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| **Policy Statement** |

The Indiana University School of Nursing is committed to providing a comprehensive and equitable review for all nursing faculty seeking advancement. This policy outlines the procedures by which these reviews are carried out as well as the criteria for evaluation of faculty performance in the areas of research, teaching, service, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as relevant for track and rank. The policy also provides examples of evidence by which faculty performance and the quality of faculty scholarship may be evaluated by the reviewing bodies in the IUSON.
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# Introduction

This document is the IU School of Nursing interpretation of campus and university policies concerning the appointment and review of academic appointees. This document is relevant for the Faculty Assembly, which includes the Indianapolis (IUI), Bloomington (IUB), Fort Wayne (IUFW) and Columbus (IUC). The guidelines included here are adjunctive and supplementary to rules, regulations, and information contained in the [IUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) and the [IUI Faculty Guide](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/FCContent/Html/Media/FCContent/committees/handbook/faculty_guide.pdf). All individuals holding academic appointments are expected to familiarize themselves with information in these documents.

The following sections A to G provide context and background information for parts II and III of this document.

## 1. A. Academic Appointments

Academic appointments at IUSON follow [IU policy ACA14 Classification of Academic Appointments](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-14-classification-academic-appointments/index.html) and the [IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification.](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Classification) This policy provides classification titles and definitions for all possible types of faculty appointments including tenure-track, non-tenure track, and specialist and non-specialist appointments. It also contains additional comments on acting, visiting, and adjunct appointments. Non-tenure track faculty are ineligible for tenure or tenure-probationary status.

## 1. B. Review Types

Information from all reviews is used for faculty development and reappointment decisions. There are eight different types of reviews carried out at IUSON: (1) appointment, (2) annual, (3) third-year, (4) fourth-year (when recommended), (5) promotion, (6) tenure, (7) reappointment, and (8) dismissal. Annual reviews cover only the prior year and may take place in conjunction with other reviews such as third-year, fourth-year, promotion, tenure, and reappointment reviews.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1. Applicable Reviews for Tenure and Non-Tenure Track Faculty | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Appointment | Annual review | 3rd Year/pre-promotion | 4th Year | Promotion | Tenure | Reappointment | Dismissal |
| Tenure track | | | | | | | | | |
| Tenure probationary rank | |  | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Tenured ranks | | √ | √ |  |  | √ |  |  | √ |
| Non-tenure tracks | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecturer ranks | | √ | √ | √\* |  | √ |  | √ | √ |
| Clinical ranks | | √ | √ | √\* |  | √ |  | √ | √ |
| Scientist ranks | | √ | √ | √\* |  | √ |  | √ | √ |
|  | \*A pre-promotion review is recommended but not mandatory. The pre-promotion review should be conducted within two years prior to promotion review. There is no set timeline for promotion on non-tenure tracks and accordingly, the timing of the pre-promotion review will vary. The pre-promotion review follows the same process as the tenure track 3rd year review. | | | | | | | | |

Academic qualifications for clinical teaching and service (professional and citizenship) in each rank of Lecturer through Professor closely parallel those set forth for tenured and tenure-probationary faculty in the School; thus, non-tenure track faculty are subject to the same policy and procedures for appointment review, annual administrative review, promotion review, and termination or reappointment review as tenured and tenure-probationary faculty.

A more detailed description of each of these reviews is contained in Section 2 of this document. An overview of responsibilities for candidates (appointees being reviewed) and reviewing units is described in Section 3 of this document.

## 1. C. Reviewing Units

At IUSON, there are two administrative reviewing units and one peer-reviewing unit. Not all units participate in all reviews. When IUB, IUFW, or IUC faculty are being reviewed, the IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator will carry out reviews for the first administrative unit review. When IUI faculty are being reviewed, the IUI department chair will carry out reviews for the first administrative review. The exception to this if the candidate under review is at a higher rank than the administrator or the candidate is seeking tenure and the administrator is not tenured. If this occurs, the candidate will be reviewed by the department chair (as long as the rank requirement is met) or a qualified designee of the dean. For example, if the IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator is a tenured associate professor, they can review candidates being promoted to senior lecturer, all clinical ranks, and assistant to associate tenure track faculty. Note: For the purposes of this policy, the term “administrator” is used to refer to the campus level associate dean, an interim associate dean, or a designee of the dean who meets the rank requirements required for conducting the first level of faculty review.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2. Types and Members of Reviewing Units and Helpful Hints | | |
| Administrative Reviewing Units | Department chair/  IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator | IUI candidates – this level of review is prepared by the department chair  IUB, IUFW, IUC candidates – this level of review is prepared by the administrator with the option to consult with the department chair |
| Dean |  |
| Peer Reviewing Units | Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Unit Committee | As elected by Faculty Assembly ([See Faculty Assembly Constitution & Bylaws](https://indiana.sharepoint.com/sites/msteams_c0019d/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?csf=1&web=1&e=HNjMtt&cid=df6ab99c%2D4443%2D485e%2Dbc82%2D05f2ef33efc2&FolderCTID=0x012000F5912D09717CE849B7CAA4D5C520656D&id=%2Fsites%2Fmsteams%5Fc0019d%2FShared%20Documents%2FGeneral%2FIU%2DNursing%2F%5BNU%5D%20NursingOne%20%2D%20Faculty%20and%20Staff%20Access%2F%5BNU%5D%20IUSON%20Bylaws%2C%20Policies%20%26%20Procedures%2FIUSON%20Faculty%20Bylaws%5F2021%2D1206%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2Fmsteams%5Fc0019d%2FShared%20Documents%2FGeneral%2FIU%2DNursing%2F%5BNU%5D%20NursingOne%20%2D%20Faculty%20and%20Staff%20Access%2F%5BNU%5D%20IUSON%20Bylaws%2C%20Policies%20%26%20Procedures)) |

## 1. D. Confidentiality of Reviews

All material considered in all reviews, aspects of the review process, and outcomes of those reviews are **confidential**. The unit committee conducts all committee meetings for discussion and voting on candidate materials in person or using technology such as Zoom. The unit committee meetings are scheduled in advance on the master calendar and held on the IUI campus. Virtual attendance at committee meetings via videoconferencing meets campus standards and are allowed. While in-person meetings are optimal, given the number of campuses it is recognized that they are not always possible. An expectation to in-person meetings is set by the IUI campus and reflects the need for careful consideration, quality deliberations, and confidential voting on these important matters of appointment and review.

During the tenure and/or promotion review process, candidate dossiers are housed in eDossier. Working within eDossier is a campus expectation. Only members of the unit committee, the IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator, department chair, SON dean, and the EADFA will have access to the electronic dossier. The administrative support person for the EADFA will facilitate electronic access to those authorized to review the candidates for promotion and tenure.

