

**Indiana University Kokomo**  
**School of Humanities and Social Sciences**  
**Promotion and Tenure Criteria**

This document will apply to candidates for promotion and/or tenure of the year that starts August 1, 2020 and subsequent years.

Approved by the Humanities and Social Sciences faculty April 29, 2020.

**Contents**

1. Criteria for Promotion_____	2
Lecturer to Senior Lecturer_____	3
Assistant Professor to Associate Professor _____	3
Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor_____	6
Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor _____	7
Associate Professor to Professor_____	9
Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor_____	11
2. Criteria for Tenure_____	12
3. Scholarship for the Public Good _____	12

This document is a supplement to the Indiana University Faculty Handbook.

## Promotion and Tenure Criteria

The School of Humanities and Social Sciences adheres to the criteria and policies regarding promotion and tenure as stated in the Indiana University Faculty Handbook and in IU Kokomo Faculty Senate documents. The criteria and guidelines constituting the supporting evidence used in the annual review and for purposes of promotion and tenure are identical; therefore, this document frequently refers to the School of Humanities and Social Sciences Annual Evaluation Guidelines for lists of evidence to support teaching, scholarship, and service.

In producing dossiers for promotion and/or tenure, faculty members are encouraged to highlight how their work in scholarship/creative activity, teaching, and/or service has advanced the mission and statements of commitment of the university, such as diversity, regional engagement, and innovation.

The School of Humanities and Social Sciences strongly supports the position of campus promotion and tenure documents that scholarship of teaching and learning may be counted as evidence in the scholarly activity category or as evidence in the teaching category (with any particular piece fitting more appropriately into one category rather than another). Pieces that are appropriate for both categories, however, may only be counted once; the candidate should note in what category each piece of scholarship of teaching and learning should count. Similarly, Scholarship for the Public Good may fit in the category of scholarly activity or service. Work that is appropriate for both categories, however, may only be counted once; the candidate should note in what category work related to Scholarship for the Public Good should count.

### 1. Criteria for promotion

Teaching, scholarly activity or creative work, and service (which may be administrative, professional, or public) are long-standing University promotion criteria. Promotion considerations must include the individual's contribution to the mission of the campus. A candidate for promotion should normally excel in at least one of the areas (teaching, scholarly activity or creative work, and service) and be satisfactory in the others. Alternatively, a candidate may present evidence of a balance of strengths that promises comparable benefits to the university over time.

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. When considered for promotion, the individual should be assessed in regard to all three criteria from the preceding section when seeking promotion in tenure track ranks; individuals in clinical or lecturer positions will be assessed only in teaching and service. Favorable action should result when the individual has demonstrated a level of satisfactory or excellence appropriate to the proposed rank in one area of endeavor. Failure to promote may arise from unsatisfactory performance in any one of the other areas.

Candidates should note that standards for promotion differ somewhat from those of the annual evaluation, as promotion looks at total accomplishments and not merely the work of one year. For example, annually receiving an Excellent rating in teaching does not guarantee that one's teaching will be considered excellent for purposes of promotion. However, the types of evidence used in the annual evaluation and in cases for promotion and/or tenure are the same. Please review the School of Humanities and Social Sciences Annual Evaluation Guidelines (HSS AEG) for these lists of types of evidence; where applicable, these sections are listed below.

### **1.1. From Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

This promotion is based upon a documented record of consistently excellent teaching and at least satisfactory service.

- a. The candidate should have demonstrated their teaching to be extremely effective in promoting student learning and engagement, with a documented pattern of assessment and reflection on teaching outcomes, and based on self, peer, and student evaluation and review. Evidence such as a consistent willingness to engage in new course development as needed, continuous course improvement, and to work individually with students should be demonstrated (See section 1.1 of the HSS AEG).
- b. A solid record of participation in campus affairs through committee work and/or in the relationships of the campus to the greater community must be clearly documented. Note, service is judged by its quality; whether a faculty member received release time for such service is not relevant when judging the quality of service.

