Indianapolis Campus Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing

Standards of Achievement

The Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, Indianapolis, adheres to the IUPUI campus guidelines for promotion and tenure (P&T). School standards supersede campus standards, and departmental standards supersede School standards, only insofar as they require a higher or more substantive level of academic achievement than the campus guidelines do. This current document replaces all previous documents pertaining to promotion and tenure approved for the School of Informatics and the School of Library and Information Science.

All candidates for academic advancement are advised to study the campus guidelines to understand the many quantitative and qualitative ways candidates may document and substantiate their achievement. It is the candidate’s responsibility to prepare for reviewers a dossier that accurately documents and persuasively explains the candidate’s academic achievement.

Academic advancement at IUPUI is awarded for excellence in scholarship. In line with campus standards, the School embraces a broad definition of scholarship, based on its conception as 1) the creation of new knowledge; 2) the dissemination of this knowledge in appropriate external venues; 3) the determination of its excellence through external peer review; and 4) documented demonstration the significant impact of the knowledge on thought and/or practice in its discipline, profession, or field of application beyond the campus. Like the campus, the School accepts the broad senses of knowledge as articulated in Boyer’s model of scholarship, and candidates are advised to study this model.

Scholarly excellence is the goal of academic work, and the final determinant of a candidate’s qualification for academic advancement. However, because the concept of excellence can be multi-faceted or subject to a wide range of interpretations, candidates must explain the impact of their scholarship. In broad terms, the impact of scholarship can be seen in its value and/or significance. Value is generally found in its use, practice, method, or application and is demonstrated when a scholarly product is accepted beyond the campus as useful to peers or to a broader audience of those knowledgeable in the field.

Significance is generally found in the thought and theory that advances professional or disciplinary understanding in its field. Value and significance are often intertwined and may not be easily distinguished from each other. The School is an academic institution and as such, its standards for academic
advancement recognize first and foremost the importance of review by external scholarly peers in the most appropriate academic venues. In this document, the School offers these definitions for candidates and reviewers to evaluate excellence and impact.

With all this in mind, the School requires the following for academic advancement:

- Consistent effort to generate scholarship from the candidate’s academic work and to disseminate it in high-impact peer-reviewed external venues and/or applications.
- Documentation of the impact of this academic work and associated scholarship on thought and/or practice in its discipline, profession, or field of application beyond the campus.
- Consistent effort to attract external support to advance the candidate’s academic work and/or to further the mission of the candidate’s department, School, campus, and university.

Candidates for tenure must document a rising trajectory of effort to generate scholarship and to attract external support, and a sufficient degree of success in disseminating that scholarship in peer-reviewed venues. These efforts must be sufficient to achieve for the candidate an emerging national or international reputation in the candidate’s declared area of excellence (research, teaching, or service–or through the balanced case).

Candidates for promotion to full rank must document a sustained national or international reputation for scholarly excellence and impact beyond the campus demonstrated by ongoing achievement in the candidate’s declared area of excellence (research, teaching or service – or through the balanced case).

The Process

Candidates for promotion and tenure are responsible for knowing the campus, School, and departmental standards, processes, and deadlines for promotion and tenure. In a normal progression toward tenure, candidates shall follow the procedural calendar explained below for preparing and presenting tenure dossiers. Because the School grants tenure and promotion to associate rank simultaneously, probationary candidates at the assistant rank must apply for promotion and tenure at the same time. Candidates for tenure who already hold associate rank are not automatically considered as candidates for promotion to full rank. Candidates for promotion to full rank or to senior lecturer or to clinical associate, although not bound by the “tenure clock” of scheduled progress in years, must follow the same procedural calendar for the preparation and presentation of their dossiers.

A. The spring semester of the fifth year of candidate’s probationary appointment

1. Candidates prepare their dossiers by the format guidelines of the IUPUI campus.
2. By May 1, candidates present their dossiers to the Departmental Chair. For example, a candidate appointed to the School in the fall of 2010 would present a tenure dossier to the chair by May 1, 2015, which would be presented to the Department and School committees in the fall of 2015, to be reviewed at the campus level in the spring of 2016. Candidates who
begins their probationary appointment in the spring semester of any year shall follow the same
tenure schedule as candidates who begin in the fall of the same calendar year.