Information from all reviews and recommendations are kept on file in limited access, electronic, confidential departmental, campus, and/or EADFA files.

## 1. E Reviewing Bodies Involved and Order of Multi-Stage Reviews

Of the eight different types of reviews carried out at IUSON, several occur in multiple stages including (1) appointment, (2) third-year, (3) fourth-year (when recommended), (4) promotion, (5) tenure, (6) reappointment, and (7) dismissal. The parties involved in these multi-stage reviews are outlined below in the order in which they complete the review.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 3. IUSON Reviewing Bodies Involved and Order of Multi-Stage Reviews | | | | | | | |
|  | Appointment | 3rd Year and Pre-promotion review | 4th Year | Promotion | Tenure | Reappointment | Dismissal |
| APT Unit Committee | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |  |  |
| Department Chair, IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Dean | √ | √ |  | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| IUI Promotion and Tenure Committee |  |  |  | √ | √ |  |  |
| IUI Chief Academic Officer and IUI Chancellor | √1 |  |  |  |  | √2 |  |
| University President | √ |  |  | √ | √ |  |  |
| Board of Trustees | √ |  |  | √ | √ |  |  |
| *1IUI. IUI Chief Academic Officer (CAO) reviews all non-research appointments; the CAO and Chancellor review all appointments with tenure.*  *2IUI. IUI Chancellor reviews all non-reappointments of tenure track, lecturer, and clinical track faculty; formal notice to the individual comes from both the dean and the chancellor’s office; the Office of Academic Affairs handles each of these cases after notification from IUSON.* | | | | | | | |

## 1. F. Handoffs during Multi-Stage Reviews

The multi-stage review processes in Table 3 requires appropriate feedback to candidates and handoff of completed reviews from one reviewing unit to another. The handoff processes are described below.

### 1. F.1 Appointment Reviews

1. The dean requests the unit committee complete an appointment review.
2. The unit committee chair assigns two committee members of appropriate rank and track to review the candidate.
3. The reviewers complete a written summary and return it to the unit committee chair who submits it and a summary form to the dean.
4. The dean ensures all other levels of review receive the appropriate documentation.

### 1. F.2 Third-, Pre-promotion, and Fourth-Year Reviews

APT Unit Committee

1. The APT unit committee completes their review.
2. The APT unit committee chair (or co-chair) presents the written summary to the candidate in person or via approved technology with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator also in attendance.
3. The review is signed by the candidate and unit committee chair (or co-chair).
4. The signed review is forwarded to the EADFA who submits the materials to the IUI Office of Academic Affairs.

Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator

1. The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator completes their review.
2. The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator presents the written summary to the candidate in person or via approved technology.
3. The review is signed by the candidate and the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator.
4. The signed review is forwarded to the EADFA who submits the materials to the IUI Office of Academic Affairs.

Dean

1. The dean completes their review.
2. The dean presents the written summary to the candidate in person or via approved technology.
3. The review is signed by the candidate and the dean.
4. The signed review is forwarded to the EADFA who submits the materials to the IUI Office of Academic Affairs. The remaining steps are managed by the campus.

### 1. F.3 Promotion and Tenure Reviews

APT Unit Committee

1. The APT unit committee completes their review.
2. The APT unit committee chair (or co-chair) presents the written summary to the candidate in person or via approved technology with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator also in attendance.
3. The review is signed by the candidate and unit committee chair (or co-chair).
4. The signed review is forwarded to the EADFA who submits the materials to the IUI Office of Academic Affairs.

Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator

1. The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator completes their review.
2. The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator presents the written summary to the candidate in person or via approved technology.
3. The review is signed by the candidate and the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator.
4. The signed review is forwarded to the EADFA who submits the materials to the IUI Office of Academic Affairs.

Dean

1. The dean completes their review.
2. The dean presents the written summary to the candidate in person or via approved technology.
3. The review is signed by the candidate and the dean.
4. The signed review is forwarded to the EADFA who submits the materials to the IUI Office of Academic Affairs. The remaining steps are managed by the campus.

### 1. F.4 Reappointments

The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator provides written documentation to the dean who works with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator to ensure all other levels of review receive the appropriate documentation.

# 2. Overview of Review Types

Section II contains a summary of the timing, purpose, and persons and/or committees involved in relation to all stages of review.

## 2. A. Appointment Review

Applications for entry-level academic positions of either track (tenure or non-tenure) are reviewed by the Search and Screen Committee and recommended to administration for consideration. Entry-level applicants may be asked to interview with faculty, department chairs or IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and may be requested to make an academic presentation to faculty. At the completion of the review process, entry-level faculty may be offered a position by administration upon the recommendation of the Search and Screen Committee.

When an applicant for a faculty position is being offered rank above entry level, the unit APT committee of the Faculty Assembly will conduct a review. The request for appointment review and for obtaining information to be used in the review is the responsibility of the coordinator for human resources in the School of Nursing. Upon receiving a request from the coordinator for human resources, the chair of the unit APT committee assigns a primary and secondary reviewer to review the candidate’s credentials. The reviewers are provided with the documentation for each rank as outlined above.

The reviewers use the University APT criteria to write a short synopsis of their conclusions and recommend the appropriate rank and tenure status.If the documentation provided to the APT committee is not sufficient to make a recommendation, the APT committee may request that the coordinator for human services request additional documentation. The requested information shall be limited to one additional page.

The reviewers forward their recommendations to the unit APT chair who completes the Appointment Recommendation Form and a short summary of the reviewers’ recommendations (See Appendix A: Appointment Review Form). The Appointment Recommendation Form is forwarded to the coordinator of human services who forwards it to the dean.

Consistent with campus policy on faculty appointments (see the [IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Classification)), applicants submit the following materials for APT review. Cover sheets outlining the required documentation are available at the [IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs Faculty Classification.](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Faculty-Classification)

**Required Documentation for Tenure Track or Tenured Appointments**

1. Tenure Track Appointments:
2. Curriculum vitae
3. Three external letters of reference (waived for candidates who have been employed in faculty role involving teaching, research, professional service, or DEI activities by a school on the IUI campus for a year or longer and whose initial appointment included review of external letters)
4. A 2-page personal statement outlining achievements and goals in teaching, research, service, and/or DEI
5. A minimum of two examples of scholarship (e.g., articles, manuscripts, book chapters)
6. Tenured Appointments:
7. Items 1-4 from Section A
8. Brief biographical sketch of referees and indication of relationship to candidate
9. An additional three (for a total of six) external letters or recommendations, all of which include evaluation of teaching, research, service, and/or DEI activities.