### **1.2. From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

This advancement is based on continued improvement and achievement, whether in quality of teaching, in scholarly activity or creative work, or in the performance of service roles.

#### **A. Standards of Excellence for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

All candidates must choose one area of excellence (unless the candidate is choosing to present a "Balanced Case" – however, this choice is not advised, and should only be undertaken after consultation with one's Dean and Chair). Below are the standards of excellence for each category.

##### **a. Teaching as the area of excellence**

The candidate should have demonstrated their teaching to be extremely effective in promoting student learning and engagement, with a documented pattern of assessment and reflection on teaching outcomes, and based on self, peer, and student evaluation and review. Evidence such as a consistent willingness to engage in new course development as needed, continuous course improvement, and to work individually with students should be demonstrated

(See section 1.1 of the HSS AEG).

**b. Scholarly activity or creative work as the area of excellence**

If scholarly activity or creative work is the area of excellence, the candidate should have demonstrated a broad grasp of his or her own fields, and the candidate should be establishing a national reputation as a scholar.

**For scholarly activity**, a definite and comprehensive plan of future research covering a number of years and a beginning thereon which extends well beyond the limits of the doctoral dissertation should be evident. There are various methods for demonstrating excellence in scholarly activity, but what follows is a typical path.

The School typically holds the following expectations for excellence in scholarship:

- Since the last appointment in rank at IU Kokomo, having at least four refereed publications OR a lesser number if those publications are particularly prestigious or high-impact (e.g., a single-author book, articles within top-tier journals). If a mix of peer-reviewed scholarly products of varying scope and impact (see HSS AEG section 2.1.) is presented as evidence of excellence in scholarship, the candidate must demonstrate how their body of work would be equivalent to four refereed publications. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication. Candidates are responsible to explain how their scholarly achievements merit the distinction of excellence in scholarship, including describing the quality of the journals in which publications appear.
- Conducting research mainly in or contributing to the fields covered by the School/Department;
- Establishing a pattern of research, presentation, and publication that shows growth and development as a recognized scholar;
- Presenting other evidence or dedication to scholarship as noted in section 2.1 of the HSS AEG.

**For creative works**, such as the Fine Arts, the candidate must provide documentation that establishes a record of achievement using the items outlined in 2.1. Candidates are encouraged to pursue funding sources in order to support their creative efforts.

The School typically holds the following expectations for excellence in creative activity:

- Documentation should be provided for approximately 6 to 10 achievements during the period under review for promotion with tenure, with at least three meeting the criteria for excellence as defined in HSS AEG section 2.1.
- The professional activities should demonstrate significance in terms of peer-reviewed standards of excellence in the creative discipline.

NOTE: Candidates may also achieve a ranking of excellence via a comparable combination of scholarly publications and creative activity achievements. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication.

### **c. Service as the area of excellence**

If service to the University, campus, profession, or community is the area of excellence, it should involve development and implementation of programs to benefit the University, profession, and/or community. This should include a pattern of active leadership. Please note, it is very difficult to argue service as an area of excellence, and it is strongly advised that a candidate choose teaching or scholarly activity/creative work as the area of excellence. See the HSS AEG section 3.1 for the types of evidence to use to support satisfactory in service.

## **B. Standards for Satisfactory Performance for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

Faculty must be at least satisfactory in the areas other than the one they select as excellent. This section sets general expectations for the minimum accepted standards for satisfactory teaching, scholarly activity or creative work, and service.

**a. Minimum accepted standards in teaching** for purposes of Tenure and Promotion require the candidate to have demonstrated a consistent record of satisfactory course development and stimulation and effective support of student learning, using evidence from the HSS AEG section 1.1.

**b. Minimum accepted standards in scholarship for faculty producing scholarly works** for purposes of Tenure and Promotion are:

- Having at least two, but typically three, refereed publications (can be in press) since the last appointment in rank at IU Kokomo; and, other evidence of or dedication to research as noted in section 2.1. of the HSS AEG. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication.
- To receive promotion with only two refereed publications requires the candidate to make the case they are of substantial merit. (Note: Papers, technical reports, and non-refereed articles in prestigious journals can enhance one's qualifications for promotion, but do not substitute for refereed journal articles.)

