

IUPUI 2022-2023 PT Guidelines
Quick Reference
Research-Excellence Tenure Track

Key evidence (provided by the candidate):

- A CV. Hyperlinks to online versions or dois for key items are essential.
- Candidate statement.
 - Within this, the candidate should describe their research focus, and identify 3-5 signature pieces of work accomplished in-rank.
- The rest of the dossier
 - More details (where details would disrupt the flow of the candidate statement)
 - External confirmation of the candidate's individual role in joint projects (grants, presentations, publications)
 - For teaching: evidence from and reflection on student evaluations, peer evaluations, and evidence of student learning.
 - Explanations of any awards
 - Details of grant-seeking history, if applicable.

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. Tenure, especially, is based on confidence in future work.
- Satisfactory work in teaching and in service. At least some disciplinary service is expected.

Distinctive elements:

- The candidate should present evidence of an "emerging national reputation" for their area of scholarship.
- External readers may also be familiar with their work, or, when reviewing it, recognize its quality.
- Quantity and quality: IUPUI campus guidelines emphasize quality of work, not quantity. If quantities are mentioned in department or school guidelines, the candidate should document exactly how they meet them. External reviewers are to assess the candidate's work in relation to national-level work in the particular discipline.
- Grant expectations, and how the candidate is progressing, should be made explicit. Precision in listing grant roles, dates, and amount is necessary.

External reviewers:

The primary focus of an external reviewer should be on the quality and reputation among scholars of the candidate's work. Reviewers may assume that teaching and service are satisfactory, although they may remark on anything special about them. Reviewers are

encouraged to comment on the substance of the person's intellectual work, rather than on quantifying either dollars or publications/presentations. Explaining special disciplinary aspects is especially useful to IUPUI committees; often, a candidate will be the only person on the campus working in a particular area.

Internal reviewers

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

- Teaching (including use of student and peer evaluations)
- Service (both internal and disciplinary)

Using evidence provided by the candidate (traditional and alt-metrics), the chair's assessment of dissemination venues, the coherence of the candidate's statement, any awards or other recognition, and the external evaluators' input, internal reviewers determine whether "excellence" in terms of an emerging (or sustained, for full) national reputation in the area of scholarship has been achieved.

It is especially important for the chair and the department committee to place the candidate's research achievements in the context of expected faculty responsibilities in teaching and service. Some external reviewers, for example, may assume that junior faculty do no service and have almost no teaching; some departments have doctoral students and others do not.