**Required Documentation for Non-Tenure Related or Probationary Appointments**

1. Clinical Appointments:
2. Curriculum vitae
3. Three internal or external letters of reference (waived for candidates who have been employed in faculty role involving teaching, research, professional service, and/or DEI activities by a school on the IUI campus for a year or longer and whose initial appointment included review of external letters)
4. A 2-page personal statement outlining achievements and goals in teaching, service, and/or DEI including a description of teaching/service/DEI outcomes and impact
5. A minimum of two examples of scholarship (e.g., articles, manuscripts, book chapters)
6. Lecturer Appointments:
7. Items 1 and 2 from Section A
8. A 2-page statement of philosophy of teaching and/or DEI, including a description of teaching or DEI outcomes and impact
9. Peer review of teaching if not addressed by letters of reference
10. Research Professor or Scientist/Scholar Ranks:
11. Items 1 and 2 from Section A
12. A 2-page statement of research goals/plans
13. Peer review of research if not addressed by letters of reference.

## 2. B Annual Reviews

IUSON observes the mandated university annual review policy for all faculty (see [IUI Faculty Guide)](https://facultycouncil.iupui.edu/Governance/IUPUI-Faculty-Guide). [IU Policy ACA-21](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-21-faculty-librarian-annual-reviews/index.html) states all academic appointees shall receive annual merit and salary reviews. Academic appointees of less than full rank and probationary appointees shall also receive annual career progress reviews on their progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Career progress reviews may be conducted separately or at the same time as annual merit and salary reviews. The department chair or the IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator on the campus in which the faculty member holds an appointment normally conducts this review. The annual performance of each faculty member shall use a multidimensional approach that addresses teaching, research/scholarship, service, and/or DEI as appropriate for appointment.

The purpose of the annual review is to provide input on the faculty member’s progress in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship, service, and DEI leading to tenure review, reappointment, or promotion decisions. Annual reviews also provide information for use in salary recommendations and other assessments. To be most beneficial to the faculty member, these reviews should be candid and critical appraisals of the faculty member’s work and should call attention to weaknesses as well as strengths. (See Appendix B: Annual, Reappointment, and/or Dismissal Review Summary Form)

These annual reviews will provide feedback to faculty regarding his/her performance; facilitate faculty development; prevent difficulties; and if necessary, provide notice to faculty whose performance is below normal expectation for rank or future promotion and/or tenure.

* Tenure-track and tenured ranks are reviewed in the following areas: teaching, research, service, and/or DEI. Tenured and tenure-probationary faculty should normally excel in at least one of the areas and be at least satisfactory in the others. In exceptional cases, a faculty member may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University.
* Non-tenure track clinical and lecturer ranks are reviewed in the following areas: teaching, service, and/or DEI. Although faculty in these ranks may be involved in research or creative activities, their primary responsibilities are clinical teaching and service (professional and citizenship). Clinical rank faculty are not expected to do individual research. Non-tenure track faculty should normally excel in one of the areas and be at least satisfactory in another.
* Non-tenure track scientist rank faculty are reviewed in research only. They are not expected to do teaching unless negotiated with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator.

The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator meets with each full-time faculty member annually to review progress.

### 2. B.1 Annual Review Procedures

1. **Orientation:** The procedure for the annual Faculty Performance Review is provided and discussed with all new faculty at the time of orientation and a packet of review forms is distributed.
2. **Submitting Documents:** In December the dean’s office sends an email to each faculty member outlining the materials required to be completed, submission deadlines, and to whom the materials need to be provided and number of copies. The requested documents include:
   1. **Digital Measures – Activity Insight (DMAI):** An electronic report is available to the faculty member throughout the year for updating and previous year’s reports.
   2. **Individual Development Plan:** Each faculty member should have an individual development plan that reflects their annual and long-term (3 & 5 year) goals with strategies for achieving them. A summary of accomplishments of the past year’s goals and goals for the upcoming years should be kept up to date by the faculty member and shared with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator.
      1. **Evaluation of Teaching:** See the current [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf).
      2. **Evaluation of Research**: See the current [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

iii) **Evaluation of Service:** See the current [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

iv) **Evaluation of DEI:** See the current [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

c) **Curriculum Vitae:** Faculty members need to use the current format identified in the current [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

1. Department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator role in the review: This review incorporates information from the above sources in order to provide a comprehensive profile of the faculty member’s efforts over the previous year.
2. Guidance on relevant areas of the Annual Administrative Review Summary Form to be completed for each individual may be found in the [IUSON Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf).
3. Together, the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and the faculty member summarize the progress towards goals, end-of-calendar-year evaluation of teaching, research/scholarship, service, or DEI and set goals for next year.
4. At the annual review meeting, the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and faculty complete the comments and both sign and retain a copy of the review.

## 2. C. Third-Year Review (Tenure-probationary) and Pre-promotion review (Non-tenure track)

The third-year review applies to tenure-probationary faculty. In addition to the annual review by the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator which covers only the previous year, a detailed review of all tenure-probationary faculty is conducted in the third year of a faculty member’s appointment. The purpose of the third-year review is to provide feedback from the school regarding the candidate’s cumulative progress in meeting the campus and the school standards for tenure and/or promotion. The third-year review follows the [IUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) to include a written assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure. (See Appendix C.1: Third-Year and Pre-Promotion Review Form)

The pre-promotion review refers to non-tenure track faculty. In addition to the annual review by the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator which covers only the previous year, the pre-promotion review provides feedback regarding the candidate’s cumulative progress in meeting the university standards for promotion. The pre-promotion review follows the format of the third-year review for tenure-probationary faculty. A pre-promotion review is recommended but not mandatory. The pre-promotion review should be conducted within two years prior to promotion review. There is no set timeline for promotion on non-tenure tracks, and accordingly the timing of the pre-promotion review will vary. (See Appendix C.1: Third-Year and Pre-Promotion Review Form)

The reviewing bodies and order of review were outlined in Section 1.E of this document. If problems are identified at any level, the summary at that level must include specific suggestions for remedy aimed at helping the faculty member and the faculty member’s department or unit in their efforts to rectify the problems. If one or more areas of inadequate progress are identified at any level, the summary at that level must include recommendation for a fourth-year review.

## 2. D Fourth-Year Review (only when recommended or requested by faculty)

The fourth-year review applies only to tenure-probationary faculty who were recommended for this level of review during their third-year review. The purpose of the fourth-year review is to provide feedback from the school regarding the candidate’s cumulative progress in meeting the university standards for promotion and tenure. The fourth-year review follows the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) to include a written assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure. Continuing faculty appointment may be influenced by the outcomes of the review and the resulting recommendations. (See Appendix C.2: Fourth-Year Review Form)

The reviewing bodies and order of review were outlined in Section 1.E of this document. If the candidate declines the opportunity to participate in a fourth-year review, the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator would notify the EADFA.

