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Part I: Overview of Case Types: from 2018-2019 cycle

1. Types of Faculty
2. Types of Cases
3. Consistency/Agreement Data
2018—2019 by the Numbers

2018-2019 had more cases than 2017-2018 (142 compared to 115), primarily due to an increase in IUSM clinical faculty cases. 2019-2020 looks like approximately 140 cases. This count does not include some cases that were withdrawn (1 tenure case, several promotion cases.)
142 Cases Completed

61 cases involved tenure
  48 to associate professor + tenure
  5 to full professor + tenure
  6 tenure-only
  2 to associate librarian

32 tenure track promotion-only cases (promotion to full)

49 non-tenure track promotion cases:
  34 clinical (28 to associate, 6 to full)
  8 senior lecturer
  7 research (6 to associate, 1 to full)
Out of All Tenure Track Cases (93)

All faculty:
59 research cases (32 to associate, 17 to full, 6 tenure-only)
18 service cases (10 to associate, 8 to full)
  8 teaching cases (5 to associate, 3 to full)
  6 balanced cases (1 to associate, 5 to full)

Non-School of Medicine:
36 research cases (23 to associate, 8 to full; 5 tenure-only)
All teaching and all balanced cases

School of Medicine:
23 research cases (9 to associate, 13 to full, 1 tenure only)
All service cases

2 librarian cases (performance)
Out of All NTT Cases (49)

Research Scientists: 6 to associate, 1 to full ← 5 from School of Medicine

Clinical: 28 for service (23 associate, 5 full) ← all from School of Medicine
6 for teaching (5 associate, 1 full) ← 2 from School of Medicine

Senior Lecturer: 8 cases ← none from School of Medicine
Consistency Data: 2018–2019

7 cases that were not unanimously positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Admin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>split</td>
<td>(n/a)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The “Admin” box indicates the President’s vote, which is the final result. “Split” means more than one negative vote and more than one positive vote; it doesn’t necessarily mean a completely even split of votes.
Consistency, 2014–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unanimous</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Take-aways:

• Most cases are very well prepared and solid. It’s hard work, but done well.
• *Most people who might have a ‘negative’ case for promotion tend to withdraw before making it through the system.*
• Looking over five years, the final, Presidential, vote always is consistent with at least one prior level, and in virtually all cases, the final decision agreed with at least one faculty-committee vote. You cannot say that “if your dean likes you you’re fine” or “if your dean hates you you’re toast.”
Part II: Changes to P&T Guidelines

1. Changes to Required Information
   – Course listings
   – Grant reviews
   – Previous external letters for re-application

2. Handling Questions about Candidate Materials
   – Affirmation of honesty
   – Asking for clarification
   – Use (or not) of external information sources
About the changes, and their timing

Changes are decided upon in spring of each year, after the conclusion of the cycle. In the past, changes were made in spring of Year 1 to go into effect in Year 3. That is, a change made in spring of 2015 (academic year 2014-2015) would not apply for the 2015-2016 cycle, but in the 2016-2017 cycle. This spring, all of the changes (except one) were beneficial to the candidate, so the IFC Executive Committee implemented them immediately / asap.

Side bar: How are changes made? In short, by consensus between the: Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee[1], the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee[2], the IFC Executive Committee, and presented to the IFC. 1 & 2 are represented on an special Ad Hoc Joint Committee to discuss P&T issues.
Timing of changes

No candidate will be penalized for not following the changes.

Changes beneficial to the candidate:
• Not having to list courses prior to 2012
• Not having to include unsuccessful grant reviews
Candidates MAY include that information.
• Removal of obsolete letters in cases of changing area of excellence, for promotion cases
  *We expect this to be very rare.*

The other change:
• An honesty statement to be included in the candidate statement.
  This corrects an omission/oversight in our guidelines. If a dossier is submitted without that statement:
• Candidates can include it as a stand-alone document in the Supplemental folder
• Candidates who do not include it will NOT be penalized
Changes: Reduction in Required Information

No need to delete if it’s already there

Course Listings: only 2012—present
For faculty demonstrating satisfactory in teaching
Courses have been auto-loaded into DMAI
Faculty seeking promotion/tenure on the basis of excellence in teaching should continue to list all coursework (at least, all coursework in rank)

Grant information: unsuccessful grant reviews no longer required
Candidates can include these if they choose
Chair needs to assess grant productivity/trajectory, if grant work is applicable for the candidate’s position and case
Change: Special Case: Re-applying for Promotion

Currently: if reapplying for promotion within three years, you (administrator) must contact original external letter writers with the new materials; all previous letters must be preserved if not replaced by new letters.