3. **The Department Chair prepares a list of at least eight external reviewers for the tenue candidate.**

4. **By May 15, Department Chairs send a solicitation letter, candidate’s CV, examples of scholarship, and a condensed copy of the tenure dossier to reviewers.** Because of the frequent difficulty in obtaining external reviews, this list may extend to 10 or more external reviewers. Departmental Chairs shall attempt to the greatest degree possible to identify reviewers considered experts in the candidate’s discipline and declared area of excellence. Departmental Chairs shall consult with candidates to ensure that any potential reviewer is “at arm’s length” from the candidate, that is, the reviewer has no vested interest in the candidate’s academic success (see IUPUI guidelines). Candidates may suggest reviewers; however, Departmental Chairs are under no obligation to use them. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to request the exclusion of particular reviewers, but only for nonacademic reasons, for example, because of past personal or financial associations. Although Departmental Chairs are under no obligation to comply with such requests, the candidate may officially note his or her request at that time, and this note shall be forwarded to subsequent internal reviewers.

B. **The fall semester of the sixth probationary year**

1. **By August 20, candidates submit their full dossier for review by the Department Chair and the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.** Although candidates may have incrementally revised the dossier over the summer, and included new factual information (e.g., a record of new publications or grants), the relevant sections of this dossier presented to the Departmental Committee must be substantially the same as the dossier distributed to external reviewers.

2. **By August 29, Departments shall assemble a Department Promotion and Tenure Committee to evaluate the dossier, either by election or as a committee of the whole.** Department chairs do not appoint committee members. A Department P&T Committees shall be assembled for each candidate. For years in which more than one candidate presents a dossier, different committees may be constituted for different dossiers. Committees shall include enough members to ensure that the dossier is evaluated with five positive or negative votes, not counting abstentions. To meet this vote total and to ensure that dossiers are evaluated by those familiar with the candidate’s academic discipline(s), committees may include qualified faculty from outside the Department or School who must be tenured at IUPUI or IUB. The Department Chair in consultation with the School Executive Associate Dean (EAD) shall determine when such supplemental members are necessary and prepare a list of candidates. The EAD shall solicit these supplemental members. Departmental committees may not include the Department Chair or a faculty member holding an administrative appointment in the School of Informatics and Computing, Indianapolis, at any level (chairs, associate deans, and deans).
3. **By August 30, Department P&T Committees shall convene to evaluate dossiers.** Committees shall deliver their reports to the Department Chair by September 14. Committees shall be convened by the Department Chair. Thereafter, the Chair is prohibited from participating in committee deliberations. Committees shall elect a chair to serve for the duration of the evaluation of each dossier. Committees shall evaluate each dossier, vote, and prepare a written report of the deliberations, thoroughly explaining the reasons for the votes whether positive, negative, or abstentions. All members of the committee shall sign this report to attest to its accurate account of the deliberations. This report will be delivered to the Department Chair by September 14.

4. **By September 17, the Department Chair shall deliver the committee report to the candidate.**

5. **By September 20, the Department Chair shall prepare a Chair’s Evaluation of the candidate’s dossier and share this evaluation with the candidate.**

6. **By September 25, the Department Chair shall deliver the Chair’s Evaluation and the rest of the dossier to the School P&T Committee at the Indianapolis campus.** The School P&T Committee will convene to review the entire dossier including the Department P&T Committee’s Report and Chair’s Evaluation. The School Committee comprises all tenured faculty members holding appointments at the SoIC, Indianapolis, except those with administrative appointments, who are Department Chairs of the candidate’s department, or who formally evaluate the academic performance of the candidate in the course of their academic duties. The committee Chair shall be elected by the School P&T Committee at the beginning of each academic year and shall preside during all deliberations that year. Committees shall evaluate each dossier, vote, and prepare a written report of their deliberations, thoroughly explaining the reasons for the votes whether positive, negative, or abstentions. All members of the committee shall sign this report to attest to its accurate account of the deliberations.

7. **By the third Friday in October, the School Committee shall deliver its report to the Executive Associate Dean of the School at the Indianapolis campus and to the Dean of the School.**

8. **By the last Friday in October, the EAD and Dean shall prepare independent evaluations of the candidate’s dossier.** The EAD shall share these reports with the candidate.