## 2. E Tenure Review

The tenure review applies only to tenure-probationary faculty. The tenure review follows the [UPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

IU policy ACA-37 Faculty and Librarian Tenure also governs tenure review. This policy discusses that only individuals who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents may be awarded tenure (or hired with tenure) , the tenure-probationary period and lengths of tenure-probationary appointments, procedures for faculty to advance to tenured status, geographic limitations of tenure, and criteria for tenure. See Appendix C.3: Promotion and/or Tenure Review Form.

The [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) govern the reconsideration process for candidates who wish to seek reconsideration of tenure review decisions.

## 2. F Promotion Review

The promotion review applies to all faculty below the ‘full’ appointment level. The promotion review criteria, review process and responsibilities are governed by the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf). (See Appendix C.3: Promotion and/or Tenure Review Form).

Additional campus criteria and review procedures are available for appointment as [Chancellor’s Professor (IUPUI)](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/Honors-Awards/IUPUI-Campus-Awards/ChancellorsProfessors) or [Distinguished Professor (IU).](https://honorsandawards.iu.edu/awards/research-creative/distinguished-profs.html)

For tenure-track academic appointments, the promotion process is also governed by IU policy [ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-38-faculty-librarian-promotion/index.html). This policy includes procedures for recommendations for promotion and criteria for promotion in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, service, and/or a balanced case. Additional school specific criteria are used during all stages of promotion review. (See Appendix D: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence for Advancement – Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)

For non-tenure track academic appointments, the promotion process is also governed by IU policy [ACA-18 Regulation of Clinical and Lecturer Appointments](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-18-regulation-clinical-lecture-appointments/index.html). This policy governs the process for the promotion review of non-visiting, non-tenure track faculty. Additional school specific criteria are used during all stages of promotion review. (See Appendix E: [Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence – Clinical Track](#_Minimal_Advancement_Expectations) and Appendix F: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence – Lecturer Track)

**Time in rank:** [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) state: “In most instances, the work being assessed as the basis for promotion or tenure will have been completed since either the initial appointment or last promotion. In many cases, it is understood that national reputation depends, in part, on foundational work that may have occurred earlier in the candidate’s career. For faculty, publications, and presentations in rank at another institution prior to appointment at IUPUI will be considered part of the candidate’s record. The overall pattern of productivity over time will be scrutinized, with emphasis placed on recent work and scholarly trajectory.” See [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) for more information. For promotion, this means that any work completed in rank, for example, at an assistant level (visiting, clinical, tenure-track, and scientist) at a prior institution or at IUI is considered “in rank.” Promotion is recognition for in-rank achievement. For tenure, the candidate’s entire academic record is considered including any academic appointment/rank at other institution(s) and IUI; trajectory, productivity and contribution/achievement record are metrics used to determine the award of tenure. The candidate does need to recognize that IUI is the institution that will be conferring promotion and tenure, so it is understandable that recent work and what has been accomplished/contributed here are important considerations in the decision-making process. The candidate certainly can address how their national reputation has evolved from earlier work and how they have continued to expand their lines of inquiry and scholarship in rank as well as from the beginning of their academic career. This is one of the challenges in constructing an effective statement and describing one’s academic journey.

## 2. G. Reappointment Review

Tenure-probationary faculty may have a contract for a specified period based on excellence in their declared area. Non-tenure track faculty *are renewed based on satisfactory (or better) performance; they may only be non-renewed for performance problems or changing program needs.*

The reappointment recommendation is a written form of review. After the period of initial appointment, reappointment is considered annually until the end of the probationary period, and thereafter, for non-tenured faculty, at intervals one year prior to the end of a multi-year appointment. Most schools base reappointment recommendations on the annual review, but faculty subject to annual reappointment should become familiar with the procedures followed in their respective units. (See Appendix B: Annual, Reappointment, and/or Dismissal Review Summary Form)

[IU Policy ACA-22 Reappointment and Non-Reappointment During Probationary Period](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-22-reappointment-non-reappointment-probationary-period/index.html) governs the process for all faculty. This policy includes information on terms of initial appointment, annual review, notice requirements, and review of decisions of non-reappointment.

# 3. Overview of Responsibilities

## 3.1 Candidate Responsibilities

Faculty members being reviewed (candidates) responsibilities during the various review processes are delineated below.

### 3.1.1 Know the expectations

Faculty members should familiarize themselves with all materials related to promotion and tenure. At appointment, all faculty shall be given electronic access to receive the most recent policies in the copies of the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) as well as this document (IUSON Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy # AFS-64). It is important that the candidate read and follow any and aall guidelines for the School of Nursing and the IUI, IUB, IUFW, and IUC..

### 3.1.2 Declare an area of excellence

Tenure-probationary and non-tenure track faculty are encouraged to make a tentative decision on area of excellence at time of appointment and a more definite decision in the first year of appointment. Faculty members should make this decision in consultation with the department chair /IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and the scholarly mentor assigned to tenure probationary faculty. Tenure-probationary faculty and research scientists are encouraged to meet with the associate dean for research during the first year to discuss their future research plans. Research scientists will need to declare excellence in research.

### 3.1.3 Assemble review materials

The candidate is responsible for maintaining a current curriculum vitae detailing all accomplishments and following the IUI required format assembling materials or developing a dossier for all reviews (see [IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Resources).](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/promotiontenure) Candidates should work with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator , or designee in the development of materials for all reviews. The candidate should realize that incomplete or poorly prepared materials or dossier could have a negative effect on reviewers. All faculty are strongly advised to attend school and campus workshops on promotion and tenure.

When materials are submitted for review, the candidate signs the curriculum vitae to indicate he/she is taking full responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of all materials.

During the promotion and/or tenure process, if there are any changes made to any materials in the dossier or if any materials are added to the dossier, candidates and all previous reviewers must be provided an opportunity to comment on or to respond to such additions. The added information and the responses will then become a part of the dossier. The administrative support person for the EADFA will assist with electronic submission of all materials for the dossier following university/campus guidelines.

### 3.1.4 Participate fully in the review feedback

Candidates are expected to attend in-person or by approved technology all meetings where they will be receiving review feedback. In addition, candidates must sign all written summary evaluations from all reviews before the evaluation is filed. Signing an evaluation indicates only that the candidate has read the evaluation. Signing does not indicate concurrence with the evaluation. Candidates will be notified of any material or evaluations added to their dossier by the EADFA. The candidate may respond in writing to the written evaluations by any reviewing unit; the written response shall become a part of the candidate’s permanent file or dossier. Furthermore, in all reviews, the candidate has the responsibility to use the summary evaluations, advice, and recommendations of the reviewing unit to improve or sustain his or her performance.

