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## Introduction

Promotion and tenure decisions are critical to the future of Indiana University Columbus (also called “IU Columbus”) and to its faculty individually and collectively. Therefore, it is essential that each candidate for promotion and/or tenure be treated fairly and evaluated using clearly stated criteria.

This document describes specific criteria to be used for promotion and/or tenure evaluations at IU Columbus, while acknowledging the subjective value judgments and flexibility required by the process. Division heads should provide these criteria to each faculty member soon after initial appointment and should make all necessary efforts to address faculty members’ questions and concerns about the criteria.

These criteria also serve as a basis for annual reviews of faculty, and division heads should provide each faculty member with an unambiguous written assessment of his/her performance each year. These criteria are also used during the Three Year Review of tenure-track faculty, which provides a formative assessment (separate from the annual review) of the individual's professional development and prospects for being recommended for tenure at the end of the probationary period.

With regard to promotion, the *IU Policies*states:

*Teaching, research and creative work, and services which may be administrative, professional, or public are long-standing University promotion criteria. 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 missions. The relative weight attached to the criteria above should and must vary accordingly. A candidate for promotion [or tenure] should normally excel in at least one of the above categories and be at least satisfactory (research/creative activity; service) or effective (teaching) in the others. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university. In all cases the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any rank is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments.* (IU ACA-38: Faculty and Library Promotions).

With regard to tenure, the *IU Policies* states:

*The principle of tenure imposes reciprocal responsibilities on the University as a body politic and on the faculty member and librarian. In order to meet its responsibilities to its students and to society, the University must attract and retain faculty and librarians of outstanding quality. To that end the University provides academic freedom and economic security, which are implicit in the principle of faculty and librarian tenure. The faculty members, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of teaching, research, service, and professional conduct. Librarians, on their part, are obligated to maintain high standards of performance in librarianship, professional development/research/creative activities, service, and professional conduct.* (IU ACA-37: Faculty and Librarian Tenure*).*

The objective of the promotion and tenure process is to retain and reward faculty who are making significant contributions to their program, their division or division, their school (such as IU Columbus), their campus (such as IU Indianapolis), and Indiana University at large. Each candidate is to be evaluated with this primary objective in mind, recognizing that there are many ways faculty may contribute.

Peer review is the principle that underlies promotion and tenure decisions, thus these decisions are to be made substantively at the program (primary) level, where the faculty member’s activities are best known and can best be evaluated. Primary level decisions must be made rigorously and subsequent evaluations will consider whether stated criteria have been satisfied and whether evaluation procedures have been followed satisfactorily. However, regardless of how explicitly criteria for teaching, research, and service are stated, evaluations will involve value judgments which are in part subjective. Evaluators at every level use their experience coinciding with their own track record of distinction, and judgment to decide whether criteria have been met. Flexibility is exercised in weighting responsibilities and commitments across areas of faculty work as each candidate’s case requires.

The primary mechanism for evaluation of scholarship, whether in teaching, research, or service is through the dissemination of peer reviewed works, including articles, books and book chapters, cases, and conference presentations. Although these criteria provide specific numbers of published works as a general guideline for evidence of excellence, simply counting these products is not adequate; some works are more significant than others and flexibility is needed to address this. It is important to evaluate the intellectual content of the works and their impact or potential impact. Work that breaks new ground is more significant than work that is routine or which simply extends the work of others in a straightforward way. A smaller body of high impact works may be judged a greater contribution than a larger body of lower impact works. In evaluating co-authored work, it is essential that the contribution of the candidate be clearly described.

Below are criteria for promotion and/or tenure for the faculty classifications at the IU Indianapolis academic unit known as IU Columbus, specifically within the IU Columbus Division of Business. Two general sections for faculty concerning promotion and tenure are presented here: (I) Tenure Track Faculty (TT Faculty), and (II) Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTT Faculty).

Because dissemination of peer reviewed work is required for advancement for both TT Faculty and NTT Faculty, quantitative guidelines are provided for these requirements. Other items provide further evidence in support of meeting performance levels in the



1 Concerning tenure for IU Columbus faculty, IU Columbus is an academic unit of IUI / Indiana University Indianapolis / IU Indianapolis. Thus, the relevant campus for IU Columbus is IUI (also called “Indiana University Indianapolis” or “IU Indianapolis”).

categories of faculty work. While faculty are not required to accomplish all of these additional items, those items achieved should be addressed in dossiers and reviews.

