



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Proposed Guidelines Changes combo

To see changes in their context, within the DRAFT-Changed document, you can do a word-search for

EDIT-Peer review

EDIT-Service

EDIT-NTT Scholarship

EDIT-Balanced

EDIT-Procedural

EDIT-Quality-Impact

EDIT-Proposal DEI NTT [not reproduced below because it exists in separate proposals.]

Blue indicates new language, strike-throughs are deleted language.

Table of Contents

1. Peer Review Summary.....	1
2. Service Summary.....	2
3. NTT Scholarship Summary	2
4. Balanced Case Types Summary	2
5. Procedural Notes.....	2
6. Quality-Impact Notes	2
1. Peer Review Details.....	3
2. Service Details.....	4
3. NTT Scholarship Details	11
4. Balanced Case Types Details	12
5. Procedural Details	19
6. Quality and Impact Details.....	20

1. Peer Review Summary

- Emphasize that external letter writers for promotion or tenure cases must be primarily academic.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- Allow for *either* professional *or* academic peer-review for appropriate items. Research items will tend to have academic peer-review. Teaching or service items may have professional peer review.

2. Service Summary

Re-define service as more than the provision of professional services to clients; broader definition includes administration. Clarifies again the distinction between university service, expected of all (except research scientists), and service as an area of excellence (or part of a balanced case.)

3. NTT Scholarship Summary

Clarify that scholarship for clinical and lecturer-rank faculty can be anything that they demonstrate *supports* their teaching and service activities.

4. Balanced Case Types Summary

- Incorporate an expanded view of ‘service’ (see that section).
- Add a balanced-integrative case (not DEI). In this case items need not be labelled as exclusively one of the three areas but all three areas must be addressed.
 - Requirement of peer-reviewed dissemination in each area is removed. Emphasis remains on cumulative excellence and an essential element of excellence is dissemination.
- Redefine the balanced-binned case as *not* integrative but allow for areas of emphasis to occur in two out of three areas vs. an expected equality between all three areas.
- For balanced-integrative DEI, balanced-integrative, and balanced-binned, present top-level (unified, consistent) criteria as a *cumulative and overall* excellent value to the university, with (for full) sustained excellence and a national reputation.
- Parallels in the clinical cases (lecturers cannot be ‘balanced’).

5. Procedural Notes

These typically come about because of editing: when one section is moved or changed, another section that used to follow or depended upon it may need a note added.

This also includes guidelines for external evaluator materials.

6. Quality-Impact Notes

Considerations candidates can address when presenting evidence of the quality and impact of their work; applies to both scholarly work (e.g. articles, citations) and administrative, programmatic, and initiative-based work: illustrative not exhaustive.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

1. Peer Review Details

- Emphasize that external letter writers for promotion or tenure cases must be primarily academic.
- Allow for *either* professional *or* academic peer-review for appropriate items. Research items will tend to have academic peer-review. Teaching or service items may have professional peer review.

In section, Institutional Values

Peer Review

- The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, and service is the bedrock on which promotion and/or tenure decisions are based.
- This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. **EDIT-Peer review.** Professional peer review as well as academic may be appropriate for clinical, lecturer, and parts of tenure-track faculty and librarian work.
- At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed. **EDIT-Peer review.** Review by peers from the academy is required for promotion for faculty members, and for tenure for tenure-track faculty and librarians. One or two external reviewers may be non-academic as long as they are qualified for the subject matter and can assess the faculty member's total record in light of their academic rank and responsibilities.
- These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research and creative activity, or service, and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

In section, Clinical Faculty Balanced Case

- **EDIT Peer review:** It is understood that academic or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required to demonstrate overall excellence for achieving a highly satisfactory rating in each area of performance in a balanced case. (Language adapted from IU policy on balanced cases.)

In section, Teaching Professor criteria

- For teaching professor:
 - **EDIT-NTT Scholarship.** The above, **EDIT-Procedural** on a sustained level of excellence, plus academic or professionally peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship that supports relevant to teaching and learning



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

2. Service Details

Re-define service as more than the provision of professional services to clients; broader definition includes administration. Clarifies again the distinction between university service, expected of all (except research scientists), and service as an area of excellence (or part of a balanced case.)

