Ad Hoc Committee to Revise Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

First Read: March 1 IFC
Town Hall: March 8, 3-5 pm
Town Hall: March 9, 10:30-12:30 pm
Vote: April 5 IFC
• Balanced Cases ([Circular 2022-05](Circular 2022-05)):  
  • Change wording: “local” to “direct” [impact]  
  • Balanced-Integrative thematic case added  
  • Balanced-Binned Case revisions

• Definition of Service ([Circular 2022-07](Circular 2022-07))

• Other:  
  • Professional peer review of works where appropriate ([Circular 2022-08](Circular 2022-08))  
  • Types of scholarship allowed for NTT/teaching cases ([Circular 2022-06](Circular 2022-06))  
  • Documenting quality and impact ([Circular 2022-04](Circular 2022-04))  
  • Re-emphasize areas of responsibility ([Circular 2022-04](Circular 2022-04))
Proposed changes:

- Are within IU policy guidelines.
- None harm any current case.
- Some involve interpretations already used in many units.
- Most are interpretations that Bloomington already uses, or that are common in other universities who do not employ “binning.”

IFC website: [Circulars](#)
2022-04 Editorial Changes
2022-05 Balanced Case
2022-06 Scholarship for Clinical and Lecturer
2022-07 Service Change
2022-08 Peer Review Change
Balanced Cases (Circular 2022-05)

Overview: Case Types

- Single area of excellence (research/creative activity, teaching, service)
- Balanced:
  - Integrative-DEI: Existing, one wording change
  - Integrative-thematic: New
  - Binned: Existing, some change
- Performance (Librarians): excellence plus highly satisfactory in one other area
Balanced-Integrative DEI

Small change: wording of direct vs. local for impact. (Change to: Circular 2021.05.1)

“• Direct 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.).”

I come up with an idea, others hear and implement it → indirect impact

I come up with an idea, implement it: direct impact
Balanced-Integrative (thematic)

1—Philosophy/theme = explanation of the overarching idea/theme/context of the candidate’s work. E.g. community-engaged scholarship, translational research.

2—Integrated activity = teaching, research/creative activity, and service activities flow into each other and support the chosen philosophy/theme.

3—Independence, innovation, and initiative = candidate has a personal role as a unique and generative actor.

4—Scholarly impact = peer-reviewed dissemination

5—Direct impact = distinct outcomes for thematic work

6—Development over time
Balanced-Binned

- Highly satisfactory in teaching
  - Includes peer-reviewed dissemination
- Highly satisfactory in research
  - Includes peer-reviewed dissemination
- Highly satisfactory in service
  - **Does not require peer-reviewed dissemination**
  - Does require achievement clearly beyond satisfactory

Activities need not be interwoven. CV will be “binned.”

See also: new scope of Service
Service: Expand the scope **Circular 2022-07**

Service when presented as evidence for excellence can involve any of the following:

- Work with or for individuals as clients or patients. **existing**

- Work with or for organizations, community, or governmental partners outside the university including disciplinary or professional bodies or with or for individual practitioners. **new**

- Work advancing a university, campus, or school unit’s teaching, research, or service missions. **new**

Current language for client-service is retained.
Service:  **IU Language**

**Service.** Educated talent, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. Because most technical assistance is carried on by professional persons, and a high proportion of them have university connection, the University must provide people to fill this need. The performance of services for the University or for external organizations may retard accumulation of evidence for proficiency in research or teaching even while contributing to the value of the individual as a member of the University community. In such cases effective service should be given the same consideration in determining promotion as proficiency in teaching or research. The evaluation of the service should be in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University, and its effect on the development of the individual.
Service: Assessment

“Faculty presenting administrative, committee, or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate distinctive outcomes and evidence of quality.” IU policy.

Peer-reviewed dissemination is still an important part of the case for excellence in service; it may be professionally peer-reviewed.

For balanced-binned cases, peer-reviewed dissemination is no longer a requirement for ‘highly satisfactory,’ although it may form part of any case (see balanced case criteria).

In the Guidelines, satisfactory service for all (except research scientists) is defined and discussed separately from service-excellence or service within balanced cases.
Side trip: Reputation

In IU language about “promotions” national reputation is ONLY applied to research cases. (ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions.)

[associate] “If research or other creative work is the primary criterion, the candidate should have demonstrated a broad grasp of his or her own and related fields and should be establishing a national reputation as a scholar.” [full] “If research or other creative work is the primary criterion, the candidate should have shown a continued growth in scholarship which has brought a national reputation as a first-class productive scholar.”

For teaching: [associate] “If teaching is the primary criterion, it should be distinctly superior to that of effective teachers at this and other major institutions.” [full] “If teaching is the primary criterion, the candidate must have demonstrated an extraordinary ability to stimulate in students, either undergraduate or graduate, a genuine desire for scholarly work. Wherever feasible he or she should have demonstrated the ability to direct the research of advanced students.”