# History of this document

The IU Columbus (formerly, IUPUC, and formerly, IUI-Columbus) Division of Business published this Expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure document periodically, as new information arrives from Indiana University and/or from Indiana University Indianapolis. The following dates are a partial list of dates wherein Division of Business Faculty revised and approved this document:

* December 6, 2016
* January 19, 2021
* February 2025 (Incorporation of Balanced – Integrative Thematic dossier)

## SECTION (I): TENURE TRACK FACULTY (TT FACULTY)

# The Five Dossier Options for TT Faculty

There currently exist five (5) dossier options for Candidates to pursue promotion and /or tenure within the IU Indianapolis campus, including IU Columbus which is a center of IU Indianapolis. Each of these five (5) dossier types are described below for the TT Faculty of the IU Columbus Division of Business.

Promotion to associate or full professor requires a dossier reflecting one (1) of the following five (5) dossier constructions, selected by the Candidate:

Binned Dossier Construction (Options 1 through 4)

*NOTE: These are the four (4) traditional academic approaches to earning tenure and/or promotion, leading to the ultimate outcome of emerging national/international reputation (for Associate from Assistant) to the established national/international reputation (for Associate to Full).*

1. *Research Excellence*. Excellent performance binned in research/creative activities, and at least satisfactory performance binned in the other two areas.
2. *Teaching Excellence.* Excellent performance in binned teaching, and at least satisfactory performance binned in the other two areas.
3. *Service Excellence.* Excellent performance binned in service, and at least satisfactory performance binned in the other two areas.
4. *Balanced Binned*. Highly satisfactory performance, or better, binned in each of research/creative activities, teaching, and service. This is the balanced-binned case.
5. *Balanced-integrative thematic*. In this case type, the candidate’s activities and accomplishments are interrelated around a chosen theme. Individual items need not be labeled or separated as belonging exclusively to teaching, research, or service. However, the candidate should demonstrate how teaching, research, and service are expressed by the items: for example, a particular grant may have both teaching and research aspects or a publication may advance disciplinary knowledge (research) and but also be a result of collaboration with practitioners (service). Candidates will state their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated impact and quality (*Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers,* 2024-2025 (p. 25).

*Scope for Ranks:* To achieve the Associate Professor level, the candidate is expected to demonstrate an emerging national/international reputation. To achieve the Full professor level, the candidate is expected to demonstrate an established national/international reputation.

# Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (with tenure)

Options 1 through 4 are the “Binned” dossier construction options. Option 5 is the “Balanced-Integrative Thematic” dossier construction option.

## Criteria for (Binned) Research Excellence

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in research, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

* 1. An active research program leading to a record of peer reviewed research publications in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications. Typically, four or more peer reviewed research publications (or three peer reviewed research publications and one peer reviewed teaching publication) will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of higher quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works. It is important for candidates to provide information that addresses the quality and impact of their scholarship.
	2. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
		+ Peer reviewed research presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences
		+ Research grants and the application for research grants
		+ Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate research
		+ Honors or awards for research
		+ Citations of research publications
		+ Review of submissions for professional journals or conferences
		+ Service on editorial boards, etc.
		+ Other evidence that a research program has achieved emerging regional or national recognition for its contributions to a field
		+ Invitations to lecture
		+ Contributions to research or scholarly efforts of professional bodies or associations.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in research, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

1. An active research program resulting in at least one peer reviewed research publication in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications.
2. A minimum of three of the activities listed in item 1 B for excellence in research.

## Criteria for (Binned) Teaching Excellence

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

* 1. A record of peer reviewed teaching publications in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications. Teaching publications include direct contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning and other scholarly publications that are demonstrated to enhance or be informed by the candidate’s teaching. Typically, four or more peer reviewed teaching publications (or three peer reviewed teaching publications and one peer reviewed research publication) will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of high quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works. It is important for candidates to provide information that addresses the quality and impact of their scholarship.
	2. Evidence of excellent teaching practice as demonstrated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, or other equivalent measures.
	3. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
		+ Peer reviewed teaching presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank.
		+ Other published materials pertaining to teaching, such as cases, manuals or innovative curricular materials
		+ A teaching load that contributes significantly to the division’s teaching responsibility to meet student and program needs
		+ Demonstrated measurable student learning outcomes
		+ Incorporation of high impact practices in teaching
		+ Teaching grants and the application for teaching grants
		+ Honors or awards for teaching
		+ Mentoring of students, including directing student research, etc.
		+ Documented efforts to improve teaching, which may include course or program development or curricular changes, mentoring faculty, and presenting or attending workshops on teaching
		+ Serving as a reviewer for scholarship of teaching and learning journals or academic presses which publish work on teaching and learning
		+ Other evidence that of an emerging regional or national recognition for outstanding teaching practice