In section, Definitions

Service

EDIT-Service

All tenure-track faculty, tenure-track librarians, clinical faculty, and lecturer faculty have responsibilities for university service. University service supports and develops IUPUI and its schools and units. Most tenure-track faculty and librarians, as well as some clinical faculty, also participate in disciplinary service which supports and develops the research and professional goals of their discipline.

- ~~The distinction between professional service and service to the university requires some elaboration.~~
 - ~~Faculty and librarian service to the university through committees and administration is important and required. The community of scholars depends on the mutual responsibility of individuals to support and develop the institution that sustains them.~~
- Satisfactory service means being a contributing member of the campus and disciplinary communities. It must be a factor in promotion and tenure these considerations, because unsatisfactory service to the university may preclude successful application for promotion and/or tenure.
 - ~~Administrative service that uses disciplinary expertise for innovative or successful achievements reviewed by peers may be offered as evidence of achievement of excellence in professional service when such work:~~
 - ~~Has been planned and stipulated in advance;~~
 - ~~When it is derived from the mission of the unit;~~
 - ~~when it is disseminated to a broader audience; and~~
 - ~~When it is peer reviewed.~~
- Not all committee service is equal.
 - Some committees, such as an Institutional Review Board, the Committee on Ethics in Research, campus Promotion and Tenure, or a Faculty Board of Review, may require extensive time commitments and may address principles or issues fundamental to the continued effectiveness of the campus. These special features need to be recognized.
- The primary committee, chair, unit committee, and dean are best able to assess the degree of performance of university service.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- If it is deemed inadequate or unsatisfactory, this fact should be noted, and an evaluation based on the documented record of performance should be included in the dossier when it is forwarded to the campus level for review. The candidate must be informed and be provided an opportunity to respond prior to a final recommendation at the primary and unit levels.
- Service when it contributes to overall excellence (the balanced cases) or as an area of excellence (service-excellence cases) is discussed *elsewhere*.

In section, Tenure Track Faculty Criteria

EDIT-Service Service-excellent-tenure-track

- ~~Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work; awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received.~~
- Service when presented as evidence for excellence can involve any of the following:
 - Work with or for individuals as clients or patients.
 - Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners.
 - Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit's teaching, research, or service missions.
- Service must be ~~academic~~ significant work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of advanced relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - ~~Contributions to a body of knowledge;~~
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of quality and impact.
 - Disseminating their work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong support for a case for excellence.
- If service involves patients or clients, the candidate must document ~~how their work exceeds normative levels of activity and quality and~~ is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. ~~In all cases~~ Overall, this work must have



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

would demonstrate impact beyond the direct recipient of the service through appropriate professional or academic peer-review dissemination activities.

- ~~Be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities~~
 - Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care. Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
 - Faculty presenting administrative, committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate distinctive outcomes and evidence of quality. ~~that it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work.~~
 - ~~Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as academic work.~~
 - Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:
 - External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service, including refereed and non-refereed publications or other means of dissemination.
 - Appropriate evaluation of ongoing activities may be accomplished by professional or academic peers. For external evaluators for the promotion or tenure case, ~~While some peers may come from the practice community,~~ a majority of evaluators should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. ~~These evaluators can assess the entirety of the candidate's case within academic responsibilities and expectations.~~ Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at "arm's length" or independent as described in the section on External Assessment.
 - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
 - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
 - Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.
 - Also: acceptable university service
 - For associate rank: Emerging national reputation
 - For full rank: A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank.
-



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

In section, Clinical Faculty criteria, this is the entire service-excellence section.

