

Circular: Overview of Proposed Changes to Campus Promotion and Tenure Review, Spring 2021

Changes to be ADDED to guidelines for the following case types: Excellence in Research, Excellence in Teaching, Excellence in Service, Balanced Case

A separate circular found [here](#) provides exact Guideline language changes.

The following changes are consistent with overall IU and Purdue criteria for tenure-track faculty. This proposal was endorsed by approximately 80% of the current Ad Hoc Committee charged with Reviewing IUPUI Campus P&T Guidelines and forwarded by the IFC Executive Committee to the IUPUI Faculty Council for review.

I. Background: Why Undertake This Review at This Time?

We must ensure that the mechanisms by which we recognize and reward faculty effort and achievements in areas that enhance equity, inclusion and diversity are aligned with our campus values. These values are evident in our current strategic plan and have been referenced in our [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#). In particular, ___ our guidelines stipulate that “IUPUI is committed to providing, nurturing and enhancing a diverse community of learners and scholars in an environment of equity and inclusion” and that “Faculty work that contributes to the diversity of learners and scholars at IUPUI and that enhances our environment of equity and inclusion is highly valued and *should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process* ([Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#), p. 6 – 7, emphasis added). Though included in the IUPUI

[IUPUI Strategic Plan](#)

Goal 9: Promote an Inclusive Campus Climate

Seek, value, and cultivate diversity in all of its forms and create an environment where all campus community members feel welcomed, supported, included, and valued.

Objectives:

1. **Develop and maintain an unapologetically equitable and inclusive campus culture that ensures the academic and professional success of historically minoritized and marginalized students, staff, and faculty, and actively promote the benefits of such a culture to the entire campus.**
2. With campus administration leading by example, provide multiple and varied learning opportunities to the IUPUI community to improve awareness and understanding of and between diverse populations, and to ensure campus accountability to the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion.
3. Develop and implement meaningful and dynamic diversity plans that are unique to each unit, and assess progress annually.
4. Employ proven strategies to diversify campus administration, faculty, staff and students.

guidelines since 2008, there have been few clear criteria provided for evaluation. The proposed changes are aimed at rectifying this issue.

IUPUI currently employs faculty engaging in activities that advance diversity, equity and inclusion, some of whose most impactful work is not currently recognized or rewarded within the traditional P&T system.

IUPUI is committed to recruiting and retaining new faculty who can help continue to advance IUPUI as an institution. The proposed changes to our campus criteria help to ensure that the language in our current [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#) is not mere rhetoric. Rather, IUPUI aspires to be a leader among higher education institutions actively working to systemically integrate its core values into the processes through which faculty work is reviewed.

The proposed changes are entirely consistent with IU Policy on Faculty and Librarian Promotions, which states that, “Promotion considerations must take into account, however, differences in mission between campuses, and between schools within some campuses, as well as the individual’s contribution to the school/campus mission,” and that “a candidate may present evidence of *balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university*” (emphasis added, ACA-38).

II. Criteria for the Balanced-Integrative DEI Case

The Balanced-Integrative DEI Case is a variant of the balanced case.

These criteria are inclusive and complete. That is, a candidate under review for promotion through an integrative case would not also be evaluated against criteria for excellence (in research, teaching, or service) or against the previous balanced case binned structure. The “balanced case-binned-highly satisfactory” case has not been removed; this type of case “balanced-integrative-DEI”) has been added. For IU routing, all Integrative cases will be labelled as Balanced.

The Integrative DEI candidate must present integrative evidence that amounts to excellence in value to the university. It is important to note that Integrative DEI cases are reviewed holistically and represent a marked departure from making clear distinctions among research, teaching and service as separate areas of review. Cases present a comprehensive argument for excellence across an integrated array of scholarly activities aligned with diversity, equity and inclusion.¹

Excellence: The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities aligned with diversity, equity and inclusion. The candidate achieves “excellent overall

¹ Normally such cases would emphasize efforts across teaching, research and service activities. However, in the case that only two of three areas are the focus for DEI-related work, candidates must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in the third area.

performance of comparable benefit to the university.”² All of the following should be evident, using multiple sources of information:

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion	The candidate articulates a philosophy ³ of diversity, equity and inclusion, including if appropriate any specifically targeted aspect.
Integrated Activity	The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUPUI faculty member in teaching, research and service which demonstrably support and advance diversity, equity and inclusion.
Independence, Innovation and Initiative	The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within diversity initiatives. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidate needs to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
Scholarly⁴ impact	Often but not exclusively facilitated by peer-reviewed dissemination ⁵ ; a variety of venues for dissemination are accepted; metrics can be developed using researchmetrics.iupui.edu .
Local Impact	Effective evaluation of diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives should demonstrate distinct outcomes. Tying to unit (program, department, school, campus or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact (e.g., contributing to local communities using professional expertise, recruiting diverse students to undergraduate or graduate programs, diversifying curricula, etc.).
Future Plans	A candidate’s statement should describe plans for future development.