Now: if the area of excellence has changed AND the original writers do NOT revise, you (administrator) may remove the obsolete letters.

 ALWAYS: need 6 accurate, current (new OR revised), external reviews.
The honesty statement: why?
Problems with Candidate Assertions

Example problems:
• I hold this national office (but it isn’t listed on any webpage)
• I wrote this grant (but we know you were only a small part of this)
• I designed this program (but X person did more work than you did)
• This article is “in press” but the date is 2016 and there’s nothing that can be found at the journal site

Response steps:
• Honesty affirmation
• Due process
• Documentation
Honesty Statement

Candidates must include in their candidate statement:

“I affirm that my statements in this dossier are a fair and accurate reflection of my achievements.”

Chairs must check that this is included

For the 2019-2020 cycle: if the candidate did not include this, they can insert a stand-alone document into the Supplemental folder. If they do not, they will not be penalized.

For 2020-2021, chairs should ensure that this is included before approving a submitted dossier.

Someday in the future we will try to have edossier have a check-box.
Responding to Questions about Candidate Assertions

Due process:
If a reviewer has a question, he or she should contact the committee chair. If it is substantive, the chair should contact the candidate:

“This question has been raised. We would appreciate a response, by ____ date. If you choose to respond, please upload your response in the Supplemental folder. Please acknowledge that you have received this request.”

Committees (or chair or dean) should be explicit in their reviews if the concern, and response (or lack of a response) is important to the decision they make.
Keep the Focus on the Dossier!

Questions about candidate statements are NOT the same as bringing non-dossier information into the discussion.

“I saw this news story: I wonder if it was our professor who did X”
“I read this blog—it says Professor X is a wild person”

Indiana University policy, ACA-37
“The dossier constructed in consultation with the candidate provides the evidence upon which the tenure decision is to be made. If additional information is sought or received during the review of the dossier at any level, the candidate and all previous committees and reviewers must be notified and given the opportunity to respond to the additional information. The information and the responses shall then become part of the dossier.”

Situation: Can a reviewer go wandering around the internets finding stuff about the candidate? General answer, no they are not required nor encouraged to do so.
Part III: eDossier

1. No Technical Changes [mostly: routing to president, download button]
2. Placing Information into Folders
   – Correct binning for NTT
   – Consolidation option
   – Avoid blank files
Behind the Scenes

1. Promotion-only folders route only to the Chancellor level (not to the President)
2. Download button
   - For campus reviewers only:
     • Karen Lee
     • Rachel Applegate
     • For School of Medicine: Melody Darnall
Placing Information into Folders

1. For **tenure track faculty** something should be in **each** area
   - Tenure track faculty are required to be at least satisfactory in each area
   - Candidates are to substantiate all statements in the CV and candidate statement with materials in the dossier

2. For **non-tenure track faculty** they should NOT have information in areas that are not part of their appointment
   - Lecturers: Teaching and service
   - Clinical: Teaching and service
   - Research: Service only

Yes to scholarship
No to labelling it research
Advice to candidates:

Those Pesky Folders

1–DO use the list of folders as a mental checklist of topics that should be addressed (somewhere).

2–DO NOT (for the love of your reviewers) put blank or meaningless documents into folders (“See CV”).

3–You CAN consolidate all information in each section into one PDF.