Service-excellent-clinical

- EDIT-Service

- ⊖ When service is presented as an area of excellence, it consists of significant contributions that clearly go beyond satisfactory university or organizational service (see Service in Definitions.) demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work; awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received. Service must be academic work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - Contributions to a body of knowledge;
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of impact
- Service when presented as evidence for excellence can involve any of the following:
 - Work with or for individuals as clients or patients.
 - Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners.
 - Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit's teaching, research, or service missions. Administrative work primarily concerned with teaching may be presented as "service" or as "teaching" excellence.
- Service must be ~~academic~~ significant work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of advanced relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - Contributions to a body of knowledge;
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of quality and impact.
 - Disseminating their work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong support for a case for excellence.
 - EDIT-NTT Scholarship. Some disseminated scholarship is required for excellence in service. The candidate must address how their scholarship advances their service and documents their excellence. Precise distinctions between "research" scholarship and "service" scholarship are



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

not necessary for clinical faculty as long as their disseminated scholarship supports their accomplishments.

- If service involves patients or clients, the candidate must document ~~how their work exceeds normative levels of activity and quality and~~ is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. ~~In all cases~~ Overall, this work ~~must have~~ would demonstrate impact beyond the direct recipient of the service through appropriate professional or academic peer-review dissemination activities.
 - ~~Be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities~~
- Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care. Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
- Faculty presenting administrative, committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate distinctive outcomes and evidence of quality. ~~that it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work.~~
 - ~~Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as academic work.~~
- Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:
 - ~~External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service, including refereed and non-refereed publications or other means of dissemination.~~
 - Appropriate evaluation of ongoing activities may be accomplished by professional or academic peers. For external evaluators for promotion, ~~While some peers may come from the practice community,~~ a majority of evaluators should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. These evaluators can assess the entirety of the candidate's case within academic responsibilities and expectations. ~~Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at "arm's length" or independent as described in the section on External Assessment.~~
 - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
 - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.
- Also: acceptable university service
- ~~For associate rank: record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in service~~
- ~~For full rank: record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in service [redundant with above]~~
- 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.

In section, Candidate Statement

- **EDIT-Service.** ~~Candidates who seek advancement based on excellence in professional service should be able to demonstrate that such service is, in fact, academic work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers. The application of criteria to professional service should be clear, and professional service must be clearly related to the mission of the university, campus, and school/unit. [Delete: no other area of excellence has such a stipulation.]~~

In the section, Dossier Folders

EDIT-Service

- ~~Service as an area of excellence is distinctly different from satisfactory service to the unit, university, and profession.~~ For tenure-track faculty whose area of excellence is research or teaching, satisfactory service is required, for both university and profession or discipline; it may or may not involve the public. For clinical faculty whose area of excellence is teaching, or lecturer-rank faculty, satisfactory service is required, and may take the form of campus and university service; it may or may not involve the public or the profession/discipline.
- When service is presented as an area of excellence, it consists of significant contributions that clearly go beyond satisfactory university or organizational service (see Service in Definitions.)
- Service when presented as evidence for excellence can involve any of the following:
 - Work with or for individuals as clients or patients.
 - Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners.
 - Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit's teaching, research, or service missions. Administrative work primarily concerned with teaching may be presented as "service" or as "teaching" excellence.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- Service must be ~~academic~~ **significant** work characterized by the following:
 - Command and application of **advanced** ~~relevant~~ knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;
 - ~~Contributions to a body of knowledge;~~
 - Imagination, creativity, and innovation;
 - Application of ethical standards;
 - Achievement of intentional outcomes; and
 - Evidence of **quality and** impact.
 - **Disseminating their work as a model for other institutions or practitioners is strong support for a case for excellence.**
 - **EDIT-NTT Scholarship.** Some disseminated scholarship is required for excellence in service. The candidate must address how their scholarship advances their service and documents their excellence. Precise distinctions between “research” scholarship and “service” scholarship are not necessary for clinical faculty as long as their disseminated scholarship supports their accomplishments.
-
- ~~Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:~~
 - ~~The public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);~~
 - ~~The profession or discipline; and~~
 - ~~The campus and university~~
- ~~Professional service, including professional service in the community and patient or client services, is characterized by those activities conducted on behalf of the university that apply the faculty member’s and librarian’s disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge of interrelated fields to issues in society. [See **Definitions** section.] Professional service to clients and patients as well as to the discipline may be local, regional, national, or international.~~
- ~~To be the basis for tenure or for advancement in rank, that is, to be an area of excellence for tenure track or clinical faculty, university and professional service must be directly linked to the unit and campus mission; the quality and impact of professional service must be evaluated within this context and must be assessed as academic work characterized by the following:~~
 - ~~Command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise;~~
 - ~~Contribution to a body of knowledge;~~
 - ~~Imagination, creativity and innovation;~~
 - ~~Application of ethical standards;~~
 - ~~Achievement of intentional outcomes; and~~
 - ~~Evidence of impact.~~
- Faculty claiming excellence in service, whose professional service consists primarily of patient or client service, must document how their work ~~exceeds normative levels of activity and quality and~~ is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. ~~In all cases, this work must~~ **will demonstrate** impact beyond the direct recipient of the service **through appropriate professional or academic peer-review dissemination activities.**; and