### 3.1.5 Pace Yourself

The candidate’s responsibilities in years 1 to 6 of the promotion and tenure process are outlined in the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)

**Tenure probationary faculty** must promote within the 7-year time frame or risk dismissal.Tenure probationary candidate responsibilities by year are below.

1. First Year
   1. connects with faculty mentor and arranges for monthly meetings with the mentor
   2. obtains electronic access to [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)
   3. obtains electronic access to IUSON Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy # AFS-64 (this document).
   4. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   5. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   6. meets with associate dean for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   7. submits materials for annual review
   8. makes tentative decision on area of excellence
2. Second Year
   1. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   2. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   3. meets with associate dean for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   4. submits materials for annual review
3. Third Year
   1. consults with mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator in preparation of dossier for third-year review; submits third-year CV, personal statement and evidence of scholarship dossier; participates in receiving all levels of third-year review feedback
   2. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   3. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   4. meets with executive associate for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   5. submits materials for annual review
4. Fourth Year
   1. consults with mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator in preparation of dossier for fourth-year review (when recommended); submits fourth-year CV, personal statement, and evidence of scholarship dossier; participates in receiving all levels of fourth-year review feedback
   2. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   3. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/ IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   4. meets with executive associate dean for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   5. submits materials for annual review
5. Fifth Year
   1. consults with mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator in preparation of all dossier materials needed for promotion, Submits materials for external reviewers by Feb 1st
   2. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   3. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   4. meets with executive associate dean for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   5. submits materials for annual review
6. Sixth Year
   1. participates in receiving all levels of promotion review feedback
   2. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   3. meets with associate dean for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   4. submits materials for annual review
7. Seventh Year
   1. promotion, if granted, is effective 7/1 of the seventh year
   2. tenure, if granted, is effective 7/1 of the eighth year
   3. consults with mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator in preparation of first sabbatical application; submits sabbatical application (not mandatory)
   4. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   5. meets with executive associate dean for research to discuss research and/or scholarship plans
   6. submits materials for annual review

**Tenured faculty seeking promotion** are not under any time constraints for promotion from tenured Associate to Full Professor. Candidate responsibilities by year are similar to those detailed below for non-tenure track faculty.

**Non-tenure track faculty** (e.g., clinical track, lecturer track, research scientists) are not under time constraints for promotion. A pre-promotion review is recommended but not mandatory for non-tenure track faculty. The pre-promotion review should be conducted within two years prior to promotion review. There is no set timeline for promotion on non-tenure tracks and accordingly, the timing of the pre-promotion review will vary. The pre-promotion review follows the same process as the tenure track 3rd year review. Candidate responsibilities by year are described below.

1. Two years prior to submission of promotion materials
   1. connects with faculty mentor and arranges for monthly meetings with the mentor
   2. obtains electronic access to [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf)
   3. obtains electronic access to the IUSON Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policy # AFS-64 (this document).
   4. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   5. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   6. meets with department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and executive associate dean for research to discuss scholarship
   7. submits materials for annual review
2. One year prior to submission of promotion materials:
   1. consults with mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator in preparation of dossier for pre-promotion review; submits pre-promotion CV, personal statement and evidence of scholarship dossier; participates in receiving all levels of pre-promotion review feedback
   2. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   3. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   4. meets with department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and executive associate dean for research to discuss scholarship
   5. submits materials for annual review
3. Year promotion materials submitted: name submitted to department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator as someone wanting to go up for promotion.
   1. consults with mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator in preparation of all dossier materials needed for promotion, submits names of external reviewers to department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and, submits materials for external reviewers according to APT timelines.
   2. attends available workshops on promotion and tenure
   3. reviews progress with faculty mentor, department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator
   4. submits materials for annual review

## 3.2 Executive Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs (EADFA) Responsibilities

The EADFA is responsible for providing support and guidance for candidates, administrative reviewing units, and peer reviewing units and for administrative and procedural tasks at all levels of review except the annual reviews. To support all levels of review at IUSON, the EADFA will:

1. Ensure the most current written description of the SON’s expectations for excellence in each area (teaching, research, service, and/or DEI) for tenure or promotion to associate and full rank is on file with IUI Office of Academic Affairs. These documents need to be approved by the Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs Committee via the faculty governance process and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for compliance with campus expectations.
2. Work with Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs Committee via the faculty governance process to ensure guidelines, policies, and procedures remain up to date and faculty are elected to peer-reviewing bodies consistent with [Faculty Assembly Constitution & Bylaws.](https://indiana.sharepoint.com/sites/msteams_c0019d/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?csf=1&web=1&e=HNjMtt&cid=df6ab99c%2D4443%2D485e%2Dbc82%2D05f2ef33efc2&FolderCTID=0x012000F5912D09717CE849B7CAA4D5C520656D&id=%2Fsites%2Fmsteams%5Fc0019d%2FShared%20Documents%2FGeneral%2FIU%2DNursing%2F%5BNU%5D%20NursingOne%20%2D%20Faculty%20and%20Staff%20Access%2F%5BNU%5D%20IUSON%20Bylaws%2C%20Policies%20%26%20Procedures%2FIUSON%20Faculty%20Bylaws%5F2021%2D1206%2Epdf&parent=%2Fsites%2Fmsteams%5Fc0019d%2FShared%20Documents%2FGeneral%2FIU%2DNursing%2F%5BNU%5D%20NursingOne%20%2D%20Faculty%20and%20Staff%20Access%2F%5BNU%5D%20IUSON)
   1. Annual review of school promotion criteria;
   2. Annual review of the guidelines contained in this document;
   3. Annual review of the protocol for soliciting external assessment letters including letters to reviewers tailored on the type of review being solicited;
   4. Annual review of timelines for third-year review, fourth-year review, promotion, and tenure reviews.
3. Distribute review timelines to administrative and peer reviewing units and candidates within IUSON by August 1 of each year.
4. Ensure compliance with all review requirements.
5. Ensure the candidate receives fair and equitable treatment during the review process.
6. Ensure that completed reviews are submitted to appropriate campus bodies as necessary.
7. Ensure that the database for tracking faculty through the various review processes is up to date at least twice yearly (and more often as needed).
8. Ensure that all tenure probationary candidates and candidates for promotion in the tenured and non-tenured ranks receive information about campus and school sponsored promotion and/or tenure workshops.