Candidates are not required to address every folder in every section. It all depends on the nature of their case. See ‘folder guides’ on the OAA website.
Other tedious practices to avoid

• Merely pasting parts of the candidate statement or the CV into the dossier folders is not useful. It makes the reviewers read the same things twice—twice the effort for no more reward.
  • Instead, spend a sentence or a paragraph summarizing for the reviewer what that laundry list (from the CV) means: “The most important service I have been involved in is the IRB review committee, because…”
• The ‘discussion of the 3-5 most important works’ should not be a simple copying of the articles’ abstracts. The discussion should succinctly convey the importance of the work, the author’s individual role, and how the work relates to the author’s trajectory (past and future).
• In general, raw materials go into Appendix folders. Do not include actual letters of thanks from students, clients, or colleagues in the main sections.
### What to do with the Folder Structure?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bloomington</th>
<th>IUPUI current</th>
<th>IUPUI future???</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Wondering if this would work: CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate statements (on each area)</td>
<td>Candidate statement [narrative, 7 pgs total]</td>
<td>Candidate statement Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[narrative, no length limit]</td>
<td>Regular folders: Analysis, summary [narrative + key evidence, 50 pages total]</td>
<td>--key (e.g. copies of 3-5 publications) --supporting evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Appendices: Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....syllabi, course materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....student evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....copies of publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>....awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Thinking about making changes?)
The eDossier structure must:

1. Convey the right information for all levels of review:
   - If information is needed at the departmental level—but largely ignored at the campus level—we still need a place in edossier to place the information
   - President McRobbie interacts with dossiers from all campuses, so ours needs to provide information that he expects in somewhat the right format that he expects
2. Avoid encouraging or allowing duplicative or meaningless information
3. Not involve too much clicking or uploading, by candidates or reviewers
4. Be modified and maintained by university IT staff
   - The primary design function of eDossier was intended to be its routing system. Secure, confidential, and trace-able. ←that’s why we don’t use Box.
Part IV: Specific Process Issues

1. Constituting Ad Hoc P&T Committees
2. Handling LETTERS
3. Evaluation of Grant Trajectory
4. Evaluation of Dissemination Outlets
5. Bias Training
Constituting Ad Hoc P&T Committees

[Department] Chair responsibilities (p. 10 of P&T)

- “If the primary/department committee does not have faculty/librarians at or above the rank sought by the candidate, establish a special primary committee that may include members from outside the department, school, or campus. Such a committee should be composed in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee and should reflect disciplines as similar to the candidate’s as possible.”
- “If the candidate’s scholarship is interdisciplinary, team science, or public in nature, consider adding additional ad hoc members who can appreciate the interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of the work to be reviewed to the primary/department committee for that case. Such ad hoc members should be added in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee.”
- *Similar language is in the “Primary/Department Committee and Unit/School Committee” section*
Constituting Special / Ad Hoc P&T Committees

The Stuff of Nightmares
Or, avoiding having the candidate have a heart attack when they see the signatures of the members of the committee….

“Therapy” chosen as an example because there are at least five schools at IUPUI which have some form of therapy program.
I study equine therapy

That's stupid

Newbie

Curmudgeon

Argh
Sigh
OK Fine
Newbie is happy in their new department. Department is too small to have a 4-vote primary committee. NEW CHAIR has no idea about prior history or tensions feels that Curmudgeon might be a GREAT member for the P&T committee!
Keep in mind....

If Curmudgeon had moved to Next State Over University, Newbie would certainly have listed Curmudgeon as someone not to be used as an external reviewer.

Newbie will know the identities of the reviewing committee (will not know) the identities of external reviewers.

Chairs should be sensitive to personal and field-dependent histories. Many new programs get developed specifically because people in traditional departments think the new stuff is stupid.
Adding Ad Hoc Members: Why

1. The natural committee is too small to yield 4 votes: especially true for **cases for promotion to full rank**
   - The requirement is for four votes at each committee level. The votes do not need to be four-positive or four-negative; they could end up being two-negative two-positive. What you cannot have is three-votes and one-abstention.
   - In schools where P&T committees consist of “all eligible,” members should carefully review where they are needed most—at the department or at the school.
   - Where possible, prioritize voting at the level at which a member is most close to the discipline of the candidate. *Campus and school reviewers rely on the department committees to provide the most disciplinary-specific review of the case.*

2. The case involves interdisciplinary or **public** scholarship
   - Campus can help you identify potential reviewers
Adding Ad Hoc Members: How (Who?)