~~○ Be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities.~~

- ~~• Excellence in professional service ordinarily results in the dissemination of results and findings through appropriate publication, whether in print or electronic media. The journals, books, or web documents in which faculty publish the results of their service activities should be assessed and evaluated by department chairs (or deans) in the same manner as they are for research or teaching publications. Publications, presentations, and grant documentation related to service is included in the dossier in the service section, not in the research section.~~
- As with research, professional service may span traditional disciplinary boundaries. In such cases, candidates and chairs or deans may wish to develop appropriate procedures (e.g., a specially composed primary committee) to ensure that the nature of interdisciplinary professional service is fully and adequately understood and assessed.

3. NTT Scholarship Details

Clarify that scholarship for clinical and lecturer-rank faculty can be anything that they demonstrate *supports* their teaching and service activities.

In section, Clinical Faculty (criteria)

- Clinical faculty may not present “research” as a case for promotion. **EDIT-NTT Scholarship.** **Disseminated scholarship is a requirement; the candidate would demonstrate how their scholarship supports their teaching, their service, or both.**
-

In this section, Clinical Faculty, service-area-of-excellence

- **EDIT-NTT Scholarship.** Some disseminated scholarship is required for excellence in service. The candidate must address how their scholarship advances their service and documents their excellence. Precise distinctions between “research” scholarship and “service” scholarship are not necessary for clinical faculty as long as their disseminated scholarship supports their accomplishments. Per IU policy, scholarship labelled as research may not be presented as evidence of excellence for a non-tenure track faculty member.
-



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

In this section, Clinical faculty, teaching-area-of-excellence

- Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence [in teaching] for clinical and tenure-track faculty.
 - **EDIT-NTT Scholarship.** Clinical faculty must have disseminated scholarship. This scholarship need not address pedagogical theory or techniques. The candidate must demonstrate how the scholarship supports their teaching and their case for teaching excellence.

In section, criteria for Teaching Professor:

- For teaching professor:
 - Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship **EDIT-NTT Scholarship which supports** in teaching

In the section, Dossier folders, Teaching

- **EDIT: NTT Scholarship.** Evidence of **the use of scholarship to support teaching.** ~~effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media.~~ Dissemination is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence for tenure-track and clinical faculty, and for the rank of teaching professor. Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
 - Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in teaching should have peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning.
 - **Clinical faculty using teaching as an area of excellence and lecturer faculty may use different forms of scholarship, not limited to contributions to scholarship of teaching and learning, in so far as those works of scholarship demonstrably advance their teaching.**

4. Balanced Case Types Details

- Incorporate an expanded view of 'service' (see that section).
- Add a balanced-integrative case (not DEI). In this case items need not be labelled as exclusively one of the three areas but all three areas must be addressed.
- Redefine the balanced-binned case as *not* integrative but allow for areas of emphasis to occur in two out of three areas vs. an expected equality between all three areas.
 - Requirement of peer-reviewed dissemination in each area is removed. Emphasis remains on cumulative excellence and an essential element of excellence is dissemination.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- For balanced-integrative DEI, balanced-integrative, and balanced-binned, present top-level (unified, consistent) criteria as a *cumulative and overall* excellent value to the university, with (for full) sustained excellence and a national reputation.
 - Parallels in the clinical cases (lecturers cannot be 'balanced').
-