9. **By the last Friday in October, the EAD and the Dean shall deliver all previous reports, documents, and the full dossier to the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs.**
IU School of Informatics and Computing at IUPUI

Addendum to the School P&T Guidelines:

Guidelines for the Appointment and Advancement of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Approved by SoIC P&T committee on December 5, 2018

Scope of these Guidelines

The purpose of this document is to establish parameters for the appointment and advancement of non-tenure track faculty in the IU School of Informatics and Computing (SoIC) at IUPUI. The school adheres to the IUPUI campus guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (P&T). School standards supersede campus standards only insofar as they require a higher or more substantial level of academic achievement than the campus guidelines.

All candidates for academic advancement are advised to study the campus guidelines to understand the many quantitative and qualitative ways candidates may document and substantiate their achievement. It is the candidate’s responsibility to prepare for reviewers a dossier that accurately documents and explains the candidate’s academic achievement. Advancement to higher ranks for lecturers must be based on excellence in teaching. In all dossiers for advancement, it is the responsibility of the candidate to explain the categorization, nature and significance of academic achievements.

Link to Campus Guidelines:
https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines

Campus Dossier Checklist
https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/RetrieveFile/ForceBrowserDownload?path=/AAContent/Html/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/PTGuidelinesCLEAN.pdf

Senior Lecturer Appointment

Following promotion to the rank of senior lecturer, the individual holding the rank of senior lecturer is eligible to receive a three-year, renewable appointment.

Candidates for Promotion to Senior Rank

The SoIC recognizes that all lecturers bring different strengths to their teaching and may achieve excellence through different blends of the elements of teaching, emphasizing the elements most appropriate to their strengths but not forgoing the others. As explained in campus guidelines, teaching comprises these elements, broadly categorized as: classroom delivery of instruction, mentoring and advising, curriculum development, and the scholarship of teaching. Candidates seeking promotion to senior lecturer in the SoIC should document and explain a blend of these elements that together demonstrate a sustained record of excellence. Candidates must also document at least a satisfactory record of service, which comprises 20% of their duties.
• Evidence of consistently high-quality teaching practice through course evaluations, peer reviews, student learning outcomes, and student testimonials.

• Evidence of scholarly and innovative activities in teaching. Evidence of peer-reviewed contribution to the scholarship of teaching and learning includes, but is not limited to: published peer-reviewed papers in educational journals or conference proceedings; presentations in local, regional or national/international teaching conferences; textbooks and novel teaching tools that have been reviewed and or solicited by peers external to the department or school; successful internal or external grant proposals supporting the scholarship of teaching; juried or otherwise peer-reviewed exhibitions; competitions and creative activities advancing the scholarship of teaching and learning. Although these creative activities may advance teaching and learning, candidates must clearly explain the connection between personal creative activities and student learning outcomes.

• Evidence of active curriculum development and teaching services includes, but is not limited to: new course development, course revision and/or curriculum redesign, or creation of technological artifacts for teaching (e.g., online course materials). Teaching also includes student advising and mentoring.

• Evidence of designing and presenting workshops or professional development for practitioners, educators, and/or students.

The School of Informatics and Computing adheres to the standards of achievement for the scholarship of teaching described in the IUPUI campus P&T Guidelines. In general, candidates are expected to demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated, retrievable, peer-reviewed artifacts documenting intellectual contributions to the theory and practice of teaching. Securing teaching grants or external funding supporting the development of a program of scholarship of teaching is highly valued.

**The Scholarship of Teaching**

A candidate for senior lecturer is expected to have developed an original body of knowledge about the theory or practice of teaching in his/her specific area of expertise.