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

1. Student satisfaction measures that are consistently favorable or have improved over time.
2. A record of continuing peer evaluation that indicates satisfactory teaching.
3. At least three of the activities listed in item 2 C for excellence in teaching.

## Criteria for (Binned) Service Excellence

Faculty members provide service to the University, the profession, and the public, but they typically do not seek promotion from assistant to associate professor based on excellence in service. A possible exception could be made for a faculty member who is assigned a specific, major service activity that persists through all or most of the probationary period, such as starting a new academic degree program.

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

* 1. Responsibility for a major service activity, such as leadership/administrative responsibility for developing a new degree program.
	2. A record of peer reviewed service publications in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, cases, or other equivalent publications. Typically, three or more peer reviewed service publications will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of high quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works. It is important for candidates to provide information that addresses the quality and impact of their scholarship.
	3. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
		+ A record of peer reviewed service presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank.
		+ Leadership roles on committees and councils, especially at the campus or University levels, including faculty governance
		+ A major role in student recruiting, retention, or advising initiatives
		+ Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations, which might include grant review
		+ Awards and honors for service
		+ Initiative and leadership in public service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies
		+ Service grants and the application for service grants
		+ Active service relationships with business and industry, including consulting, economic development, and the initiation and administration of partnerships
		+ Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at the national level.
		+ Service to an academic discipline, such as the editorship or membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
		+ Frequent service as a reviewer of manuscripts for professional journals and/or presentations for professional conferences
		+ A service load that contributes significantly to the division’s service responsibility to meet division, campus, and university needs.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

1. Consistently performing one’s fair share of service to one’s academic program, division, and campus, typically through active service on committees, task forces, and councils.
2. At least three of the activities listed in item 3 C for excellence in service.

## Criteria for Balanced (Binned) case:

To be promoted based on a Balanced Binned case, the faculty member must demonstrate highly satisfactory performance in each of teaching, research, and service. This may be the most subjective evaluation, requiring ratings closer to excellent than to satisfactory.

* Highly satisfactory in research would typically require three peer reviewed research publications and several other activities and accomplishments from the criteria for excellence in research.
* Highly satisfactory in teaching would typically require a significant contribution to the teaching mission of the campus as evidenced by one peer reviewed teaching publication, consistently strong peer and student evaluations, and several other activities and accomplishments from the criteria for excellence in teaching.
* Highly satisfactory in service would typically require a significant service contribution to the unit, campus or University as evidenced by numerous activities and accomplishments from the criteria for excellence in service.
* A list of at least four peer reviewed presentations related to teaching, research, and/or service at regional, national, or international conferences while in rank.

## Criteria for Balanced-Integrative Thematic Case

In this case type, the candidate’s activities and accomplishments are interrelated, around a chosen theme. The strongest balanced-integrative thematic cases will emphasize a theme that is tied to unit missions, visions, values, and goals. Individual items need not be labelled or separated as belonging exclusively to teaching, research, or service. However, the candidate should demonstrate how teaching, research, and service are expressed by the items: for example, a particular grant may have both teaching and research aspects or a publication may advance disciplinary knowledge (research) and also be a result of collaboration with practitioners (service). Candidates will state their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated impact and quality.

Candidates using an integrative approach are expected to demonstrate independence, innovation, initiative, and impact. The same judged outcomes of emerging national/international reputation (Assistant to Associate) and established national/international reputation (Associate to Full) are expected. Integrative dossiers will rely upon professional or peer review and well as other indicators of quality, supporting an argument for overall excellence in their contributions to the unit, campus, and university. Candidates are expected to achieve the binned rating of “at least satisfactory” for each the three individual areas - research, teaching, or service. However, for successful dossiers, the integration of cumulative work products in rank will generate an overall judgement from reviewers of excellence. Typically, four or more peer reviewed publications related to the candidate’s chosen theme will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of high quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works.