**c. Minimum accepted standards in scholarship for faculty producing creative works, such as in Fine Arts** for purposes of Tenure and Promotion are:

- The candidate must provide documentation that establishes a record of achievement using the items outlined in section 2.1 of the HSS AEG.
- Documentation should be provided for approximately 5 to 8 achievements during the period under review for promotion with tenure.
- Candidates are encouraged to pursue funding sources in order to support their creative efforts.

NOTE: Candidates may also achieve a ranking of satisfactory via a comparable combination of scholarly publications and creativity activity achievements. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication.

**d. Minimum accepted standards in service** for purposes of Tenure and Promotion require the candidate's service contributions to reflect a consistent pattern of service activity at least at the departmental and campus levels. Note, service is judged by its quality; whether a faculty member received release time or possessed an administrative appointment for such service is not relevant when judging the quality of service. Specifically, administrative service is vital to the function of the department, campus, and university, and its function should be judged by its impact just as any other service: administrative service should neither be privileged nor discounted because of its nature. See the HSS AEG section 3.1 for the types of evidence to use to support satisfactory in service.

### **1.3. From Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor**

In accord with the Indiana University Academic Handbook, clinical appointees are faculty whose primary duties are teaching students and providing professional service in the clinical setting. Accordingly, this promotion is based upon a documented record of consistently excellent teaching both within the classroom and in relation to clinical duties, and at least satisfactory service (especially related to interfacing with the community).

- a. The candidate should have demonstrated their teaching to be extremely effective in promoting student learning and engagement, with a documented pattern of assessment and reflection on teaching outcomes, and based on self, peer, and student evaluation and review. Evidence such as a consistent willingness to engage in new course development as needed, continuous course improvement, and to work individually with students should be demonstrated (See section 1.1 of the HSS AEG).

b. A solid record of participation in campus affairs through committee work and in the relationships of the campus to the greater community must be clearly documented. Within the documentation of service activities, the candidate must have demonstrated clear connections between their service and the clinical nature of this appointment (see section 3.1 in the HSS AEG).

#### **1.4. From Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor**

This promotion is based upon achievement beyond the level required for the Senior Lecturer. In addition, excellence in any area assumes a level of achievement greater than described as Satisfactory below. Candidates are judged based on activities completed since the last promotion review. Note, while the standards are higher, they are the same for each candidate. Evidence of teaching may be presented in different ways; some candidates may wish to submit publications related to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) while others will not do so. Differences between individual applicants are irrelevant; they both have the same expectations to demonstrate significant progress and achievement since their promotion to Senior Lecturer.

##### **A. Standards of Excellence for Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor**

All candidates must choose one area of excellence. Below are the standards of excellence for each category. Note: it is highly unusual for a Lecturer to seek a rating of Excellent based on service. Likewise, Senior Lecturers who wish to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor should consult with supervisors before submitting the dossier.

a. **If teaching is the primary criterion**, the candidate must have demonstrated an excellent ability as a teacher, as demonstrated by the types of evidence listed in the HSS AEG section 1.1. They must have demonstrated excellence in two or more areas such as course delivery, course development, course improvement, course innovation, mentoring students, program development, graduate or undergraduate research, or SoTL, and/or be recognized as excellent in teaching by peers and students, whether by evaluations or awards.

b. **If administrative, professional, or academic service** is the primary criterion, significant, beneficial contributions to the University, the profession, and/or the community must have been demonstrated, including a pattern of active leadership. Section 3.1 of the HSS AEG details examples of acceptable types of service activities. Note, service is judged by its quality; whether a faculty member received release time or possessed an administrative appointment for such service is not relevant when judging the quality of service. Specifically, administrative service is vital to the function of the department, campus, and university, and its function should be judged by its impact just as any other service: administrative service should neither

be privileged nor discounted because of its nature. However, faculty seeking promotion based on excellence in service who receive significant release time must demonstrate accomplishments beyond those expected for satisfactory, routine performance of administrative duties. Note: it is highly unusual for a Lecturer to seek a rating of Excellent based on service. Senior Lecturers who wish to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor should consult with supervisors before submitting the dossier.

