

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

Key evidence (provided by candidate):

- A CV. *Items reflecting ‘direct impact’ activities can be listed in the style of a business resume—name the activity, describe its goals, provide evidence of outcomes.*
- Candidate statement
 - Within this, the candidate needs to identify 3-5 signature accomplishments.
- The rest of the dossier:
 - More details (where details would disrupt the flow of the candidate statement)
 - External evidence of quality and impact (letters from constituencies service, metrics, reports; copies of awards)
 - External confirmation of the candidate’s individual role in joint projects
 - For teaching: 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 work. This is described in the candidate statement and should be confirmed, for at least the signature items, by co-worker statements.
- Future plans.
- Scholarly impact. *Please note that the absolute quantity of scholarly output will NOT be the same as in a research-excellence case.* Focus on quality, not quantity; look for evidence that the items themselves are being used, not just that they have appeared in competitive venues.

Innovative elements

- Philosophy of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Readers do not judge the philosophy itself, but rather use it to understand the candidate’s work. *IUPUI readers: this is very similar to an expectation that a research-excellence candidate will have a guiding ‘focus’ to their work or that teaching-excellence people have a distinct teaching philosophy.*
- Integrative work. This has two manifestations: the candidate shows how their most important work is interrelated (and philosophy-driven), and, individual items may blend aspects of research, teaching, and service.
 - For schools and programs where grant funding is considered essential to mission success, grants may take the form of student support, research support, community-oriented activities, or any useful combination of these.
- Direct impact: “Direct” impact items are those where individuals or groups are identifiably benefitted. The candidate should outline goals, activities, and relevant outcomes.
 - This type of measurement is sometimes called “program” evaluation, roften reported in terms of inputs, outputs, and outcomes.

- Scope, difficulty, creativity, success, and adoption by others can all be considered.

External reviewers:

Taking into account the above items (philosophy/integration, independence, independence, scholarly impact, direct impact, future plans), a reviewer should provide an **overall** assessment of the candidate's value to IUPUI as a faculty member.

External reviewers will have special importance when assessing the quality of the scholarly impact, but are also encouraged to comment where they have expertise in the direct impact activities.

Because this is an innovative approach to promotion and tenure, external reviewers should not compare candidates to research-only cases. Instead, the candidate will have explained how their work advances the mission of their unit, and given the external reviewer's knowledge of typical university goals, they can affirm or critique that contribution.

Internal reviewers:

Internal reviewers should be able to determine quickly from the CV and statement that the candidate performs *at least satisfactorily* in:

- Research/creative activity (including some level of peer-evaluated dissemination)
- Teaching
- Service

The next steps:

- Determine that the candidate has provided evidence of philosophy/integration, independence, scholarly impact and direct impact, and a reasonable plan for the future.
- Considering all activity, particularly those items identified as signature accomplishments, assess whether the candidate's total contribution is overall 'excellent' (of 'comparable worth' as a single-area-of-excellence candidate.)

FOR EXAMPLE:

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.

Integrative DEI candidate:

- 4 articles, all co-authored with students; 3 invited presentations at other universities
- 1 external grant for underrepresented masters students (tuition, coaching); 1 internal (CTL) grant for leading the diversification of a masters-sequence of courses.
 - 13 students completed the program; overall enrollment rose 20%; success rate in revised courses improved 30%.
- Directed curriculum subcommittee of school DEI task force; presentations at CTL events.