The Division of Business adopts the criteria for the Balanced-Integrative Thematic Case as stated in the IUI / IU Indianapolis *Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers,* 2024-2025 (p. 25). These may include, for example,

* + Civic Engagement
	+ Translational Research
	+ Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
	+ Public Scholarship

Balanced-Integrative cases may address one of these Themes as their leading philosophy, but this list is not exhaustive. A Candidate may also choose to select a Theme specifically mentioned in the unit Strategic Plan or Self-Study.[[1]](#footnote-1)

*Top level expectation*: The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities aligned with their theme, consistent with IU policy on balanced cases: “a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.”

*Balanced-Integrative cases will demonstrate that the candidate possesses these characteristics:*

* Evidence of at least satisfactory performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
* A clearly articulated philosophy / defined Theme which is reflected in the interrelated activities across teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
* Integrated activity: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IU Columbus faculty member in teaching, research, and service which demonstrably support and advance their chosen theme.
* Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within the selected Theme. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidates need to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
* Scholarly impact: Often but not exclusively facilitated by peer-reviewed dissemination; a variety of venues for dissemination are accepted.
* Direct impact: Effective evaluation of initiatives should demonstrate distinct outcomes. Tying to unit (program, division, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact (e.g., contributing to a local community’s using professional expertise, recruiting students to undergraduate or graduate programs, enhancing intellectual diversity in curricula, etc.).
* A cumulative record that supports an argument for overall excellent contribution to the unit and university.
* Increasing development over time. A candidate’s statement should describe plans for the future.

# Promotion from Associate Professor to (Full) Professor

## Options 1 through 4 are the “Binned” dossier construction options. Option 5 is the “Balanced-Integrative Thematic” construction option.

## Criteria for (Binned) Research Excellence

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in research, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

* 1. An active research program expanding on a record of peer reviewed research publications in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications. Typically, four or more peer reviewed research publications (or three peer reviewed research publications and one peer reviewed teaching publication) will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of higher quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works. It is important for candidates to provide information that addresses the quality and impact of their scholarship.
	2. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
		+ Peer reviewed research presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences
		+ Research grants and the application for research grants
		+ Mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate research
		+ Honors or awards for research
		+ Citations of research publications
		+ Review of submissions for professional journals or conferences
		+ Service on editorial boards, etc.
		+ Other evidence that a research program has achieved emerging regional or national recognition for its contributions to a field
		+ Invitations to lecture
		+ Contributions to research or scholarly efforts of professional bodies or associations.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in research, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

1. An active research program resulting in at least one peer reviewed research publication in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications.
2. A minimum of three of the activities listed in item 1 B for excellence in research.

## Criteria for (Binned) Teaching Excellence

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

* 1. A record of peer reviewed teaching publications in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications. Teaching publications include direct contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning and other scholarly publications that are demonstrated to enhance or be informed by the candidate’s teaching. Typically, four or more peer reviewed teaching publications (or three peer reviewed teaching publications and one peer reviewed research publication) will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of high-quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works. It is important for candidates to provide information that addresses the quality and impact of their scholarship.
	2. Evidence of excellent teaching practice as demonstrated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, or other equivalent measures.
	3. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
1. Peer reviewed teaching presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank,
2. Other published materials pertaining to teaching, such as cases, manuals or innovative curricular materials,
3. A teaching load that contributes significantly to the division’s teaching responsibility to meet student and program needs,
4. Demonstrated measurable student learning outcomes,
5. Incorporation of high impact practices in teaching,
6. Teaching grants and the application for teaching grants,
7. Honors or awards for teaching,
8. Mentoring of students, including directing student research, etc.,
9. Documented efforts to improve teaching, which may include course or program development or curricular changes, mentoring faculty, and presenting or attending workshops on teaching,
10. Serving as a reviewer for scholarship of teaching and learning journals or academic presses which publish work on teaching and learning,
11. Other evidence that of an established regional or national recognition for outstanding teaching practice.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

1. Student satisfaction measures that are consistently favorable or have improved over time.
2. A record of continuing peer evaluation that indicates satisfactory teaching.
3. At least three of the activities listed in item 2 C for excellence in teaching.

## Criteria for (Binned) Service Excellence

Faculty members provide service to the University, the profession, and the public, and in a sense, it could be argued that everything faculty members do when they are at their very best is of service to some population. To achieve promotion to full professor on (binned) service, the faculty member will need to establish themselves as a regional or national expert in academic service.