In section, Tenure Track Criteria (case types.). *The Balanced-Integrative Case was not edited at all (it will show in black)—the whole section is included here for clarity and context.*

EDIT-Balanced

At IUPUI, candidates may present a single-area-of-excellence or a balanced case for promotion or tenure. In all balanced cases, the candidate must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in the areas of responsibility that pertain to their faculty types. The sum total of all of their accomplishments across all areas ("balanced strengths") adds up to an excellence that is "of comparable benefit to the university" as a single-area case ([ACA-38.](#))

An individual faculty member's career and accomplishments may be more or less integrated across teaching, research and service. Those who primarily see themselves as experts or focused on one of these should choose the single-area case type.

The balanced type of case includes each of these:

Balanced-binned: accomplishments distributed among areas, but not necessarily integrated among themselves.

Balanced-Integrative Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: an integration among accomplishments and an overall philosophy and achievement towards DEI.

Balanced-Integrative: an integration among accomplishments according to a specified philosophy or focus.

Top-level expectations for all balanced cases¹:

The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of activities: "In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university." (ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions)

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.

Balanced-binned case

In this case type, the candidate's activities and accomplishments are *not* concentrated in one area, but are distributed among all three, although not necessarily to the same degree in each. The candidate must demonstrate that their work constitutes clearly more than satisfactory accomplishment in at least two of the three areas, with convincing evidence of significant peer-evaluated impact and quality. Not all candidates would have all example items in each area as

¹ Adapted from the approved Integrative DEI case



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

listed. Cases would be expected to show a greater number and quality in at least two of the areas. Candidates must clearly identify their signature accomplishments and areas of emphasis.

~~Balanced case binned highly satisfactory tenure track~~

- In this type of case, all activities are labelled and discussed as belonging to one of research, teaching, or service (“binned.”)
- **In the area of research,** ~~Balanced case highly satisfactory research tenure track~~
 - The candidate’s work has attracted favorable **academic** peer review and commentary notes promise. ~~Some level of national~~ **Significant** ~~peer reviewed~~ dissemination of scholarship is required.
 - Successful grant and external support have been obtained [as appropriate for scholarship and departmental expectations] and continuing efforts and promise are documented.
 - ~~Regular local and external peer review; regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and dissemination has occurred. [redundant]~~

In the area of teaching, ~~Balanced case highly satisfactory teaching tenure track~~ **evidence of accomplishment that is clearly beyond satisfactory can include:**

- Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for **extraordinarily** effective and innovative instruction.
- Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes.
- **Where applicable,** mentoring and advising **document** important impact and student achievement ~~documented~~.
- Scholarly activities **demonstrate,** ~~including awards:~~
 - Evidence of regular and significant local/regional/**national** peer reviewed dissemination contributing to pedagogy in the discipline or profession. ~~of good practice. Recognition of high quality of teaching.~~
 - Grants, ~~or~~ awards at the department, ~~or~~ campus **or national** level. ~~[Candidates need not have awards, but all balanced binned cases must have peer reviewed dissemination.]~~
 - **Work with national or international bodies on standards, protocols, assessment, accreditation, etc., oriented towards university teaching, may be placed here or in Service.**
- Professional development efforts in teaching:
 - High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers.
 - Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues. Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments.
- **In the area of service,** ~~Balanced case highly satisfactory service tenure track~~ **some of these would be evident:**
 - University (**campus, school, unit**) service:



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance by Faculty Council) “wrote a policy that was approved by committee” “not required or expected.”
- Played a major role in initiative over a period of time that contributed to campus or unit goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others.
- Service to discipline:
 - Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants); “organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered”;
 - Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to discipline’s goals or organization’s mission, with independent evidence of significance, impact, role, and effective communication to others.
 - Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required.
- Service to community organizations, [governmental bodies](#), etc.:
 - Accompanied by independent evidence of impact. “chaired a committee of a board that accomplished X, Y, and Z”; “played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization.”
 - Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to community goals, with independent evidence of the significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others.