1. Joint responsibility of chair/dean and the natural committee members

2. **Not** a responsibility of the candidate

3. Candidate input:
   - Candidates can request exclusion of individuals from being *external reviewers*
   - Candidates cannot request exclusion of natural committee members
   - No language exists to cover candidate exclusion of ad hoc committee members

*Suggest sensitivity to candidate input*
Some reasonable categories of people cannot be external reviewers but could be ad hoc reviewers: people from other IUPUI schools, people from Bloomington or Purdue-West Lafayette.
Constituting Ad Hoc P&T Committees

Chair responsibilities (p. 10 of P&T)
• “If the primary/department committee does not have faculty/librarians at or above the rank sought by the candidate, establish a special primary committee that may include members from outside the department, school, or campus. Such a committee should be composed in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee and should reflect disciplines as similar to the candidate’s as possible.”
• “If the candidate’s scholarship is interdisciplinary, team science, or public in nature, consider adding additional ad hoc members who can appreciate the interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of the work to be reviewed to the primary/department committee for that case. Such ad hoc members should be added in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee.”
• Similar language is in the “Primary/Department Committee and Unit/School Committee” section
Constituting Ad Hoc P&T Committees

in *consultation with the duly constituted primary committee*

In practical terms, the department chair (or dean) will probably work with the chair of the P&T committee to come up with names and the chair/dean will figure out schedules and availability of the potential reviewers. The final committee must be acceptable to the ‘natural’ committee members.
Letters: Solicited Letters

Not: External evaluations
Not: Candidate-solicited letters (those go in the dossier proper)

Potential sources:
• Non-academic people able to give input into the candidate’s work
• Important academics who are not arms-length (co-authors, etc.)
• Special reviewers of particular aspects of the candidate’s position or work
(see next slide for more on this)

Please refer in your (chair, dean, P&T committee) letter to the existence and content of the solicited letters.
Why solicited letters?

Some people cannot be external reviewers:
• They are not at arms’ length: they were co-authors, or PIs.
• They are not at the right rank, title, or comparable institution: they may be the leading person on that type of research, but not be an academic (so they can’t speak to teaching or service). They may be clinical supervisors (but not tenure-track).

Some people have particular and very important insights into the quality of the candidate’s work:
• They are community partners in public scholarship: they can testify as to the impact of the work.
• They have been influenced in their practice by the innovations introduced by the candidate.
• They were mentees of the candidate and can describe their educational experience
Solicited letters—*solicited by the chair (dean)*

Letters solicited *by the candidate* go into the regular dossier. Those letters are inherently of *lesser weight* because they are presumably not objective and not systematic.

Example: people who completed PhDs with the candidate as chair. Presumably the candidate would only solicit letters from successful and happy graduates; the candidate would only include letters that are positive.

The *chair* can solicit from all or a systematic sample of Ph.D. graduates.
Evaluation of Grant Trajectory

Change in requirements: candidates need not include unsuccessful grant reviews in their dossier.

HOWEVER: where applicable, chairs and primary committees are required to “analyze the pattern of grant success.”

- Chairs should monitor grant activity throughout the candidate’s career
- Candidates should be encouraged to include important grant information. This can include ratings or reviews for unsuccessful grant applications especially if they have not yet been successful.

(Please clarify stature and status of grants for those not in your field: what is an R01? A K32?)
Evaluation of Dissemination Outlets

1. Chairs: pursue this dialogue with your candidates throughout their annual reviews
2. Consult with the University Library (Heather Coates) about traditional and “alt” metrics of item, journal, and venue quality
3. Be sensitive to changing methods of dissemination
   – Maintain ‘peer review.’
   – A respected blog can be evidence of national reputation but is not in itself a peer-reviewed venue. [nightmare scenario: anti-vax bloggers!]
These three examples came to me during **one week**

**The Good, the Bad and the Ugly**

Dear Rachel Applegate,

I would like to invite you to consider submitting your original research work to the **International Workshop on e-Health Pervasive Wireless Applications and Services e-HPWAS'19**, in conjunction with the prestigious 15th WiMob conference - rank B (sponsored by the IEEE Communication Society) that will be held in Barcelona, Spain on October 21, 2019.