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

* 1. Responsibility for a major service activity, such as leadership/administrative responsibility for developing a new degree program.
	2. A record of peer reviewed service publications in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, cases, or other equivalent publications. Typically, three or more peer reviewed service publications will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of high-quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works. It is important for candidates to provide information that addresses the quality and impact of their scholarship.
	3. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
* A record of peer reviewed service presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank,
* Leadership roles on committees and councils, especially at the campus or University levels, including faculty governance,
* A major role in student recruiting, retention, or advising initiatives,
* Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations, which might include grant review,
* Awards and honors for service,
* Initiative and leadership in public service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies,
* Service grants and the application for service grants,
* Active service relationships with business and industry, including consulting, economic development, and the initiation and administration of partnerships,
* Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at the national level,
* Service to an academic discipline, such as the editorship or membership on the editorial board of a professional journal,
* Frequent service as a reviewer of manuscripts for professional journals and/or presentations for professional conferences,
* A service load that contributes significantly to the division’s service responsibility to meet division, campus, and university needs.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria D and E.*

* 1. Consistently performing one’s fair share of service to one’s academic program, division, and campus, typically through active service on committees, task forces, and councils.
	2. At least three of the activities listed in item **3 C** for excellence in service.

## Criteria for Balanced (Binned) case:

To be promoted based on a Balanced Binned case, the faculty member must demonstrate highly satisfactory performance in each of teaching, research, and service. This may be the most subjective evaluation, requiring ratings closer to excellent than to satisfactory.

* Highly satisfactory in research would typically require three peer reviewed research publications and several other activities and accomplishments from the criteria for excellence in research.
* Highly satisfactory in teaching would typically require a significant contribution to the teaching mission of the campus as evidenced by one peer reviewed teaching publication, consistently strong peer and student evaluations, and several other activities and accomplishments from the criteria for excellence in teaching.
* Highly satisfactory in service would typically require a significant service contribution to the unit, campus or University as evidenced by numerous activities and accomplishments from the criteria for excellence in service.
* A list of at least four peer reviewed presentations related to teaching, research, and/or service at regional, national, or international conferences while in rank.

## Criteria for Balanced-Integrative Thematic Case

In this case type, the candidate’s activities and accomplishments are interrelated, around a chosen theme. The strongest balanced-integrative thematic cases will emphasize a theme that is tied to unit missions, visions, values, and goals. Individual items need not be labelled or separated as belonging exclusively to teaching, research, or service. However, the candidate should demonstrate how teaching, research, and service are expressed by the items: for example, a particular grant may have both teaching and research aspects or a publication may advance disciplinary knowledge (research) and but also be a result of collaboration with practitioners (service). Candidates will state their integrative philosophy and show how their most important accomplishments demonstrate peer-evaluated impact and quality.

Candidates using an integrative approach are expected to demonstrate independence, innovation, initiative, and impact. The same judged outcomes of an established national/international reputation (Associate to Full) are expected. Integrative dossiers will rely upon professional or peer review and well as other indicators of quality, supporting an argument for overall excellence in their contributions to the unit, campus, and university. Candidates are expected to achieve the binned rating of “at least satisfactory” for each the three individual areas - research, teaching, or service. However, for successful dossiers, the integration of cumulative work products in rank will generate an overall judgement from reviewers of excellence. Typically, four or more peer reviewed publications related to the candidate’s chosen theme will support a case for excellence, but quality is more important than quantity and a smaller number of high quality works may be judged more significant than a larger number of lower quality works.

The Division of Business adopts the criteria for the Balanced-Integrative Thematic Case as stated in the IUI / IU Indianapolis Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers, 2022-2025 (p. 25). These include:

* Civic Engagement
* Translational Research
* Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
* Public Scholarship

Balanced-Integrative cases may address one of these Themes as their leading philosophy, but this list is not exhaustive. A Candidate may also choose to select a Theme specifically mentioned in the unit Strategic Plan or Self-Study.

*Top level expectation*: The candidate demonstrates excellence across an array of integrated scholarly activities aligned with their theme, consistent with IU policy on balanced cases: “a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university.”