For promotion and/or tenure reviews, the EADFA at IUSON assumes some of the responsibilities delineated in the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) as “Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline” because IUSON is a core school. In addition to the above responsibilities, the EADFA will:

1. Obtain a list of external reviewers from the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and solicit letters from external “arm’s length” reviewers as appropriate to the various levels of review (appointment, promotion, tenure) as outlined in the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) including soliciting reviewers, distributing materials to reviewers, notifying reviewers of a change in the candidate’s area of excellence, instructing candidates not to contact external reviewers, collecting completed reviews, and uploading completed reviews into the dossier. (See sample letters for the initial contact making the request and the instruction letter sent to each reviewer with the dossiers.)
2. Solicit letters from IUSON, campus, and university colleagues on behalf of candidates as appropriate to the various levels of review
3. In a tenure case, at the first level where there have been negative votes discuss the candidate’s right and process for reconsideration as outlined in [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf). **This must be done in a timely manner and prior to the next level of review.**

## 3.3 Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator Responsibilities

The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator is responsible for providing support and guidance for faculty during all types of reviews. Pertinent to all levels of review, the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator will:

1. Ensure compliance with all review requirements.
2. Ensure the candidate receives fair and equitable treatment during the review process.
3. Ensure that completed reviews are submitted to the EADFA as appropriate.
4. Inform the EADFA of candidates requiring various levels of review.
5. Assume primary responsibility for conducting the annual reviews (see Appendix A: Appointment Review Form).
6. Assume primary responsibility for conducting the reappointment reviews (see Appendix B: Annual, Reappointment, and/or Dismissal Review Summary Form).
   1. Reappointment reviews take place in the clinical rank faculty’s last year of appointment term, which is determined in the letter of official appointment. The purpose of the review is to evaluate (excellent, highly satisfactory, satisfactory or unsatisfactory) the candidate’s current progress in clinical teaching, service, and/or DEI (professional and citizenship);
   2. The candidate consults with the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator or in the preparation of all materials to be considered in reappointment reviews. The candidate is responsible for submitting the materials to the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator by the specified time. The department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator shall send one copy of each reappointment review to the EADFA and the dean. The reappointment review summary shall be placed in a secure central academic administrative file and the department chair will complete campus reappointment forms and forward to the EADFA.
7. Assume primary responsibility for conducting the dismissal reviews (see Appendix B: Annual, Reappointment, and/or Dismissal Review Summary Form).

For promotion and/or tenure reviews, the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator assumes all other responsibilities not assigned above to the EADFA and as delineated in the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) under the heading “Department Chair (or Designee) Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline”. The department chair may work with the IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator for IUB, IUFW, and IUC candidates. An example form for evaluation journal stature/dissemination outlets is included in Appendix I: Department Chair’s/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator ’s Assessment of Dissemination Outlets in the Candidate’s Area of Excellence.

## 3.4 APT Unit Committee’s Responsibilities

The APT Unit Committee participates in appointment reviews for new hires seeking appointment above entry level. The committee responsibilities are delineated above in section 2.A.

The APT Committee is also involved in third-year or pre-promotion, fourth-year, tenure, and promotion reviews. The responsibilities are delineated under the heading “Primary/Department and Unit/School Level Promotion and/or Tenure Committee Responsibilities” in the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf). Also in the guidelines are the responsibilities during the reconsideration process.

## 3.5 Dean’s Responsibilities

Appointment Reviews: Prior to appointment of all faculty (tenure-eligible and clinical rank) and research scientists, the dean seeks and receives a recommendation from the APT Unit Committee regarding the candidate’s rank and tenure status. As noted [ACA -12 General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-12-general-provisions-academic-appointments/index.html) and [ACA-14 Classification of Academic Appointments](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-14-classification-academic-appointments/index.html) academic faculty are appointed to the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Rank and tenure status are based on the experience and accomplishments of each individual faculty member. Tenure may be conferred at the time of appointment, or the probationary period can be for a shorter period than seven years. During the probationary period, appointments are usually for a period of one to three years.

Reappointment Reviews: The dean receives written summaries of all reviews of all tenured and tenure-probationary faculty, clinical faculty, and research scientists including third-year, fourth-year, tenure, promotion, reappointment, and dismissal reviews, as available. The dean uses information from all reviews in reappointment decisions.

Promotion and/or Tenure Reviews: The dean prepares a written evaluation of all candidates that is added to the candidate’s dossier and forwarded to IUPUI Promotion and Tenure committee by the requested date. The dean is required to submit a letter for the dossier that includes a summary evaluation of the candidate’s professional activities. If the candidate holds a joint appointment in another school, the dean of the secondary school will provide a signed and dated letter of evaluation for the dossier. The dean may request a letter of evaluation from the dean of schools in which the candidate holds an adjunct appointment. Specific responsibilities for the dean of a school are found in the [IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) under the heading “and Libraries Personnel Officer) Responsibilities”.

Dismissal Reviews: The dean requests the APT Unit Committee to evaluate faculty performance prior to dismissal (see Section 1 of this document)

## 4. IUSON Statement Regarding Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Advancement Criteria

The Indiana University School of Nursing (IUSON) views activities and scholarship that enhance and promote diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) as important in advancing the mission of the IUSON and the discipline of nursing. The IUSON is therefore committed to recognizing and rewarding faculty efforts and achievements that enhance DEI. This view is consistent with the IUSON diversity statement:

*Recognizing the rapidly increasing diversity of America and of higher education, and in support of the mission of Indiana University School of Nursing, faculty and staff are committed to promoting an educational environment that values, respects, and reflects a global view of diversity. To fulfill this commitment, we strive to:*

* *Promote curriculum content that reflects a commitment to diversity*
* *Develop a comprehensive academic success model*
* *Recruit and retain students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds*
* *Establish and maintain links to the diverse communities of the city, the state, the nation,*

*and the world to identify resources that support diversity, promote academic excellence, and enrich our academic environment.*

The IUPUI Faculty Council voted to approve the addition of a balanced DEI case to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. This will encourage tenure and promotion based on engagement in activities that support and advance DEI. The balanced DEI Case Type allows tenure track, clinical track, and lecturer faculty to present an array of scholarly activities aligned with DEI[. IUPUI Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/AAContent/Html/Media/AAContent/02-PromotionTenure/PromotionAndTenure/ptguidelines-current-year-final.pdf) states, “Faculty work that contributes to the diversity of learners and scholars at IUPUI and that enhances our environment of equity and inclusion is highly valued and should be acknowledged and rewarded in the review process.

The following definitions of DEI are provided by the IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs to guide the evaluation of DEI criteria:

Diversity: Perceived human differences in appearance, thinking, and actions, shaped by historical and social systems of advantage and disadvantage. Diversity includes but is not limited to intersectional identities formed around ideas and experiences related to race, ethnicity, class, color, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, size, disability, veteran status, national origin, religion, and/or marital status.

