This ppt has been enhanced with additional information and clarification in response to questions and answers that occurred during the live workshop, and with additional links to resources.
Wait: What THIS workshop is about

This workshop focuses on how balanced case CURRENTLY is defined and managed within the current IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

There is great interest and increasing momentum in revisioning both P&T cases as a whole (maybe ALL cases should address interconnectedness?) or, revising specifically balanced cases (possibly something called an “integrative” case which would remain separate from a research or teaching case.)

THIS WORKSHOP will talk about how to succeed in the current situation. Any candidates applying for tenure (or promotion to full) in the 2021-2022 cycle should focus on this.

Anyone farther out, do understand current processes: candidates for promotion go up under whatever standards are current at the time of applying; those for tenure may choose standards which were current when they were hired. “Standards” means specifically criteria. Procedures often do change mid-stream, and we will help people navigate new procedures.

If you are interested in being part of a task force on this revision or providing input, please contact me (rapplega@iupui.edu). We are in the initial stages of figuring out not just what to do, but how to do it.
Some units cannot pursue balanced cases

- School of Engineering and Technology
- School of Science

*Purdue University controls promotions* and does not currently recognize balanced cases

- Library

*IUPUI P&T standards require excellence in performance* for librarians

- School of Medicine

*The Dean does not allow balanced cases*
Topics

1. Campus definitions of ‘balanced’
2. Thinking and talking about balance
3. Managing balanced cases
4. Panel
Defining Balanced Case
Defining Balanced Case

IU Policy: ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions
“In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.”

IUPUI P&T Guidelines: p. 19
“Balanced case: Faculty presenting a balanced case must present achievement in each of the three areas that is “highly satisfactory” and includes, in all areas, peer-reviewed dissemination.”

All schools and departments should have criteria that address ‘highly satisfactory’ for each area for tenure-track faculty. However, some only include ‘excellence,’ in which case the default becomes the campus standard. Units may have criteria that are more specific than campus, or more rigorous, but not less.
Satisfactory – Highly Satisfactory – Excellent

• Satisfactory ↔ internally focused (for teaching and service; some dissemination for research)

• Highly satisfactory: at least: some peer-reviewed dissemination

• Excellent ↔ for tenure-track: emerging (associate) or established (full) national reputation

Balanced goes HERE
Question: what kind of reputation is required in a balanced case?

There is no simple answer to this question.

“Emerging national reputation” and “achieved national reputation” language is used specifically in the definition of “excellence” in research.

It is NOT used in the definition of “highly satisfactory.”

However, many people with balanced cases DO have national reputations—as integrated scholars with broad portfolio of influence on the campus and their fields.

In research cases, a reputation tends to be narrowly focused on a particular specific research contribution (protein X does Y; implications of taxation on Z): in other words, not on the person but on their research insights.

In balanced cases, a reputation tends to be more focused on the person and their overall influence.

Take-away: tenure-track faculty are expected to have some sort of activity and influence that goes beyond IUPUI and IU.
The point of dissemination is:

If you are doing a good job, **share it**.

If you have a good idea, **share it**.

Let others build upon your work.

Appropriate methods of dissemination are very field or context-specific.

For non-traditional forms of dissemination (everything besides journal articles with citation indexes):

Ask the University Library!
They will show you how to preserve it for future retrieval (**scholarworks**)  
They will help you document impact (**Researchmetrics**)
For **tenure-track** faculty:  
**Binning*** on the CV

*Binning: for grants, presentations, and publications, each one is designated with one (and only one) “area:” teaching, research or service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of cases</th>
<th>Dissemination required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellence in</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced case</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dissemination requirement

Reviewers (and candidates and mentors) should view the dissemination requirement as **one** component of a person’s case.

Because it is easily recognized, some reviewers may default to seeing it as the MOST important or the ONLY element.

Candidates should not lose sight of the importance of dissemination, but dissemination can be the culmination or external mark of extremely important and valuable *internal or community-based work*. (The visible tip of the iceberg does not exist without the iceberg as a whole.)

A frequent example is **leadership on an IUPUI or unit initiative**. 80-90% of your time and effort may be spent getting this up and running (including perhaps internal or external grants); you then may present about it at conferences or in journals. Both reviewers and candidates should weigh the importance and local impact of the initiative at least as highly as the number of presentations or papers that are generated.
Thinking and talking about balance
I don’t think I have a national reputation in anything, so I’ll go for a balanced (‘highly satisfactory’) case.

I’m an administrator so I don’t have time for as much research as other people do. I’ll call my administration “service” work.

Seems like I’ve divided my time between teaching and research. I can’t say I focus on either. Wait, what does it mean to have dissemination in service?

I’ve done a little bit of everything; I like teaching, and research, and being part of committees (that’s service, right?)

My elevator pitch is 30 minutes long.

I can describe stuff I’ve done…. Is there a theme?
Better ways....

What I do is so integrated that it shows up in my research, my teaching, and my service.

Who I am is so powerful it spills over into everything.

Where is your frustration?

Telling a coherent, energetic, and passionate story.

YOU are the one who has to do this. Start practicing!

Shoving things into the research/teaching/service boxes.

We (chairs, OAA) can help you with this.
Strong balanced cases include:

- Scholarly products in each area
- Visibly more than merely satisfactory
- A coherent integration across areas
- Intentionality
- Overall benefit to the University, tied to the unit’s mission

Sharing your ideas, findings, and solutions with others in a peer-reviewed venue
Peer-reviewed?

The requirement for peer-review does not confine you to traditional journal outlets.