*Balanced-Integrative cases will demonstrate that the candidate possesses these characteristics:*

* Evidence of at least satisfactory performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
* A clearly articulated philosophy / defined Theme which is reflected in the interrelated activities across teaching, research/creative activity, and service.
* Integrated activity: The candidate has interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IU Columbus faculty member in teaching, research, and service which demonstrably support and advance their chosen theme.
* Independence, innovation, and initiative: The candidate articulates their personal role as an essential and generative actor within the selected Theme. Interdependence and teamwork are valued as well as contributions to group achievements; the candidates need to describe their own roles and responsibilities.
* Scholarly impact: Often but not exclusively facilitated by peer-reviewed dissemination; a variety of venues for dissemination are accepted.
* Direct impact: Effective evaluation of initiatives should demonstrate distinct outcomes. Tying to unit (program, division, school, campus, or university) missions strengthens the importance of the impact (e.g., contributing to a local community’s using professional expertise, recruiting students to undergraduate or graduate programs, enhancing intellectual diversity in curricula, etc.).
* A cumulative record that supports an argument for overall excellent contribution to the unit and university.
* Increasing development over time. A candidate’s statement should describe plans for the future.

## SECTION (II): NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY (NTT FACULTY)

# Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer and from senior lecturer to teaching professor requires excellent performance in teaching and satisfactory performance in service.

Promotion to senior lecturer and teaching professor is accompanied by the awarding of three -year rolling contracts.

Promotion from clinical assistant to clinical associate and from clinical associate to clinical full professor requires excellent performance in teaching or professional service and at least satisfactory performance in the other area and in University service. Promotion to clinical associate professor and clinical professor is accompanied by awarding of five-year rolling contracts.

Lecturers and clinical faculty will have an initial probationary period of three years. In March of the third year of appointment, lecturers and clinical faculty are expected to submit a personal statement that provides an opportunity to reflect not only on their work, but also on the focus that is emerging in their work. This focus will provide the coherence to their work that should shape their efforts between the third year and the time of their candidacy for promotion. If the individual is continued in rank past the third year, they are expected to prepare and submit a personal statement every five years subsequent to the initial three-year appointment period. Lecturers and clinical faculty are not obligated to pursue promotion.

# Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, and C.*

* 1. Documented student learning as demonstrated by student learning outcomes (e.g., at course, program levels), student input into teaching (e.g., student evaluations), and peer evaluations of teaching. At least three peer evaluations across time are required.
	2. Distinct teaching philosophy as demonstrated by a teaching philosophy statement, and reflection on input from student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and peer evaluations.
	3. Excellent achievement in instruction and in at least one of the other domains (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.
1. Excellent achievement in instruction as demonstrated by documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes. The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy.
2. Achievement of excellence in a teaching-related domain (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.
	* Course or curricular development includes the production of effective course and curricular products, and evidence of having disseminated ideas locally or internally through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.
	* Mentoring and advising (of students) is characterized by a scholarly approach. High accomplishments of students mentored or advised are consistently linked to the influence of mentor, demonstrating impact. Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented.
	* Service in Support of Teaching and Learning is demonstrated through course coordination, training of other faculty, support of student learning experiences, or support of community in area of expertise, etc.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

1. Consistently performing one’s fair share of service to one’s academic program, division, and campus, typically through active service on committees, task forces, and councils.
2. A minimum of three of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for satisfactory. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
	* A record of peer reviewed service presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank.
	* Leadership roles on committees and councils, especially at the campus or University levels, including faculty governance
	* A major role in student recruiting, retention, or advising initiatives
	* Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations, which might include grant review
	* Awards and honors for service
	* Initiative and leadership in public service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies
	* Service grants
	* Active service relationships with business and industry, including consulting, economic development, and the initiation and administration of partnerships
	* Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at the national level.
	* Service to an academic discipline, such as the editorship or membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
	* Frequent service as a reviewer of manuscripts for professional journals and/or presentations for professional conferences

# Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, C, and D.*

1. Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching
2. Documented student learning as demonstrated by student learning outcomes (e.g., at course, program levels), student input into teaching (e.g., student evaluations), and peer evaluations of teaching. At least three peer evaluations across time are required.
3. Distinct teaching philosophy as demonstrated by a teaching philosophy statement, and reflection on input from student learning outcomes, student evaluations, and peer evaluations.
4. Excellent achievement in instruction and also in at least one of the other domains (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.
	1. Excellent achievement in instruction as demonstrated by documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes. The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy.
	2. Achievement of excellence in a teaching-related domain (course or curricular development, mentoring/advising, service in support of teaching/learning), depending on responsibilities.
		* Course or curricular development includes the production of effective course and curricular products, and evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through administration, mentoring, publication, presentation, or other means.
		* Mentoring and advising (of students) is characterized by a scholarly approach. High accomplishments of students mentored or advised are consistently linked to the influence of mentor, demonstrating impact. Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented.
		* Service in Support of Teaching and Learning is demonstrated through course coordination, training of other faculty, support of student learning experiences, or support of community in area of expertise, etc.

