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Outcomes from 2021-2022
148 cases completed

41 cases involved tenure *(42 last year)*
  33 to associate professor + tenure *(32)*
  3 to full professor + tenure *(2)*
  2 tenure-only associate professors
  3 to associate librarian + tenure

39 tenure track promotion-only cases (promotion to full) *(33 last year)*

non-tenure track promotion cases *(58 last year)*:
  52 clinical *(39 to associate, 13 to full)* *(35; 28, 7)*
  6 research *(5 to associate, 1 to full)* *(6)*
  6 senior lecturer *(2)*
  4 senior lecturer to teaching professor *(15)*

This volume is why the P&T CV format is so important!
Case Types for 2021-2022

- NTT
  - Research/Creative
  - Teaching
  - Service

- TT all
  - Research/Creative
  - Teaching
  - Service
  - Balanced
Problem and discussion

Only **seven all-read cases**
All involved **promotion to full**
- 1 teaching professor
- 1 clinical full
- 5 to full, tenure-track

*Final result: 5 yes, 2 no*

*All ‘no’ cases were majority no at the campus and school committees*

Most significant discussion was around **sustained national**....

? Reputation?

? Work?

Does “sustained” mean “consistent”??
Minor

Continued need for:

• Explanation of grant roles, clear for non-specialists

• Explanation of teaching load for research cases

• One sentence that expresses someone’s area of expertise
  • “I have received four grants and published 10 papers.”
  • “I am an expert in llama blood transfusions, for which I have received $$$ in grant funding and authored 5 major studies in leading journals.”

  Not just “I am great” but, “Here is what I am great at”

• External letter writers: not multiple from the same institution
Administrator and department chair responsibilities
But wait!

Please please please please please please please please

Please please please please please please please please

Please please please please please please please please

Please please please please please please please please

Please please please please please please please please

Always say, “I am writing as the **department chair**” or “the **P&T committee chair**”

Please please please please please please please please

Please please please please please please please please

Please please please please please please please please
Check the Guidelines

Really nice year by year description

List of responsibilities

If you are the dean make sure everyone knows who is their contact for dean/dean delegate stuff.

Critical chair duties:

- Identifying and managing external letter writers
- Supporting the department (“primary”) committee in its work

Critical dean duties:

- Supporting the school (“unit”) committee in its work
- Intervening when decisions differ
External letter writers

1. No exceptions to the six, arms-length, qualified external reviewers

2. Multiple reviewers should not come from the same institution

3. Late-arriving letters can be discarded if you already have six and the committee has already met.

4. Do NOT send any reviewer any additional special information that they may request. They get the ‘standard’ packet and that is it.
Intervening when decisions differ

“When divergent evaluations of a dossier result in different recommendations on tenure, the unit (school) committee may wish to consult with the primary (department) committee and/or department chair. The dean should ensure that such consultation, when necessary, has occurred before the dean considers a case. The consultation should note the relative importance of criteria, principles, or evidence used in the evaluation that led to the contrary recommendation. The consultation must be noted in the unit committee’s report, including notice of whether the vote of a committee was changed as a result. When there are divergent evaluations with respect to promotion, the unit committee should provide feedback to the primary committee. The report from each committee should account for negative votes based on committee discussions as opposed to submitting a minority report, which is not allowed. The reports should be written with sufficient detail to fully review the candidate’s qualifications. It is strongly recommended that the letter address the criteria as listed in the Reviewer’s Summary Evaluation.”
Good third year reviews prevent divergent evaluations!
Supporting committees

1. If there are fewer than four qualified voters, work with the regular members to add members. OAA/FA can help.

2. Help with scheduling.

3. Keep everybody on time. eDossier does not route to the next level until a particular level is done.

4. Oh, wait: dept chairs? Don’t approve the dossier until and unless (at least) the CV is in the required format and there is a reasonable candidate statement.
New to Promotion and Tenure
Thanks, Ad Hoc Committee!

1. Teaching professor
2. Balanced-Integrative Diversity Equity and Inclusion
   - Tenure-track, clinical (lecturer)
3. Balanced-Thematic
4. Service and
   - Balanced-Binned case
   - Service Excellence
5. Scholarship and non-tenure-track faculty
6. Quality and Impact metrics
Teaching Professor

2022-2023: last phase-in year for accepting all work as done in-rank.

Work that people may have done prior to becoming a senior lecturer may be accepted as in-rank for promotion to teaching professor.

Will not be renewed.

2023-2024: last year for accepting tenured-associate faculty reviews for teaching professor cases

May be renewed.
Balanced-Integrative DEI cases

The same:
- Independence
- Scholarly impact
- Future plans

The same:
At least satisfactory in all areas of responsibility

New:
- DEI philosophy
- Direct impact on known individuals
- Holistic (integrated)

These are more explanations for readers than actual criteria
Balanced-Integrative Thematic cases

The same:
• Independence
• Scholarly impact
• Future plans

New:
• Coordinating theme
• Direct impact on known individuals
• Holistic (integrated)

The same:
At least satisfactory in all areas of responsibility

Potential themes:
• Community/Publicly Engaged Scholarship
• Translational Science
• Global Learning

These are more explanations for readers than actual criteria
Service

1. For the balanced-binned case, performance must be highly satisfactory but need not include disseminated scholarship.
   - Both clinical and tenure track faculty must have disseminated scholarship for promotion, but it need not be categorized as “service.”