The **point** of peer review:

- Communication with the academy (we are part of a larger community)
- Not based on your own opinion of yourself (a giant in your own eyes)
- Open to feedback and correction (I’ve discovered cold fusion—shhhhh, don’t tell anybody)

There are many new, relevant, and dependable sources of peer review. Don’t think old-timey.
Scholarship of service

Peer-reviewed dissemination is required in *all three areas* for a balanced case

What is service?
- *The application of disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge*  
  - It does NOT include university or disciplinary citizenship
- “academic work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers.”
- “contributions to a body of knowledge”
- “evidence of impact”

More than application:
Contribution to a body of knowledge

Service varies by discipline and profession
Administration is not ‘service’ until it results in published models for others
Binning items → Your decision

Your **Candidate Statement** tells the tale of your integrated **life** as a faculty member.

Your **CV** inventories your **work products** into different bins (categories).

**Life does not equal work products**

One **integrated** endeavor can have **distinct and different work products**.
Enthusiasm
Coherence
Accomplishments

This is a partial screenshot of this, which was part of Liz Kryder-Reid’s dossier for promotion to full. It starts with "Publications" but continues with many other categories.

### Evidence of Scholarly Record since 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Side trip: Community-Engaged Scholarship: could well be balanced, but not necessarily.

Not involved in public work

Everything you do, you do with the community

Balanced Case

Public/Community-Engaged Scholarship

Your research/creative activities and your teaching are heavily integrated

Your service and your research may be entwined

You may involve students in your work....do you contribute to the scholarship of teaching?

Where do YOU fit?
Back to basics: version 1

Who am I?

- Explain yourself in 5 minutes to:
  - Your non-academic dad
  - Your dissertation chair, meeting at a conference 10 years after graduating

Why do I do what I do?

- What did you spend your last summer doing? Why?
- Where did you publish last? Why? *To whom were you talking?*
Back to basics: version 2

• Look at your CV. **Color-code** it as to *potential bins*
  – If going for **full**, mark **in-rank** items
  – Note all student co-authors
  – Mark **multiple bins**

• Is it consistent with **who you are** and **how you spend your time**?
  – I do this, because that, which advances my program/unit

• Where are there gaps?
  – Next steps in strengthening your CV and/or your statement/case
Managing balanced cases
## Tenure-track case types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IUPUI 2019-2020</th>
<th>Bloomington 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67 cases</td>
<td>112 non-librarian cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excellent in:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excellent in:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research: 46</td>
<td>Research: 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: 13 (all IUSM)</td>
<td>Service: 1 [promotion to full]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching: 3 (1 assoc., 2 full)</td>
<td>Teaching: 6 [5, promotion to full]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced: 4 (1 assoc., 3 full)</td>
<td>Balanced: 10 [9 for full]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Unusual Case

Balanced case is *not discouraged by the campus*

Balanced case is treated carefully—as all are—by the campus committee

Balanced case is not automatically an “all-read” (problem) case

**Most of your readers**

*Have most of their experience*

*With research cases*

**Educate, explain, enthuse...**
External reviewers and other people to provide input

External reviewers must be:
• Academics. One or two might be non-academics, but the chair needs to make a strong specific case for their expertise in evaluating scholarly value.
• At the desired or higher rank; at a comparable or higher institution
• **Not co-authors, co-PIs, or mentors**
• Able to review and evaluate the candidate’s work; **they do not need to be experts in all aspects.**

Margie Ferguson and Rachel Applegate can help chairs brainstorm reviewers

**Chairs can solicit** other letters:
These letters go into a special non-candidate folder. They are more valuable than candidate-solicited letters, but less than external reviewers.
• Especially valuable for service (and sometimes teaching) where there are limited formal publication products
• Clients and partners in projects can provide their perspectives
• Especially appropriate for experts who are not academics
More about letters

There are three types of letters:

• External reviewers: normally academics, at the appropriate rank; they **must be at arms-length.** (No co-authors, co-PIs, or your dissertation chair)

• Candidate-solicited letters: YOU as candidate choose these and place them in the candidate section of the dossier. You will probably include: a) co-authors so they can affirm YOUR role in multi-author projects; b) campus people who know the value of your work; c) community or non-academic people who work with or benefit from your work.

• Chair “Solicited Letters.” You can give the chair names of people: like letters of reference, these are provided straight to the chair who puts them in a special administrative folder. Because the candidate does not control (cherry-pick) them, these have greater weight than ‘candidate-solicited’ letters.

• For the more important people listed in above, ask your chair to solicit them.

But caution! Dossier readers do not have infinite patience or time! Be selective!
Are you community engaged?

We are setting up a special additional review committee, initially for third year reviews, eventually for tenure reviews.

This committee will write an additional evaluation, that will place the candidate’s work in the context of community-engaged scholarship.

CONTACT ME: rapplega@iupui.edu
Questions from registrations:

• Publications: requirements, examples

• Grants vs. publications vs. awards

• What is ‘highly satisfactory’?
Panelists

Greg Hull, Herron School of Art and Design. Dossier

Elizabeth Kryder-Reid, School of Liberal Arts Evidence Grid

Cullen Merritt, O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs Dossier

Jennifer Thorington-Springer, School of Liberal Arts Dossier

Dossiers are behind a CAS login
Thank you!

Next steps:

• Check out your department and school criteria
• If you are looking at 2021-2022, attend or look into the materials from the Dossier Prep workshop
• Update your DMAI information
• Explore sample Dossiers—either at OAA or within your unit.

• Talk with your mentor, or the associate dean for faculty affairs if there is one for your school
• If you want, set up a meeting with me: rapplega@iupui.edu (Try scheduling assistant in Outlook). I am best at looking at CVs and talking about strategy; I do not provide detailed feedback about candidate statements.