### **B. Standards for Satisfactory Performance for Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Teaching Professor**

Faculty must be at least satisfactory in the area other than the one they select as excellent. This section sets general expectations for the minimum accepted standards for satisfactory teaching, service, and scholarly activity or creative work. Note: it is highly unusual for a Lecturer to seek a rating of Excellent based on service. Senior Lecturers who wish to be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor should consult with supervisors before submitting the dossier.

a. Minimum accepted standards in teaching for purposes of promotion require the candidate to have demonstrated a consistent record of satisfactory course development and stimulation and effective support of student learning. Faculty members who wish to seek promotion to Teaching Professor without a rating of Excellent in teaching should communicate closely with supervisors prior to submitting their dossiers.

b. Minimum accepted standards in service for purposes of promotion require the candidate's service contributions to reflect a consistent pattern of quality service activity at least at the departmental and campus levels, with evidence of filling significant service roles as expected of a senior faculty member (such as chairing committees, serving on campus P & T or third year review committees, participation in significant Faculty Senate committees, serving in administrative capacities). Section 3.1 of the HSS AEG gives examples of items that can count toward service.

Note, while service outside of the department and campus is valued, it is expected that senior faculty demonstrate favorable participation in shared governance appropriate to rank. Additionally, service is judged by its quality; whether a faculty member received release time or possessed an administrative appointment for such service is not relevant when judging the quality of service. Specifically, administrative service is vital to the function of the department, campus, and university, and its function should be judged by its impact just as any other service: administrative service should neither be privileged nor discounted because of its nature.



### 1.5. From Associate Professor to Professor

This promotion is based upon achievement beyond the level required for the associate professorship. In addition, excellence in any area assumes a level of achievement greater than described as satisfactory below. Candidates are judged based on activities completed since the last promotion review. Note, while the standards are higher, they are the same for each candidate. For example, if candidate X published 4 articles for promotion to associate professor, and candidate Y published 6 articles to achieve promotion to associate professor, this difference is irrelevant when they are seeking promotion to professor: they both have the same expectation for publishing additional articles for promotion to professor, regardless of their level of productivity as assistant professors.

#### A. Standards of Excellence for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

All candidates must choose one area of excellence. Below are the standards of excellence for each category.

**a. If teaching is the primary criterion**, the candidate must have demonstrated an excellent ability as a teacher, as demonstrated by the types of evidence listed in the HSS AEG section 1.1. They must have demonstrated excellence in two or more areas such as course delivery, course development, course improvement, course innovation, mentoring students, program development, graduate or undergraduate research, or SoTL, and/or be recognized as excellent in teaching by peers and students, whether by evaluations or awards.

**b. If scholarly activity is the primary criterion**, the candidate should have shown a continued growth in scholarship which has brought a national reputation as a productive and/or innovative scholar, with a stream of activities that shows in-depth focus in a particular area and coherence in thought development, including at least six refereed journal articles (or their equivalent, such as a substantial single author book) since the last appointment in rank at IU Kokomo. Such growth and achievement can be evidenced through publication type, frequency, and/or prestige of venue, but the absolute number of publications is only one possible factor to be considered in this evaluation. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication. Regardless of number, an emphasis on peer-reviewed publication is highly important. If a mix of peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed scholarly products of varying scope and impact (see section 2.1 in the HSS AEG) is presented as evidence of excellence in scholarship, the candidate must have demonstrated how their body of work indicates their growth and stature as an expert in their field.