Faculty are encouraged to document any of the above activities in ways that will allow future evaluators (whether department chairs, reviewers in promotion processes, grant reviewers or committees awarding departmental, school or campus honors) to better understand the benefits of their innovative contributions to the theory and/or practice of teaching and learning. Such documentation and evidence can take the form of:

• Reflective writing in published experience reports, project reports, presentations, journal articles, conference papers linking professional development and enhanced teaching to curriculum (peer-reviewed and disseminated);

• Evidence of student success (both within and beyond the SoIC) that can be linked to these activities (e.g. a teacher may learn a new technique that is taught in class and enables a student to complete a project or secure a career);

• New course or curricular content and strategies that can be linked to professional development and/or extracurricular mentoring;

• Evidence that the teacher has engaged in activities, analyzed their outcomes, applied this analysis in the classroom or in extra-curricular venues for teaching and learning, and disseminated the results with colleagues and peers.
Examples of artifacts that demonstrate evidence of scholarship of teaching can include, but are not limited to:

- A body of retrievable, peer-reviewed presentations, abstracts, demonstrations, papers accepted at conferences (external to campus). To count towards scholarship of teaching, these presentations should focus on the scholarly discourse or research performed around teaching theory or practice.
- Production of non-traditional media, including digital and analog artifacts, web-based, interactive applications, prototypes, or systems. Appropriate credit will be given to such creative activity using the same criteria as discussed above for conventional publications; that is, it is essential that the activity is disseminated, retrievable, and peer-reviewed. The peer-reviewed nature of the material must be clearly documented. Non-peer-reviewed materials are weighted less than items that undergo peer review. The role of the candidate must be documented. Since the usual standards of peer-review may not be apparent, the candidate should provide objective documentation that peers value and appreciate the scholarship contribution of the candidate.
- A presentation or workshop about innovative teaching theory or practice at a professional conference attended by educational professionals or peers.
- An online presentation or posting that attracts significant attention and comment among learners and/or educators discussing teaching (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo, Digital Training, Twitch, etc.).
- An outreach activity that can be considered community-based education; leads to innovative teaching theory or practice; becomes scholarship of teaching and learning; achieves impact and advances the teaching mission of our school. The candidate should describe and document how any notable outreach activity has been incorporated into the candidate’s teaching, as well as disseminated to peers.

The work of lecturers is crucial to the success of the School of Informatics and Computing, IUPUI. In many instances, lecturers teach courses that are most directly linked to, and responsive to, the rapid changes in industry practice. Every year, new software, new applications and new trends in design emerge in the marketplace. This requires from our lecturers a constant process of professional training, continuing education hours, and development. The SoIC recognizes and values this work, and considers it part of the overall work that leads to academic advancement.

- To stay informed and skilled in these emerging technologies and domains, and thus to stay relevant as teachers, lecturers can often devote significant effort and energy outside of the classroom to learning these new technologies and understanding their place in the marketplace. This can take place through leading or presenting in formal workshops, through continuing education opportunities, through self-guided tutorials and through informal peer professional learning that occurs in various organizations, venues and events dedicated to advancing capacity and competence in tech-centric business and practice. The SoIC recognizes and values all of these efforts as forms of professional development necessary to teaching success. When documenting such efforts in their dossiers, candidates for promotion should carefully note the roles played (e.g. workshop leader, attendee, etc.)
- Similarly, lecturers frequently devote many hours each month to sponsoring various extra-curricular student groups that focus on various applications and uses of technology, and the social contexts in which technologies are relevant. The SoIC recognizes and values this faculty effort as a form of student mentoring that can supplement and enhance classroom activities and generally elevate a school-wide climate of learning. When documenting such efforts in their
dossiers, candidates for promotion should explain the nature of the work performed and any correlation of this effort to classroom activities or the scholarship of teaching and learning.
**Service**

- Service is not an area of excellence for lecturers, yet, the service work of lecturers is crucial to the success of the School of Informatics and Computing, IUPUI. In many instances, lecturers provide professional service to the community. The SoIC recognizes and values this work, and considers it part of the overall work that leads to academic advancement. Service can provide additional recognition to the program, department, and school. As such, recruitment activities, sponsoring or participating in extra-curricular events, enhancing student experience and advancing the enrollment and retention goals of the school (without producing defined learning outcomes) are considered service.

Examples of professional service can include, but are not limited to:

- Student advising and mentoring
- Contributing member of national and state organization
- Committee member of a national, state and local board/committee
- Organizer of an event, professional workshop etc.
- Presentation at national, state and local event centered on service
- Contributing to educational accreditation, policy and/or certifications for program area
- Influencing national standards/ testing etc.