IUPUI 2022-2023 PT Guidelines
Quick Reference
Balanced-Binned Case:  Tenure Track

Key evidence (provided by candidate):
- A CV. Links or doi-s for publications are essential.
- Candidate statement
    - Within this, the candidate needs to systematically address all three areas.
- The rest of the dossier:
    - More details (where details would disrupt the flow of the candidate statement)
    - External evidence of quality and impact, especially of service activities (letters from constituencies, metrics, reports; copies of awards)
    - External confirmation of the candidate's individual role in joint projects
    - For teaching:  (at least) evidence from and reflection on student evaluations, peer evaluations, and evidence of student learning.

Elements that are like any other case:
- Independence and initiative.  Regardless of any author-order conventions, readers must be able to understand the candidate's personal and unique contribution to their work. This is described in the candidate statement and should be confirmed, for at least the signature items, by co-worker statements.  Depending on department expectations, the candidate may not be a single or senior author on any individual item.
- Future plans.
- Scholarly impact.  Peer-reviewed disseminated items are required in both the teaching and research areas; in the service area, dissemination or work may not be academically peer-reviewed but evidence of quality and impact is required.

Distinctive characteristics of the balanced-binned case
- Each publication, presentation, or grant must be labelled and attributed to research, teaching, or service.  There *must* be at least some publication/presentation in research and in teaching.
- In research, performance must be clearly beyond the level of merely satisfactory.  It need not reach the level of a national reputation.
- In teaching, performance must be clearly beyond the level of merely satisfactory, and include both distinctively superior teaching and also dissemination of scholarship supporting teaching.
- In service, performance must be clearly beyond the level of merely satisfactory.  Work internally or externally that involves leadership and demonstrates quality is acceptable.
- Activities need not be related thematically or topically; areas may be treated separately.

External reviewers:
Taking into account a candidate's described research, teaching, and service, a reviewer should provide an **overall** assessment of the candidate's value to IUPUI as a faculty member.

External reviewers will have the greatest familiarity with disseminated work, but are also encouraged to comment where they have expertise in other areas.

Characterizing items as teaching, research, and service (with "scholarship" potentially in each one) is specific to IU and external reviewers need not make these distinctions, but rather comment on overall quality and importance.

Internal reviewers:

Internal reviewers should use the candidate's description and labelling to determine that they have disseminated items in both research/creative activity and in teaching. Service items need not include traditional peer-reviewed dissemination but should be documented with significant work and accomplishments. Service may include administrative work.

The next steps:

- Determine that all three of the areas are clearly beyond merely satisfactory; that the combination of the three provides excellent value to the university.

**EXAMPLE:** (associate rank)

Single area of excellence/ research candidate:

- 10 articles, 6 conference presentations.
- 1 external grant providing summer salary, hourly student labor, and lab consumables.
- Member of department admissions committee; attends school council; reviews 2-3 articles for journals per year.
- Teaches regular load.

Balanced-Binned candidate

- 2 articles, one internal grant, and one book chapter in teaching
- Four articles and one small external grant providing student research assistantships in research.
- Developed new undergraduate certificate from initial design, two new courses, creation of an advisory board through candidate status for external accreditation; became an external reviewer for national organization accrediting that area.