Equity: The promotion of access, opportunity, justice, and fairness through policies and practices that are appropriate for specific individuals and groups. While the term “equality” recognizes a common humanity, “equity” recognizes the distinct needs of individuals and groups, which cannot be addressed with generalized solutions that fail to acknowledge structural inequities.

Inclusion: An approach designed to ensure that the thoughts, opinions, perspectives, and experiences of all individuals are valued, heard, encouraged, respected, and considered. While “diversity” ensures adequate representation of human difference, “inclusion” solicits and centers diverse contributions.

The IUSON provides candidates for advancement an opportunity to present a DEI balanced case. In accordance with [IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](https://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/Faculty-Affairs/PromotionTenure/guidelines-and-standards), the IUSON has developed a set of criteria for minimal advancement expectations while in rank when the declared area of excellence is DEI. These criteria are found in this document. The IUSON criteria for excellence in DEI reflect that the candidate (a) articulates a philosophy of DEI, (b) has interrelated accomplishments in teaching, research, and service which support and advance diversity, (c) articulates role as an essential actor in DEI initiatives, (d) demonstrates local and scholarly impact of work through a variety of venues, and (e) describes plan for future initiatives to support and advance DEI initiatives consistent the IUSON mission.

Moreover, the IUSON requires that all candidates for promotion and/or tenure demonstrate efforts to promote DEI within the school, campus, university, community/population, or professional level. While all faculty are encouraged to contribute to the IUSON diversity mission across multiple areas, by AY 23/24 all candidates for promotion and/or tenure must meet at least one criterion for satisfactory in at least one area (teaching, research, service) regardless of their area of excellence.

The IUSON commitment to recognizing and rewarding faculty achievements in DEI initiatives also reflects a commitment to valuing the totality of a faculty member’s work, advancing equity in faculty recognition and rewards, privileging a broad range of faculty contributions, rewarding dissemination that is written for the public as well as for the scientific community, and rewarding research that advances nursing and healthcare practice and policy as well as nursing and the health sciences.

|  |
| --- |
| **Forms and Links** |

1. View Appendices A-I below

|  |
| --- |
| **History** |

*Approved by Faculty Assembly 3/27/17*

*Approved by Faculty Affairs 4/3/20, 12/8/20, 10/25/21, 4/10/23*

*Approved by Faculty Council 4/9/18, 4/13/20, 3/8/21, 4/25/22, 5/8/23*

# Appendix A: Appointment Review Form

***To be completed by the Search & Screen Committee Chair or Hiring Administrator***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Position: |  | | Department/Campus: | CHS  SNC  IUB  IUFW  IUC |
| Candidate: | | | | |
| Current Rank: | |  | | |
| Years in Current Rank: | |  | | |
| Current Institution: | |  | | |
| Current Tenure Status: | |  | | |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Search & Screen Chair/Hiring Administrator Date

***To be completed by the Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Unit Committee Chair***

Summary of Review:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rank: | |
| Tenured: | Yes  No  N/A |
| Credit Towards Tenure: | Years  N/A |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

APT Unit Committee Chair Signature Date

# Appendix B: Annual, Reappointment, and/or Dismissal Review Summary Form

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate: |  | | Department/Campus: | CHS  SNC  IUB  IUFW  IUC |
| Area of Excellence: |  | | Date of Rank: |  |
| Date of Review: |  | | Date of Tenure: |  |
| Assigned Time Allocation (%) | | | | |
| Teaching: | |  | | |
| Research/Creative Activities: | |  | | |
| Service: | |  | | |
| DEI Activities: | |  | | |
| Type of review: | | Annual  Reappointment  Dismissal | | |

Complete a narrative justification and rate Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, and Service on the following scale: Excellent, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement, and Not Applicable (NA). For DEI, rate as Satisfactory or Needs Improvement.

Teaching

Excellent  Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory  Needs Improvement  NA

Comments:

Research/Creative Activities

Excellent  Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory  Needs Improvement  NA

Comments:

Service

Excellent  Highly Satisfactory  Satisfactory  Needs Improvement  NA

DEI

Satisfactory  Needs Improvement

Comments:

Conclusions About Cumulative Progress (check one in each row):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | NA |
| Teaching |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/Creative Activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEI | | |  |  |  |

Recommendations:

Comments:

Signatures

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator Date

# Appendix C.1: Third-Year and Pre-Promotion Review Form

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate: |  | Department/Campus: | CHS  SNC  IUB  IUFW  IUC |
| Area of Excellence: |  | Date of Rank: |  |

**Review Type:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Third-Year or Pre-promotion review |  |  |
| Reviewer:  Dept. Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator  APT Unit Committee  Fourth-Year Review?  Recommended  Not Recommended  Not applicable  Vote:        Yes        No        Abstain |  |  |

Teaching (May not be applicable for scientists)

Research/Creative Activities (not Applicable for Clinical Track and Lecturer faculty)

Service (May not be applicable for scientists)

DEI

Conclusions About Progress:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | NA |
| Teaching |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/Creative Activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEI | | |  |  |  |

Signatures

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unit Committee Chair Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator Date

# Appendix C.2: Fourth-Year Review Form

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate: |  | Department/Campus: | CHS  SNC  IUB  IUFW  IUC |
| Area of Excellence: |  | Date of Rank: |  |

**Review Type:**

|  |
| --- |
| Fourth-Year |
| Reviewer:  Dept. Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator or  APT Unit Committee  Vote:        Yes        No        Abstain |

Teaching (May not be applicable for scientists)

Research/Creative Activities

Service (May not be applicable for scientists)

DEI (May not be applicable for scientists)

Conclusions About Progress:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory | NA |
| Teaching |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/Creative Activities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEI |  |  |  |  |  |

Signatures

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unit Committee Chair Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator Date

# Appendix C.3: Promotion and/or Tenure Review Form

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate: |  | Department/Campus: | CHS  SNC  IUB  IUFW  IUC |
| Area of Excellence: |  | Date of Rank: |  |

**Review Type:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Promotion | Tenure  Tenure not applicable check here |
| Reviewer:  Dept. Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator  APT Unit Committee  Dean  Promotion:  Recommended  Do Not Recommended  Promotion Vote:        Yes       No       Abstain | Reviewer:  Dept. Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator  APT Unit Committee  Dean  Tenure:  Recommended  Not Recommended  Tenure Vote:        Yes       No       Abstain |

Teaching (May not be applicable for scientists)

Research/Creative Activities (not Applicable for Clinical Track and Lecturer faculty)

Service (May not be applicable for scientists)