2. For balanced-binned as well as for excellence in service, “service” now includes:
   - Professional services rendered to patients/clients ← as before
   - Administration/internal or external leadership positions
   - Service to organizations, legislative bodies, etc.
Scholarship and Clinical/Lecturer Faculty

Clinical and lecturer faculty cannot be assessed on or promoted for “research.”

They may present scholarship insofar as it advances teaching or service:

• Conducting disciplinary research scholarship alongside students can be scholarship in support of teaching

• Conducting patient service research scholarship alongside practitioners can be scholarship in support of service

Candidates must explicitly make the connection between their scholarship and their area of excellence.
Quality and Impact Metrics

Principles of assessment: the candidate spells out these dimensions of their work:

- **Scope**: the number of people, events, tasks, and other elements involved: more is better.
- **Difficulty/challenge**: initiatives addressing issues that are both important and have proven difficult to improve: more difficulty the better.
- **Innovation/creativity**: initiatives where the candidate provides unique and creative ideas, rather than applying known examples: the more innovative, the better.
- **Success/outcomes**: achievement of planned or secondary objectives—the more successful the better.
- **Adoption by others**: e.g., citations, use in courses, use in other communities or organizations: the more widespread beyond IUPUI, the better.

Not all of these are necessary nor are they individually sufficient. Each item or case will differ in its combination of elements.
In trial or for discussion in 2022-2023

Trial: for campus committee, a consent agenda

Simplification

   Dossier
   CV

Criteria for full rank

NTT membership on the campus committee

Establishment of a NOT AD HOC Committee to oversee P&T
Consent agenda

Trial: for campus committee, a consent agenda

• Every case assigned to two readers.
• Every tenure case dealt with individually (usually 5 minutes)
• Every promotion to full rank (all types) dealt with individually (5 min)
• Every controversial case discussed (usually 15 minutes):
  • Split or negative votes at any level
  • Any case where a reader requests it
  • Any case where a candidate requests it

• All others placed on a joint “consent” agenda to be voted on as a group.
  • Non-tenure track
  • First-promotion (to senior lecturer or clinical assistant)
  • Non-controversial (dean/chair yes; committees positive except for < 25% no votes)
Consent agenda cases (and all cases)

School/department/chair/dean review letters are super-important.

Only one need summarize all elements of the case

All others can ‘agree’ with the summary

Explicitly explain all negative votes and all positive points

Do not cite external reviewers by name
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Based on 2021-2022 Cases</th>
<th>Time Pre</th>
<th>Time post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 consent cases</td>
<td>6 minutes each</td>
<td>5 minutes for all consent cases</td>
<td>4 hours 45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 non-consent non-controversial cases</td>
<td>6 minutes each</td>
<td>6 minutes each</td>
<td>8 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 controversial cases</td>
<td>15 minutes each</td>
<td>15 minutes each</td>
<td>1 hour 45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full rank

What *should or could* a career trajectory look like?

What is “national” reputation?

What is “sustained”? 
Simplification

Dossier simplification

- Role of narration or description
- Role of confirmatory evidence

CV simplification

- Role of professional development listings?
- Course listings

What do schools need?

If one school wants GHI, we don’t want the campus to require DEFGHI from everybody.

Some candidates fill all 50 pages. Some candidates have some details. Some have zero details!!! And still schools are voting yes!
Clinical or lecturer-line faculty on the campus Promotion and Tenure committee

Almost certainly will be elected at-large

Schools: Be prepared to share

• Reasoning why you DO or DO NOT include NTT
• What works or does not work
• Does “area of excellence” or “rank” matter most/more/any?

Currently about half of departments and schools already have NTT members.
Ad Hoc Committee to Revise P&T Guidelines

Per IUPUI constitution and bylaws, both the campus P&T committee and the IFC Faculty Affairs Committee have some oversight of promotion and tenure processes.

Currently, the Ad Hoc Committee is populated by:

- Asking members of the campus P&T committees and Faculty Affairs Committee if they want to attend

Then

- Asking faculty governance and administrators in all non-represented schools to send someone

- And adding anyone that the Exec Committee thinks would be good

We will develop a proposal for a permanent committee.
Fall 2022

1. School representatives to the Campus P&T Committee

2. P&T Workshops
   - “Dossier Prep” will have dedicated sessions for “binned” and for “integrative” cases
   - Individual consultations available
   - Schools encouraged to run their own workshops (didactic or hands-on)

3. Faculty Fellow for workshops and P&T assistance

   Faculty Affairs resource page
   Who Does What because Rachel’s now on phased retirement
Thank you!

Rachel Applegate for individual questions

Margie Ferguson for overall input, workshop support, etc.

Karen Lee for e-dossier support and general process questions