Balanced-Integrative Case-Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion-Tenure-Track

- Top level expectation: The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities aligned with diversity, equity, and inclusion, consistent with IU policy on balanced cases: “In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.” (ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions)
 - To associate: Candidate will have led or been an essential part of endeavors with distinct and demonstrable local outcomes. Local refers to either or both of campus/university and local community. National or international dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of work.
 - To full: The candidate will be seen as a local leader and will also have achieved a national or international reputation through their work.
- Integrative Excellence in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: The following should be evident, using multiple sources of information.
 - Diversity, equity, and inclusion: The candidate articulates a philosophy² of diversity, equity, and inclusion, including if appropriate any specifically targeted aspect.

² Similar to the requirement for a teaching philosophy in teaching excellence cases (which is incorporated into the candidate statement or presented separately.)



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- Integrated activity: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUPUI faculty member in teaching, research, and service which demonstrably support and advance diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidates need to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
- Scholarly³ impact: Often but not exclusively facilitated by peer-reviewed dissemination⁴; a variety of venues for dissemination are accepted.
- Local impact: Effective evaluation of diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives should demonstrate distinct outcomes. Tying to unit (program, department, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact (e.g., contributing to a local community's using professional expertise, recruiting diverse students to undergraduate or graduate programs, diversifying curricula, etc.).
- Increasing development over time. A candidate's statement should describe plans for the future.

Balanced-Integrative Case-Tenure Track

In this case type, the candidate's activities and accomplishments are interrelated, usually around some theme or philosophy. Individual items need not be labelled or separated as belonging exclusively to teaching, research, or service. However, the candidate should demonstrate how teaching, research, and service are expressed by the items: for example, a particular grant may have both teaching and research aspects or a publication may advance disciplinary knowledge (research) and but also be a result of collaboration with practitioners (service). Candidates will state their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated impact and quality.

- IUPUI P&T Guidelines (section I above, "Institutional Values") name five areas with "should have that work acknowledged and rewarded in the review process":
 - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (see Balanced-Integrative-DEI case above)
 - Civic Engagement
 - Teaching: Profiles of Learning for Undergraduate Success, RISE to the IUPUI Challenge/Experiential Learning, University College.

Balanced-Integrative cases may address one of these values as their philosophy, but this list is not exhaustive. The strongest cases will be tied to unit missions and goals.

³ In the current guidelines, in the Service area, this is phrased as, the work is *academic in nature*. This is described as "characterized by command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contribution to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity, and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact."

⁴ Peer-reviewed dissemination is the standard language already used in the IUPUI guidelines, broad enough to cover the wide range of research and creative activities pursued by IUPUI faculty across all schools.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Balanced Integrative cases will demonstrate that the candidate possesses these characteristics:

- Evidence of at least satisfactory performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
- A clearly articulated philosophy of the interrelatedness of their activities across teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
- Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidates need to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
- Scholarly and local impact and demonstrated quality. Academic peer review is required as a component of assessing scholarly (research, creative activity) impact; professional or academic peer review as well as other indicators would support assessments of teaching- and service- oriented activities.
- A cumulative record that supports an argument for overall excellent contribution to the unit and university.

In section, Clinical Faculty (introduction):

- Clinical faculty may choose:
 - Excellent in service and satisfactory in teaching
 - Excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service
 - A balanced case, highly satisfactory in service and teaching
 - **EDIT-Proposal DEI NTT** A balanced case, with integrative activities supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion.

[NOTE: THE DEI NTT CLINICAL PROPOSAL IS NOT YET INCORPORATED AND IS NOT INCLUDED HERE. IT WILL BE INCLUDED IF PASSED BY IFC.]