**c. If creative works**, such as in the fine arts, is the primary criterion, the candidate must provide documentation that establishes a record of achievement in exhibitions, commissions, publications, grants, and fellowships after the previous promotion and tenure; these professional achievements should

demonstrate significance in terms of national recognition in the creative discipline. Documentation should be provided for approximately 8 to 12 achievements during the period under review for promotion with tenure, with at least five meeting the criteria for excellence as defined in HSS AEG section 2.1.

NOTE: Candidates may also achieve a ranking of satisfactory via a comparable combination of scholarly publications and creative activity achievements. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication.

**d. If administrative, professional, or academic service** is the primary criterion, significant, beneficial contributions to the University, the profession, and/or the community must have been demonstrated, including a pattern of active leadership. Section 3.1 of the HSS AEG details examples of acceptable types of service activities. Note, service is judged by its quality; whether a faculty member received release time or possessed an administrative appointment for such service is not relevant when judging the quality of service. Specifically, administrative service is vital to the function of the department, campus, and university, and its function should be judged by its impact just as any other service: administrative service should neither be privileged nor discounted because of its nature. However, faculty seeking promotion based on excellence in service who receive significant release time must demonstrate accomplishments beyond those expected for satisfactory, routine performance of administrative duties. Please note, it is very difficult to argue service as an area of excellence, and it is strongly advised that a candidate choose teaching or scholarly activity/creative work as the area of excellence.

## **B. Standards for Satisfactory Performance for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

Faculty must be at least satisfactory in the areas other than the one they select as excellent. This section sets general expectations for the minimum accepted standards for satisfactory teaching, service, and scholarly activity or creative work.

**a. Minimum accepted standards in teaching** for purposes of promotion require the candidate to have demonstrated a consistent record of satisfactory course development and stimulation and effective support of student learning.

**b. Minimum accepted standards for faculty producing scholarly works** for purposes of promotion require the candidate to have produced a body of research evidencing continued contributions to scholarship since the last promotion in rank. Typically, this would include at least three, but more often four, refereed publications (in print or in press) since the last appointment in rank at IU Kokomo. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication. If a mix of peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed scholarly products of varying scope and impact (see section 2.1 of the HSS AEG) is presented as evidence of satisfactory

scholarship, the candidate must have demonstrated how their body of work would be equivalent to at least three refereed publications.

**c. Minimum accepted standards for faculty producing creative works, such as in Fine Arts** for purposes of Tenure and Promotion require the candidate to have produced a body of creative works exceeding that of what would be considered satisfactory for promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate must provide documentation that establishes a record of achievement using the items outlined in 2.1 of the HSS AEG. Documentation should be provided for approximately 6 to 10 achievements during the period under review for promotion, at least 3 meeting the criteria for excellence as defined in section 2.3 of the HSS AEG.

NOTE: Candidates may also achieve a ranking of satisfactory via a comparable combination of scholarly publications and fine arts achievements. Per the Scholarship for the Public Good option (see Section 3), candidates may substitute one project in this area for a publication.

**c. Minimum accepted standards in service** for purposes of promotion require the candidate's service contributions to reflect a consistent pattern of quality service activity at least at the departmental and campus levels, with evidence of filling significant service roles as expected of a senior faculty member (such as chairing committees, serving on campus P & T or third year review committees, participation in significant Faculty Senate committees, serving in administrative capacities). Section 3.1 of the HSS AEG gives examples of items that can count toward service.

Note, while service outside of the department and campus is valued, it is expected that senior faculty demonstrate favorable participation in shared governance appropriate to rank. Additionally, service is judged by its quality; whether a faculty member received release time or possessed an administrative appointment for such service is not relevant when judging the quality of service. Specifically, administrative service is vital to the function of the department, campus, and university, and its function should be judged by its impact just as any other service: administrative service should neither be privileged nor discounted because of its nature.

### **1.6. From Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor**

Similar to promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor, this promotion is based upon a documented record of consistently excellent teaching both within the classroom and in relation to clinical duties, and at least satisfactory service (especially related to interfacing with the community). Achievement in each area must exceed that required for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. Candidates are judged based on activities completed since the last promotion review.