Rank: At the *associate professor level* the candidate should have led or been an essential part of endeavors with distinct and demonstrable local outcomes. National or international dissemination is also expected as a reflection of the quality of the work. At the *full professor* level the candidate should be seen as a local leader and also have achieved a national or international reputation through their work.

² IU Policy ACA-38, ‘comparable’ in contrast to research, teaching or service cases.

³ Similar to the requirement for a teaching philosophy in teaching-excellence cases (which is incorporated into the candidate statement or presented separately.)

⁴ In the current guidelines, in the Service area, this is phrased as, the work is *academic in nature*. This is described as “characterized by “command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contribution to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity, and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact.”

⁵ Peer-reviewed dissemination is the standard language already used in the IUPUI guidelines, broad enough to cover the wide range of research and creative activities pursued by IUPUI faculty across all schools.

III. Documentation of Activities in the Dossier

The basic format for constructing the dossier to reflect the integrative case is listed below:

1. Candidate Statement

- Presents a philosophy of diversity, equity and inclusion that is evidenced through related activities and achievements. This is similar to a teaching philosophy in that it spells out, when necessary, specific targeted areas of focus within DEI-related activities. (A separate philosophy of diversity, equity and inclusion statement may be presented, with a more condensed version included in the candidate statement itself.)
- Articulates how the candidate’s activities and achievements are interrelated; shows that the candidate’s work is intentional and coherent.
- Ties work to the unit, campus or university mission.
- Highlights key accomplishments in **both**:
 - Contributions to scholarly discourse (peer-reviewed dissemination)
 - Local impact
- Establishes both independence and initiative—articulates the candidate’s own role in multi-person endeavors and shows where the candidate fits in initial conception, execution, and/or expansion.

Not every item on a candidate’s CV would be expected to be tied to the DEI /integrative case. In the candidate’s statement, the candidate should identify key accomplishments and endeavors that highlight the candidate’s value to the university in respect to DEI work.

School Criteria are expected to provide guidance on how excellence can be determined within the context of each discipline and area.

Dossier evidence: *Material in the dossier’s main sections exists to provide details, context, and confirmation of assertions in the candidate’s statement.*

The dossier provides substantiation of the statements in the candidate statement, including the following:

- Description of teaching, research, and service (including administrative) load throughout the time in rank.
- Discussion of teaching - Reflection on the following sources of evidence to demonstrate continual growth, assuming that mentoring is also a form of teaching:
 - Peer evaluations

- Student evaluations; for mentoring or other non-course teaching, the chair or program director should arrange for anonymous feedback
 - Evidence of student learning
 - Professional development activities related to teaching
- Scholarly communication - Contributions to the national discourse in the form of peer-reviewed dissemination.
 - Discussion of 3-5 key publications, presentations, creative works, etc.
 - Attestation of individual role in multi-author works (with confirmation from co-PIs, co-authors, etc.)
- Evidence supporting local impact (in department, school, campus, university, region or community)
 - Description of relevant unit specific initiatives, strategic goals, or mission statements.
 - Summary of available contextual quantitative metrics
 - Evaluation of quality and impact, e.g. input from collaborators, recipients; program/outcomes evaluation.

Overall, readers should be able to see evidence of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.

Curriculum Vita(e): The integrative CV has the following format.

- Administrative roles are listed
- All grants and fellowships are combined in one section
- All awards are combined in one section
- All publications are combined.
- Candidates use a hashtag symbol (#) to indicate diversity-centered items.

Except in the *Balanced-Integrative Case type*, candidates must determine and list each grant, presentation and publication under one appropriate category: teaching, research, service as appropriate for their appointment.