In section, Clinical Faculty Balanced Case

EDIT-Balanced Balanced service and teaching-clinical

- Clinical faculty may present accomplishments and activities which are “highly satisfactory” and achieve the same benefit to the university as excellence in one and satisfactory in another. **EDIT Peer review:** It is understood that **academic or professional** peer-reviewed scholarship is **required to demonstrate overall excellence** ~~for achieving a highly satisfactory rating in each area of performance~~ in a balanced case. (Language adapted from IU policy on balanced cases.)
- **Accomplishments and activities may be highly integrated across teaching and service or may be more separate. The cumulative effect of all activities would reach the level of overall excellence as a clinical faculty member.**

In the section, CV



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- **EDIT-Balanced.** Except in the **Balanced-Integrative Case types**, candidates must determine and list each grant, presentation, and publication under one appropriate category: teaching, research, service as appropriate for their appointment.
- **EDIT-Balanced.** In the **Balanced-Integrative Case types**, items are organized in the following categories. **No item can be listed more than once; indicators such as T, R, or S or a combination may be used to signal the main goals of each item.**

In the section, Dossier Folders

Edit: Balanced

Main Section: Integrative Excellence: **Balanced-Integrative and **Balanced-Integrative-DEI Case**⁵**

- In a **Balanced-Binned Case**, use the folders as described in previous sections.
- In **Balanced-Integrative cases**, combine the following into two PDFs: main section (**deposited in the Research folder**) and appendices. Each should have a table of contents indicating the sections. Upload the main section into the first folder in Research and the appendices into the first folder in Appendices-Research.
- Provide substantiation of the statements in the candidate statement including:

Dossier Folder Checklist. **[further edits only entail removing “DEI” as a qualifier, to encompass other integrative cases.]**

- ✓ **Include in candidate statement, with additional details here if needed:**
 - **For the DEI case:** Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Philosophy (unless included in a 7-page Candidate Statement). The case for excellence is grounded in a sophisticated diversity, equity, and inclusion philosophy. The candidate may highlight aspects of DEI that are a particular focus of their work.
- ✓ **Description of teaching, research/creative activity, and service/load expectations throughout time in rank.**
 - Includes, as applicable, teaching responsibilities including number of sections and courses per semester or year, assigned mentoring or advising loads, percent of time allocated to research/creative activity (whether funded or not), and any administrative responsibilities. Service on committees should be briefly summarized—do not simply copy the CV listings.
- ✓ **Discussion of three to five most significant accomplishments**
 - “Accomplishments” is inclusive of local, regional, national, or international work. Make evident the intentionality between and among efforts. Initiatives may be at various stages of development at the time of promotion or tenure. Activities may span teaching, research, service, and administration. Do not repeat lists, but identify select key, signature activities.

⁵ Until the eDossier folder structure can be changed, the “Research” folder is arbitrarily designated to hold these materials.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- ✓ Evidence of quality and impact of ~~DEI~~ activities
 - Quality indicators include but are not limited to traditional metrics such as publication and consequent citations; receipt of internal or external funding; competitive or invited presentations.
 - Qualitative and quantitative input from local constituencies is an essential element of demonstrating impact.
 - Other evidence includes program evaluation reporting generated for funders and other organizations; awards; descriptions of policy or other changes made as a result of efforts.
- ✓ Documentation of individual contributions to collaborative work
 - The candidate must provide a clear explanation of their own role within collaborative work. Confirmation from co-workers is essential for at least the signature activities.
 - The candidate's role must be unique and essential to the success of the endeavor.
- ✓ Teaching evidence: Summaries of student evaluations, peer evaluations, professional development, and reflection on teaching responsibilities
 - The candidate is expected to engage in regular efforts to obtain and use feedback from learners and peers in order to continually improve their teaching. Numerical comparisons are neither required nor advised. Candidates may include direct measures of learning here or may include it within the evidence of impact or the signature activities section.
- ✓ ~~DEI~~ Recognition: Grants, Awards, Honors, Fellowships
 - The candidate should describe and provide contexts for all awards, so that readers understand the scope and the audience of those awarding the recognition, especially since these may not be obvious to all readers.
- ✓ Plans for future work
 - A brief plan of action is included in the candidate statement. In this section, provide additional detail and description.
- ✓ Appendix: ~~DEI~~
 - *Raw materials, copies of publications, letters, and other materials not included in the regular 50-page limit.*

5. Procedural Details

These typically come about because of editing: when one section is moved or changed, another section that used to follow or depended upon it may need a note added.