- a. The candidate must have demonstrated excellent ability to stimulate and

effectively support student learning. The candidate must have demonstrated (using evidence such as that presented in section 1.1 of the HSS AEG) excellence in two or more areas, such as course delivery, course improvement, course innovation, mentoring students, program development, graduate or undergraduate research, or SoTL. Within the documentation of teaching activities, the candidate must have clearly demonstrated excellent support of student experiential learning in clinical settings, including development of new and/or enhanced opportunities for student learning in practical settings.

b. A solid record of participation in campus affairs through committee work and in the relationships of the campus to the greater community must have been clearly documented. The candidate's service contributions must reflect a consistent pattern of quality service activity, with evidence of filling significant service roles as expected of a senior faculty member (such as chairing committees, serving on campus P & T or third year review committees, participation in significant Faculty Senate committees, serving in administrative capacities, etc.). Section 3.1 of the HSS AEG gives examples of items that can count toward service. Within the documentation of service activities, the candidate must have demonstrated clear connections between their service and the clinical nature of this appointment.

## 2. Criteria for Tenure

After the appropriate probationary period, tenure shall be granted to those tenure-track faculty members whose professional characteristics indicate that they will continue to serve with distinction in their appointed roles. The criteria for tenure and the criteria for promotion (see, [Indiana University Academic Policies; Faculty and Librarian Tenure](#) and [Faculty and Librarian Promotion](#)) are similar, but not identical. (See policies governing [Reappointment and Non-Reappointment during Probationary Period](#)).

Tenure considerations must take into account the mission of the department and the individual's contribution to that mission. To be eligible for tenure, the candidate must not simply meet a minimum set of standards: the candidate's past performance should offer a strong indication that he/she will continue to grow and contribute strongly to the department's mission of teaching, scholarly activity or creative work, and service.

## 3. Scholarship for the Public Good

The School of Humanities and Social Sciences is committed to serving its community and the general public in the United States or abroad. In fulfillment of this commitment, faculty members in the School often engage in research and scholarship that may not look like typical research and scholarship. For example, a faculty member may work on a public

policy issue with a government agency. This work may result in a new policy document or other applied research document. Though drawing upon the faculty member's expertise and requiring rigorous research capabilities, this work may not result in a peer-reviewed article, monograph, or book.

Faculty members who engage in scholarship for the public good may use it to count as a substitute for one publication (per cycle) for the purposes of promotion and/or tenure. Thus, a faculty member could make such a substitution in seeking promotion and tenure from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and then use a second project in seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

The following guidelines should be followed by any faculty member pursuing this option:

1. While no scholarship ever is pre-approved to count towards promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member is encouraged to discuss the appropriateness of the project with his or her department chair and/or the Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. Basic criteria include but are not limited to a demonstrable need for and benefit of the project (as defined by community stakeholders as well as the faculty member proposing the project), the estimated time commitment of the project (comparable to the time spent on a typical scholarly product), the rigor of the research being done, etc.
2. Methods, results, and recommendations of the project must be included in a final report. This report then should be uploaded as part of the faculty member's promotion and/or tenure dossier.
3. The final report will be shared with two external reviewers chosen by the department chair. In cases where the department chair is the faculty member conducting the project, the reviewers will be chosen by the Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. The reviewers will assess the rigor, merits, conclusions, and actionable items from the report. The reviewers will provide a written summary of their assessment of the project, and these documents must be shared in the promotion and/or tenure dossier.
4. In cases where there is a community partner, the partner should provide a final written statement (formal letter, e-mail, etc.) acknowledging the work of the faculty member and providing any feedback that the partner would like to share. This document must be shared in the promotion and/or tenure dossier.
5. Projects that are ongoing or completed before August 1, 2020, may count under this policy, but only with the approval of the department chair and the Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. For faculty seeking promotion to full professor, only projects completed after the previous promotion may count.