

PROPOSAL—Peer Review Changes
Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

This proposal consists of a variety of *changes* and *clarifications* that address the use of peer-review in the P&T Guidelines.

Peer review is a bedrock principle of academic evaluation and this does not change.

The Guidelines use the term “peer review” in several different ways, collected under two categories:

- External evaluative peer review, of candidates for promotion and tenure
- Ongoing peer review, of particular activities (disseminated items, teaching)

All sections using “peer review” are edited to reflect the following points and remove ambiguities or lack of clarity.

No change:

External peer reviewers of candidates for promotion or tenure will remain *academic, arm’s length, at a rank equal to or higher than the rank sought by the candidate, and from an institution or program equal to or higher than the IUPUI home unit; a minimum of six are required.*

- Academic: Academic peer reviewers are expected to understand general conventions and expectations for academic work, including the combination of responsibilities appropriate to each type of faculty.
 - If a reviewer is “emeritus,” they should have remained engaged in their discipline with up-to-date expertise.
 - Non-academics may be selected as long as they can comment on the relevant area of excellence and a specific case is made for them. These non-academics should be few in number.
- Arm’s length:
 - People who are or have been co-PIs or co-authors during the last five years are not at arm’s length, unless they are involved in very large multi-site projects and have not worked directly with the candidate.
 - Dissertation chairs are always excluded.
 - Co-panelists (conferences, grant review groups) are not excluded.
 - Editor-author relationships should be avoided, unless there were steps that removed direct evaluation of one by the other.
 - Community partners who have worked with or benefitted from the candidate’s work cannot be at arms’ length. Experts in community engagement who are at arms length can be allowed under the ‘non-academic’ exception above.
- At a rank equal to or higher than that sought by the candidate.
 - Reviewers for a candidate for tenure should possess tenure themselves, unless they are at an institution that does not use tenure.
 - Titles for NTT faculty can be expected to vary. Reviewers for NTT candidates can be NTT or tenure-track.

- Until 2023, TT faculty at the associate level can review teaching professor candidates.
- At an institution or unit at the same or higher level as IUPUI/the candidate’s home unit.
 - This may vary by type of case and expertise—reviewers for candidates with a teaching focus may be found from teaching-oriented institutions that do not have the same research ranking as IUPUI.
 - Units may use their own program-specific national or international rankings information to select appropriate reviewers.
 - External reviewers for all ranks and types except senior lecturers are external to IUPUI. Some senior lecturer reviewers may be from IUPUI. ←no change to existing rule.

Peer review:

- Peer review of teaching: “Peers” for this purpose are those who have experience in teaching. This may include non-tenure track faculty, or, staff from the CTL. Peers need not be of a higher academic rank than the candidate. **Minor change/clarification:** *This reflects current practice, although this is not currently specified in the Guidelines.*
- Peer review of disseminated items: Major change: **Stipulate that professional peer review may be an acceptable form of peer review, as well as academic peer review.**
 - **This will be particularly appropriate** for clinical faculty, and for work in the “service” area.
 - Work classified as “research” will most often be reviewed by academic peers.
 - Examples:
 - Some journals, conferences, and professional development are aimed at professional audiences. They have professionals on editorial boards, conference committees, and professional development review mechanisms.
 - Standardized treatment protocols, accreditation standards, technical reports and legislative materials undergo multiple rigorous levels of review, feedback, revision, and adoption: this is professional peer review.
 - Academic peer review is typically conducted by university faculty, who provide blind peer review of articles and review of conference proposals and papers.

EXACT GUIDELINE LANGUAGE CHANGES:

New language is in blue; deleted language has strike-throughs; red highlights exact spots of changes.

The IFC is asked to endorse the concept of the change listed above. There may be further wording and formatting changes in the Guidelines once all proposals have been reviewed.

In section, Institutional Values

Peer Review

- The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, and service is the bedrock on which promotion and/or tenure decisions are based.
- This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. **EDIT-Peer review**. Professional peer review as well as academic may be appropriate for clinical, lecturer, and parts of tenure-track faculty and librarian work.
- At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed. **EDIT-Peer review**. Review by peers from the academy is required for promotion for faculty members, and for tenure for tenure-track faculty and librarians. One or two external reviewers may be non-academic as long as they are qualified for the subject matter and can assess the faculty member's total record in light of their academic rank and responsibilities.
- These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research and creative activity, or service, and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

In section, Clinical Faculty Balanced Case

- **EDIT Peer review**: It is understood that academic or professional peer-reviewed scholarship is required to demonstrate overall excellence for achieving a highly satisfactory rating in each area of performance in a balanced case. (Language adapted from IU policy on balanced cases.)

In section, Teaching Professor criteria

- For teaching professor:
 - **EDIT-NTT Scholarship**. The above, **EDIT-Procedural on a sustained level of excellence**, plus academic or professionally peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship that supports relevant to teaching and learning