In the *Balanced-Integrative Case type*, items are organized in the following categories:

- Education
- Appointments [IU, auto-loaded]
- Administrative roles [at IUPUI, if not already auto-loaded]
- Past appointments
- Licensure, Certification, Specialty Board Status
- Professional Organization Memberships
- Professional Development

- [Librarian Performance]
- Teaching Assignments [Auto-loaded]
- Mentoring
- Other teaching [includes curriculum development]
- Grants [Auto-loaded if awarded to IU; added if not]
- Awards
- Service activities [roles]
- Presentations
 - Refereed
 - Invited
 - Other
- Publications [includes the Digital Measures categories of Artistic and Professional Performances and Exhibits; Publications/Scholarship of Discovery; Intellectual Property (copyright, patents)] [NOT divided by area]
 - Refereed - *Chronologically ordered and by format (e.g., articles vs. books)*
 - Invited
- Other Projects [includes the Digital Measures categories of Scholarship of Application/Engagement, Digital Scholarship]

Order and sub-division depends on disciplinary conventions (chronological, type of venue, etc.)

IV. Future Considerations

The following areas reflect future considerations recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee charged with Reviewing IUPUI Campus P&T Guidelines. Though they are not included within the proposed changes being presented to the IUPUI Faculty Council, they help to illustrate the deliberative process of the Ad Hoc Task Force. As importantly, they reflect areas that should continue to be discussed in order to further refine our campus standards to better support the evaluation of all promotion and tenure cases.

1. **Dissemination** - There is a need for a modern, flexible, and less-biased approach to assessment of dissemination venues. Some of the current issues include (but are not limited to):
 - New methods and new items that are published, beyond the ‘journal’ and ‘the book.’
 - Relation of topic to venue. Current tradition does recognize narrow scientific specialties and their associated journals, but sometimes has unwarranted skepticism for new or interdisciplinary areas.
 - Relation of work to appropriate audience. “Impact” is not (solely) how other academics use the work; it can include how communities or the public or others

use the work, and the work will vary according to the audience. An adopted policy change, for example, is a powerful instance of demonstrated impact.

- Varieties of *peer* review. Peer review is a core concept and at least some of this review must be conducted by members of the academy, but the perspectives of others are also relevant and appropriate⁶. *Self*-publishing is not the goal, but the definition of peer needs attention and appreciation.
- Review of ephemeral work (the traditional “retrievability” criterion).
- Some of the most ‘prestigious’ traditional venues have demonstrated biases (e.g. favoring authors from certain ‘prestigious’ universities, discounting women co-authors, avoiding some topics or aspects.). Valuing traditionally-prestigious venues above others extends this bias.
- Is there a better way to express ‘national’ ‘international’ ‘visibility’ ‘reputation’ ‘impact’ ‘influence’?

2. Metrics

- Note that the competitiveness or prestige of a particular *venue* is not a direct measure of the impact and importance of a particular *work*. Some articles in the ‘best’ journals are never cited.
- Competitive grant funding is one measure of what reviewers think about the concept proposed. It is an insufficient measure of the results of the funding. It also is subject to some embedded bias both in terms of researcher selection (who gets money) and also in terms of what topics are funded at any given time.
- Many new metrics have been developed (sometimes called ‘alt-metrics’ but that inaccurately implies that they are lesser than the traditional ones.)
- Candidates (all) should present all available and relevant metrics of the impact, influence, and importance of their work, as appropriate to their purpose and their audiences. Researchmetrics.iupui.edu can link them to librarians who can assist with this.
- Review committees often are not aware of newer methods of measurement, or default to the forms most familiar to them.
- What does ‘reputation’ mean? How is it appropriately assessed?

3. Independence

- Current guidelines for all cases emphasize the need for candidates to describe their individual roles in multi-party endeavors, and obtain confirmation for at least the key endeavors.
- Team science and other forms of collaborative projects necessarily have collective outcomes; however, it is individuals who are tenured or promoted.

⁶ In current guidelines, with respect to community-engaged work: “Given the importance of collaboration in this work, external evaluators must have knowledge of the processes involved in public scholarship activities and should have knowledge of the project content, rather than only experience based on the faculty member’s discipline. This may include scholars and experts from outside the academy.”

- Reviewers may hold default expectations for certain PI status or author order that do not appropriately value the essential nature of the candidate's participation.
- A candidate's participation may vary over time (from more junior to more senior) and over projects (lead in this, supportive in that).
- The candidate should take care to represent their own work accurately and to help reviewers understand how it contributed to joint outcomes. Reviewers should be open to collaborative methods of achieving goals.