In section, Promotion

- For probationary tenure-track candidates, promotion to the associate level is normally sought toward the end of the probationary period in conjunction with the tenure decision.



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

- In general, promotion standards are those in effect at the time of application for promotion; tenure standards are those in effect at the time of hire. **EDIT-procedural.** Units must keep copies of the standards in effect upon hire (the acceptance of an offer letter) for each pre-tenure faculty or librarian. Individual faculty or librarians may choose standards developed later if they wish. Decisions about tenure and promotion to associate rank should in most cases be parallel and consistent.
- All promotions to full, and all promotions in the non-tenure-track ranks, are based on standards in effect at the time of application.

In section, Teaching Professor criteria [for some reason ‘sustained’ was not included here].

- For teaching professor:
 - **EDIT-NTT Scholarship.** The above, **EDIT-Procedural** on a sustained level of excellence, plus academic or professionally peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship that supports relevant to teaching and learning

In section, Candidate Statement

- **EDIT—Procedural.** Candidates whose scholarship, teaching, or service have been affected by the COVID pandemic should be specific about the effects and their adaptations.

In section, External Evaluation

- **EDIT-Procedural.** Schools should maintain consistency in what is sent to external evaluators. This may vary by type of case, but not by candidate.
 - For cases based on excellence in research, a typical package consists of an IUPUI P&T CV, a disciplinary CV, the candidate’s statement, and links to or copies of signature research items (or, links embedded in the CV).
 - For teaching, service, or balanced cases, each candidate should be asked to create a mini-dossier, containing the CVs and candidate statement, plus select and critical information supporting their case. Candidates should be cautioned that referees do not have unlimited time and attention.

6. Quality and Impact Details

EDIT-Quality and Impact

At end: new Appendix



IUPUI

OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Appendix: Quality and Impact

Candidates should provide evidence of the quality of their work and its impact for any kind of case. The following measures are intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive.

- Departments are encouraged to consider discipline-specific examples and measures and incorporate them into their guidelines.
- Any individual promotion or tenure case may have a combination of initiatives and metrics. The candidate must clearly articulate how their aggregated accomplishments are deserving of a finding of ‘excellence.’ Review committees should look for persuasive arguments with compelling evidence, simultaneously being open to non-traditional methods of assessment.

The following are elements that add to the strength of the case:

- Scope: the number of people, events, tasks, and other elements involved: more is better.
- Difficulty/challenge: initiatives addressing issues that are both important and have proven difficult to improve: more difficulty the better.
- Innovation/creativity: initiatives where the candidate provides unique and creative ideas, rather than applying known examples: the more innovative, the better.
- Success/outcomes: achievement of planned or secondary objectives—the more successful the better.
- Adoption by others: e.g. citations, use in courses, use in other communities or organizations: the more wide-spread beyond IUPUI, the better.

None of these are necessary or individually sufficient. For example, a very creative approach to a very difficult problem may have a small scope and limited (initial) outcomes, but also be inspiring to other organizations. A broader application of a known good model (from outside IUPUI, at IUPUI), may have a large scope and more consistent success, but be less innovative.

Examples of activities with impact with examples for the DEI case (see also DEI examples [here](#)):

- Policy work: work that supports adoption of DEI-enhancing governmental or organizational policies and practices.
- Grants: securing grants for IU/IUPUI/unit programs for DEI, e.g. funding diverse junior researchers, pipeline initiatives; internal or external.
- Grants-assistive work: work that assists either IU/IUPUI-units or community organizations to secure grants to support DEI goals.
- Mentorship/advising: designing a mentoring program; serving as a mentor—could be junior colleagues, graduate students, undergraduate students, or pre-college individuals, with impact on diversity, equity, and inclusion; advising groups or individuals.
- Inclusive teaching practices
- Innovative DEI-related curriculum design and delivery
- Providing professional development related to DEI