For service: [associate] “If service to the University, profession, or community is the primary criterion, it should be discharged with merit and should reflect favorably on the University and on the individual’s academic status.” [full] “if administrative, professional, or academic service is the primary criterion, distinguished contributions must be evident.”
Peer review adjustment Circular 2022-08

Peer review of dissemination is essential.

In many cases, the appropriate “peers” are academic.

In others, professionals may be just as or even more appropriate.

Proposal: Allow units to accept (or not, or to specify when they accept), professional-peer-review of items where applicable. Campus would accept those judgments.

- In effect, is already being used (art being reviewed by art critics or juries; presentations given at professional conferences; journals being edited/peer-reviewed by professionals.)

- External peer reviewers of candidates would remain largely academic.

  Community experts may be appropriate reviewers but they must be at arms-length (not participants, collaborators, or beneficiaries)
Scholarship for NTT candidates/teaching.

**Circular 2022-06**

Background: outside of Medicine, the vast majority of clinical, and all lecturer-track, cases present a case for **excellence in teaching**.

Clinical and lecturer-track faculty are not allowed to be **evaluated and promoted on research**.

Question: for **excellence in teaching** must disseminated scholarship be strictly **scholarship of teaching and learning**?

Proposal (recommended by Ad Hoc; used currently in several units):

Lecturer and clinical faculty may present products of scholarly activity as part of a case for excellence in teaching*, on condition that they discuss and demonstrate how those activities support teaching. No product may be labelled as “research” (per IU policy) but they may be listed in the ‘teaching’ section of a IUPUI binned P&T CV.

*Clinical faculty whose scholarship supports their service will use service as an area of excellence.
Appendix:  Circular 2022-04
Documenting Quality and Impact

The following are elements that add to the strength of the case:

- **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 or combining 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 wide-spread beyond IUPUI, the better.
Other editorial changes

Consistently use “area of responsibility” and “area of excellence” terminology

Ensure all criteria explain what satisfactory means for each area of responsibility; no candidate can be promoted unless all of their areas of responsibility are at least satisfactory.

Add temporary note about language for external reviewers re COVID (IFC)

Note that tenure standards at time of hire must be preserved.

In Teaching Professor criteria, add note that excellence is sustained over time.

Direct schools to develop consistent / explicit policy on what is sent to external reviewers (per type of case).
Process:

Finished:
Ad Hoc Committee, discussion, debate, decisions)
Includes all schools; some IFC Fac Affairs members, some campus P&T members, some IFC Executive Committee members)

Presentation to the IFC Executive Committee

Preview: IFC December 2021

First read: IFC March 1
Town Halls
Depending on debate, will result in no changes or amendments to the proposals (the circulars.)

Vote: IFC April 5
Effective date

All candidates in the 2022-2023 cycle may use 2021-2022 Guidelines

Candidates may choose the 2022-2023 Guidelines (those which incorporate all passed proposals; draft HERE) as soon as they and their units are ready.

Some of these interpretations are already in use or are easily adopted by schools.

Schools may also add or retain their own requirements; for example, “dissemination” for “highly satisfactory in service” was not an IU requirement, but an IUPUI one; if a unit decides to define “dissemination” requirements for service they may.

Anything existing stays until removed, e.g. if schools currently have dissemination-in-service requirements, those stay until removed.
Overall goals: Remove barriers, reward excellence

Or, What are the problems we are trying to solve?

- “Service” is poorly understood in non-Medicine contexts.
- ”Peer-reviewed dissemination” is poorly understood and sometimes inadequate if defined only as “academic” and when applied to non-Medicine service.
- Administrative accomplishments (program-building, etc.) have been recognized by Bloomington and allowed by IU language but ignored by IUPUI rules.
- Balanced-integrative vs. balanced-binned: how ‘integrative’ one’s activities are is often a personal or disciplinary perspective and varies a lot. Retaining two different balanced cases allows people to choose the framework that fits their case best.
Happy successful faculty members!

Happy supportive mentors, colleagues, and staff
Ad Hoc Members

Columbus: Andrea Valentine
Dentistry: Gail Williamson
    Richard Gregory
Education: Jim Scheurich
Engineering: Deb Burns
    Marj Rush Hovde
FSPH: Paul Halverson
    Constantin Yiannoutsos
    Sylvia Bigatti
HHS: Robyn Fuchs
    NiCole Keith
    Keith Avin
Herron: William Potter
Informatics: Andrea Copeland
Kelley: Steve Jones
    Ken Carow
Liberal Arts: Sue Hyatt
    Thom Upton
    Jennifer Thornington Springer
Lilly: Patrick Rooney
McKinney: George Wright
Medicine: Megan Palmer
O’Neill: Tom Stucky
Science: Deb Herold
    Jane Williams
Social Work: Margaret Adamek
Univ. Library: Willie Miller
OAA: Gina Gibau
    Margie Ferguson
    Mary Price
Convenor: Rachel Applegate