---

Dear Ms. Rachel Applegate,

Let me remind you about our offer to publish one of your research works with Lambert Academic Publishing.

We would be deeply interested to consider for publication your academic paper, some scientific material or any piece of writing synthesizing your professional concerns.

Our aim is to provide knowledge to a wide audience and to connect readers and authors.

---

This is probably legit: my School does computing (even if I don't, and IEEE is a respectable organization.

**Bad sign:** they'll publish anything
Invited presentation!

Ahem: I know nothing about pediatrics; there is not the slightest indication in anything about me that would legitimately qualify me for this.

Dear Dr. 

Best Wishes.

We would like to invite you to be as speaker/delegate at “Global Staunch Conference on Pediatrics & Emergency Medicine” during September 25 - 26, 2019 | Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Being aware of your vast knowledge and wide range of expertise we are privileged to request you to be an eminent speaker/delegate of the most prestigious conference of Pediatrics & Emergency Medicine give us a prospect to appreciate your research works. The conference emphasis on the theme “ASSURING TO DISCOVER THE DIFFERENCES AND DEVELOP POSSIBILITIES IN SUCCESS FOR PEDIATRICS & EMERGENCY MEDICINE”.

It gives us immense pleasure to welcome you to be the honourable delegate/speaker for the Conference.
Development for P&T Reviewers

A thought: chairs, P&T committee chairs, deans, and associate deans

Spend some time thinking about and considering how to address:
• Small group dynamics
• Bias in student evaluations
• Implicit bias

Watch for more information later this year about educational options

Study after study shows that student evaluations of teaching contain bias against women and people of color. Yet it is common practice at many colleges and universities to use such biased instruments as an important element in major personnel decisions, including those involving hiring, reappointments, promotions, salaries and tenure.

From: Inside Higher Ed
Part V: Preview of 2019-2020 P&T Revision Work

1. Teaching Professor Criteria
   - Current senior lecturer candidates
   - Time in rank considerations

2. Use of Student Evaluations

3. Binning
   - Balanced case
   - TT non-research cases
   - NTT “scholarship” cases

4. Community-Engaged Scholarship
Teaching Professor

- Work is needed at **both the school and campus levels**: start planning now for meeting days and times
  - Most schools will use their P&T committee, or their Faculty Affairs Committee, or a special ad hoc committee, to work on this. New standards must be approved by the faculty as a whole.
  - Campus committee will start in September.

- Ideas about Teaching Professor—preliminary

- Consider faculty workload in relation to expectations (*Bloomington NTT faculty explicitly have course releases to prepare for promotion*)

- Make special transitional rules to cover “time in rank” considerations
Lecturer vs. Clinical

In IU policy, the difference in lecturers and clinical faculty lies in their responsibilities.

   Lecturers: teaching only (service means university/committee work)
   Clinical: teaching AND service. Service in this context goes beyond university / committee work. Usually involves clinical practice (delivery of professional services to clients) or supervision of students learning clinical / in-the-field skills, or other non-standard-teaching, or community-engagement, activities (“clinic,” in this light, being the venue that bridges the university and the community).

If your only or traditional differentiation between “clinical” and “lecturer” has been salary scale or qualifications (e.g. terminal degree) you will need to revisit that.
Reviewing / updating: who?

More details next slides.

Use of student evaluations  ← IFC special committee

Binning  ← Ad Hoc Committee on P&T
  Balanced case
  TT non-research cases
  NTT “scholarship” cases

Community-engaged scholarship  ← various
Issues to be discussed

Use of student evaluations

- Many general concerns exist around the student evaluation process itself: the change to all-online administration of evaluations ("Blue") instead of in-class paper-based; online class formats where evaluations may have been modelled on in-person class formats; what to do with low response rates.
- (on the other hand, where do we get systematic student ‘voice’?)
- There is a growing body of research that shows systemic bias in numerical scores: e.g. the ‘average’ female professor will score .5 lower than the average male (for the same work: some research has changed the names of instructors, in all-online classes). Thus a female professor will be told to ‘work harder’ at teaching to achieve the ‘same’ score.

This is a large and complex issue. The IFC will be tackling it directly under president John Watson.

