPUI 2021-22 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/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf

# Related Policies:

* [University Policy ACA-33](http://policies.iu.edu/policies/categories/academic-faculty-students/conditions-academic-employment/Code-of-Academic-Ethics.shtml): Code of Academic Ethics (Clinical appointments must adhere to this policy as well.)

**APPENDIX 2. Clinical Faculty Promotion and Scholarship Matrix, 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. Clinical faculty 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 Clinical faculty interact. Examples of types of activities are shown in Bold below. As noted in the previous sections, academic and/or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required for clinical promotion at IUPUI.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **Representative Clinical Faculty Scholarship Related To** | |
|  | **Teaching** | **Service** |
| **Business** | 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. Scholarship may include both quality academic and professional peer reviewed publications. Clinical faculty may also focus their scholarship on disciplinary scholarship as well as pedagogical scholarship. The different ways in which clinical faculty may choose to engage in the dissemination of their scholarship are described below.  Dissemination is evaluated based on its rigor and contribution; thus, significantly greater weight is placed on academically peer- reviewed scholarship. | 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 activities including presentations, publications in both peer and non-peer reviewed journals, professional publications, grants, serving on boards, conducting workshops, service learning, and running or establishing programs. The different ways in which clinical faculty may choose to engage in the dissemination of their scholarship are described below. Dissemination is evaluated based on its rigor and contribution; thus, significantly greater weight is placed on academically peer-reviewed scholarship. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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. | **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. |
|  | **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 rigor, 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 (when evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship) * 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. * Professional peer-reviewed scholarship. | **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 rigor, 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 their service * Reports and grants related to their service * Professional peer-reviewed scholarship. * 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. (when evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship) * Web pages or other electronic aids to facilitate service (when evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship) * Service contributions to the academy in the faculty member’s area that are evidenced by reports or other written   dissemination |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | * Contributions to local and national news media outlets. Some common examples include the *Indianapolis Recorder, Indianapolis Business Journal* (local)*, The Conversation* and *The Wall Street Journal* (national). While quotes are examples of excellent service, for publication the primary writer should be the faculty member. (When evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship) * Web pages or other electronic aids to facilitate learning and instructional techniques. (When evaluated by an editor, this is an example of professional peer-reviewed scholarship) * Contributions to social media, for example *Inside Indiana Business* (podcast, TV), featured posts (e.g., LinkedIN). * Assessments of 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. | * Contributions to the unit and IUPUI that are evidenced by reports or other written dissemination   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. |
|  | **Obtaining Grants Related to Teaching Activities.** 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. | **Obtaining Grants Related to Service Activities.** 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. |
|  | **Workshops**. 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 an | **Workshops**. 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, |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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. | internal to the campus, or external to the campus. |
|  | **Service Learning** 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. | **Service Learning** 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. |
|  | **Materials** that are innovative and used beyond campus: videos, CDs, modules with reviews or data that demonstrate impact can be viewed as public dissemination. | **Materials** that are innovative and used beyond campus: videos, CDs, modules with reviews or data that demonstrate impact can be viewed as public dissemination. |
|  |  | **Serving on Boards**. Being asked to serve on boards of businesses or non-profits can be viewed public dissemination of techniques or discipline specific material. |
|  |  | **Running or Establishing Programs for the University or Professional Organizations** 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. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Promotion from Assistant to Associate and Promotion from Associate to Full**  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. | **Promotion from Assistant to Associate and Promotion from Associate to Full**  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. |