*To receive a rating of satisfactory performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria A and B.*

1. Consistently performing one’s fair share of service to one’s academic program, division, and campus, typically through active service on committees, task forces, and councils.
2. A minimum of three of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for satisfactory. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
	* A record of peer reviewed service presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank.
	* Leadership roles on committees and councils, especially at the campus or University levels, including faculty governance
	* A major role in student recruiting, retention, or advising initiatives
	* Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations, which might include grant review
	* Awards and honors for service
	* Initiative and leadership in public service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies
	* Service grants
	* Active service relationships with business and industry, including consulting, economic development, and the initiation and administration of partnerships
	* Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at the national level.
	* Service to an academic discipline, such as the editorship or membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
	* Frequent service as a reviewer of manuscripts for professional journals and/or presentations for professional conferences

# Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in teaching, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, C, and D.*

1. Scholarly activity resulting in publication of at least one peer reviewed publication in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, teaching cases, or other equivalent publications. This scholarship may be in teaching or an area of disciplinary research, but if the latter, the candidate must describe how that scholarship contributes to his or her excellence as an instructor.
2. A record of peer reviewed teaching presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank. Typically, four or more peer reviewed teaching presentations will support a case for excellence, but extra peer reviewed teaching publications can compensate for fewer peer reviewed teaching presentations.
3. Evidence of excellent teaching practice as demonstrated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, or other equivalent measures.
4. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
	* Other published materials pertaining to teaching, such as cases, manuals or innovative curricular materials
	* A teaching load that contributes significantly to the division’s teaching responsibility to meet student and program needs
	* Demonstrated measurable student learning outcomes
	* Incorporation of high impact practices in teaching
	* Teaching grants and the application for teaching grants
	* Honors or awards for teaching
	* Significant mentoring of students, including directing student research, internships, etc.
	* Effective student advising
	* Documented efforts to improve teaching, which may include course or program development or curricular changes, mentoring faculty, and presenting or attending workshops on teaching
	* Serving as a reviewer for scholarship of teaching and learning journals or academic presses which publish work on teaching and learning
	* Other evidence that of an emerging regional or national recognition for outstanding teaching practice

Criteria for satisfactory service are the same as listed above for tenure track faculty.

*To receive a rating of excellent performance in service, the candidate must meet criteria A, B, C, and D.*

1. Responsibility for a major service activity, such as leadership/administrative responsibility for developing a new degree program.
2. Scholarly activity resulting in publication of at least one peer reviewed service publication in rank, consisting of articles in reputable journals, scholarly books, book chapters, proceedings, cases, or other equivalent publications.
3. A record of peer reviewed service presentations at regional, national and/or international conferences while in rank. Typically, four or more peer reviewed service presentations will support a case for excellence, but extra peer reviewed service publications can compensate for fewer peer reviewed service presentations.
4. A minimum of five of the following activities. Although any activity may be accomplished more than once, a range of activities will strengthen the case for excellence. The list below is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.
	* Leadership roles on committees and councils, especially at the campus or University levels, including faculty governance
	* A major role in student recruiting, retention, or advising initiatives
	* Service to state and national governmental offices or agencies, or other public organizations, which might include grant review
	* Awards and honors for service
	* Initiative and leadership in public service to the community, and evidence of the influence of these activities on community programs and policies
	* Active service relationships with business and industry, including consulting, economic development, and the initiation and administration of partnerships
	* Service grants
	* Service to professional societies with leadership roles (such as presidency of professional organizations) at the national level.
	* Service to an academic discipline, such as the editorship or membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
	* Frequent service as a reviewer of manuscripts for professional journals and/or presentations for professional conferences

Criteria for satisfactory teaching are the same as listed above for tenure track faculty.

1. Schools and departments such as IU Columbus and the Division of Business, may develop Strategic Plans, Self-Studies, or other templates and expectations for themes particularly relevant to their units. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)