The Campus P&T Committee does not find student evaluation data to be very useful, at their level, but, we do not want to delete information that other levels of evaluation need.
Binning

“Binning” means placing evidence of ‘scholarship’ (an article, a grant, a book) into a category of teaching OR research OR service.
Current IUPUI rules require the labelling of each presentation, publication, grant or other product into ONE (and only one) area/bin.

Current IUPUI rules require the following bin population:

For those with excellence in research: items in research only.
For tenure track faculty with excellence in service or teaching: items in service, or teaching, AND in research
For tenure track faculty with balanced cases: items in research, teaching AND service
For clinical faculty with balanced cases: items in teaching and service
For clinical faculty no items in research!
Binning is not a problem for:

Tenure-track faculty whose area of excellence is ‘research’
They put every publication, presentation, or grant into ‘research.’

95%-100% of Bloomington faculty. Almost all tenure track Bloomington faculty are ‘research’ and for their 5% of cases which are “balanced” they do not format the CV the way we do. They do not have TT service cases.

Regionals? I don’t know…
Binning is a problem for

Tenure-track faculty whose area of excellence is **service** or **teaching**.
- We require publications/presentations in their area of excellence AND in “research.”
- Each publication/presentation must be characterized as either ‘research’ or the other area. *This strikes many candidates as arbitrary and artificial.*

Tenure-track faculty who are presenting a **balanced case**.
- Instead of an ‘integrated whole’ they are required to separate their accomplishments into all three areas.

Clinical and lecturer faculty who are not allowed to call their publications/presentations / grants “research”

Clinical faculty (and reviewers) who have no clear sense of the distinction between scholarship of ‘teaching’ or scholarship of ‘service.’
Binning is not used by our peers

- From our 12 official peers:
The prevalent requirements for tenure-track faculty are:
--acceptable teaching, which does not require any disseminated scholarship of teaching; only two refer to scholarship of teaching and learning (for all others “publications” in teaching refers to textbooks etc.)

--demonstrated scholarship (almost always called “research”), which is inclusive of all forms of scholarship / creative activity, including SOTL and community-engaged

--acceptable service, defined as service to unit/university and to profession/discipline; does not require any dissemination; besides IU, only two allow ‘service’ as an area of excellence and for one of them, it applies only to their medical center.

(Two say that candidates must be ‘excellent’ in teaching, research AND service, but their standards are very vague.)
It’s an IUPUI problem

Of the 143 P&T cases in 2018-2019, 61 were not binning-problem cases, and 82 were (57%).

Let’s try to figure out an IUPUI solution
Part VI: P&T Programming for 2019-2020

1. New:
   - Zoom
   - Evening Sessions
   - Promotion for Women
   - Promotion in the Lecturer Ranks

2. Partners
   - Office of Vice Chancellor for Research
   - Center for Teaching and Learning
   - University Library

3. On the Road:
   - Revising Standards?
   - Chairs?
   - Candidates?
# P&T Programming Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Teaching</td>
<td>Thursday August 29, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Plan Now for Success</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 18, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion for Women</td>
<td>Monday, September 30, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Research</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 16, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising P&amp;T Standards: Discussion on teaching—for P&amp;T committees and governance leaders</td>
<td>Monday, October 28, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier Prep</td>
<td>Thursday, November 7, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier Prep—evening option</td>
<td>Monday, November 25, 5:30-7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Research—evening option</td>
<td>Monday, December 2, 5:30-7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion in the Lecturer Ranks</td>
<td>Wednesday, December 11, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier Prep—ZOOM ONLY</td>
<td>Tuesday, December 17, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Service --evening</td>
<td>Tuesday, January 14, 5:30-7:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Full Rank</td>
<td>Monday, February 10, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion/Tenure on Balanced Case</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 10, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion in the Clinical Ranks—non IUSM</td>
<td>Monday, March 30, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year and tenure reviews: for deans, associate deans, and chairs</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 29, 9-11 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OAA website is being revised. All of these events will be on the events calendar “soon”
New Administrators?

Please contact Karen Lee for help with eDossier routing: klee2@iupui.edu.
Thank you!

Faculty Affairs at IUPUI
acadhr@iupui.edu
Rachel Applegate
rapplega@iupui.edu