DEI

Signatures

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Candidate Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_­­­­­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unit Committee Chair Date

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator Date

# Appendix D: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence for Advancement – Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

All tenure-track faculty declare an area of excellence (research, teaching, service, balanced case, balanced DEI case) for advancement. In most cases, this should be discussed with the candidate’s chair upon hire. Tenure-track faculty in the IUSON may advance in one of the following ways:

**Excellence in Research**

***Associate Professor/Tenure*:** To advance to associate rank with tenure with a declared area excellence in research, candidates must demonstrate an emerging national reputation in a focused field of research and show a body of work that is sustained and progressive.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in research (Table 1) and satisfactory in teaching (Table 2) and service (Table 3).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

***Professor:*** To advance to rank of Professor with a declared area excellence in research, candidates must demonstrate a national/international reputation in a focused field of research and show a body of work that is well-established and cumulative.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in research (Table 1) and satisfactory in teaching (Table 2) and service (Table 3).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

**Excellence in Teaching**

***Associate Professor/Tenure*:** To advance to associate rank with tenure with a declared area excellence in teaching, candidates must demonstrate an emerging national reputation in a focused field of teaching and show a body of work that is sustained and progressive.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching (Table 2) and satisfactory in research (Table 1) and service (Table 3).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

***Professor*:** To advance to rank of Professor with a declared area excellence in teaching, candidates must demonstrate a national/international reputation in a focused field of teaching and show a body of work that is well-established and cumulative.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching (Table 2) and satisfactory in research (Table 1) and service (Table 3).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

**Excellence in Service**

**Associate Professor/Tenure:** To advance to associate rank with tenure with a declared area excellence in service, candidates must demonstrate an emerging national reputation in a focused field of service and show a body of work that is sustained and progressive.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in service (Table 3) and satisfactory in research (Table 1) and teaching (Table 2).

For faculty with administrative appointments, service must include outcomes that exceed work routinely required of the appointment.  For faculty engaged in clinical practice, service must exceed routine, required, or expected patient or client outcomes or clinical performance. In both cases, service must include work that reflects application of relevant scholarly expertise, contributions to a body of knowledge, innovation, and/or impact that extends beyond the local context.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

***Professor*:** To advance to rank of Professor with a declared area excellence in service, candidates must demonstrate a national/international reputation in a focused field of service and show a body of work that is well-established and cumulative.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in service (Table 3) and satisfactory in research (Table 1) and teaching (Table 2).

For faculty with administrative appointments, service must include outcomes that exceed work routinely required of the appointment.  For faculty engaged in clinical practice, service must exceed routine, required, or expected patient or client outcomes or clinical performance. In both cases, service must include work that reflects application of relevant scholarly expertise, contributions to a body of knowledge, innovation, and/or impact that extends beyond the local context.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

**Balanced Case**

***Associate Professor/Tenure*:** To advance to associate rank with tenure with a balanced case, candidates must demonstrate an emerging national reputation in a field of scholarship that integrates research, teaching, and scholarship and show a body of work that is sustained and progressive.

Candidates must meet criteria for highly satisfactory in research (Table 1), teaching (Table 2), and service (Table 3). Peer reviewed dissemination is required in all three areas.

Because it can be particularly challenging to meet the criteria for highly satisfactory in three areas (research, teaching, service) for advancement to associate professor with tenure, candidates should discuss this option with their chair before declaring intent to advance on a balanced case.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

***Professor*:** To advance to full rank of Professor with a balanced case, candidates must demonstrate a national/international reputation in a focused field of scholarship that integrates teaching, research, and service and show a body of work that is well-established and cumulative.

Candidates must meet criteria for highly satisfactory in research (Table 1), teaching (Table 2), and service (Table 3). Peer reviewed dissemination is required in all three areas.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

**Balanced Case in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

***Associate Professor/Tenure*:** To advance to associate rank with tenure with a balanced case of DEI, candidates must demonstrate an emerging national reputation in a focused field of DEI and show a body of work that is sustained and progressive.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in DEI (Table 4) and satisfactory in research (Table 1), teaching (Table 2), and service (Table 3).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have meet the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

***Professor*:** To advance to full rank of Professor with a balanced case in DEI, candidates must demonstrate a national/international reputation in a focused field of DEI and show a body of work that is well-established and cumulative.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in DEI (Table 4) and satisfactory in research (Table 1), teaching (Table 2), and service (Table 3).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all tenure-track and tenured candidates below.

**Requirement for all candidates for advancement**

All candidates who seek advancement during the AY 23/24 or after in the School of Nursing must meet at least one of the satisfactory criteria for DEI in any of three areas (teaching, research, service). The area does not need to be in the area of excellence. For example, candidates seeking advancement in research may meet this requirement by meeting one of the DEI satisfactory criteria under teaching (e.g., incorporate diversity perspectives in classroom teaching).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 1: TENURE TRACK - RESEARCH CRITIERA** | | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent | Examples of Evidence |
| Research program not articulated | Research program clearly articulated | Research program clearly articulated | Research program clearly articulated | Candidate statement clearly outlines research program, including future directions |
| Research has not been conducted or disseminated | Performed research relevant to the science of nursing or related field | Performed research with demonstrated impact on the science of nursing or related field | Performed research that has a significant and sustained impact on the science of nursing or related field | External and local peer reviews |
| Role on collaborative projects is not articulated | Clearly articulated role on collaborative projects; provided meaningful contribution to projects | Clearly articulated role on collaborative work – played key role in projects | Clearly articulated role on collaborative work – assumed leadership role for projects | Documentation of contributions to all collaborative research projects |
| No or little dissemination of research | Disseminated results of research in scholarly journals and/or other venues1 | Maintained sustained publication record including peer-reviewed research publications; some publications should be in high impact venues, show prominence as primary or senior author,2 and/or be data-based  [Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed publications a year in research, teaching, OR service are recommended for promotion in a balanced case, meaning most candidates will have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by substantial focus on other research activities (e.g., grant submissions) but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate with tenure) or sustained national reputation (full).] | Maintained sustained publication record including peer-reviewed research publications; a substantial number of publications should be in high impact venues, show prominence as primary or senior author,2 and/or be data-based.  [Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed research publications per year are recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications (cumulative) for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by substantial focus on other research activities (e.g., grant submissions) but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate) or sustained national reputation (full).] | Peer-reviewed journal articles with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs) with evidence of impact (e.g., readership, adoption by organizations, influence on policy and practice, altmetrics4)  Public dissemination of research (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics4)  Intellectual property (e.g., patents, copyright) |
| No presentations of research at local or regional venues | Presented research at local or regional venues | Presented research findings regularly: some presentations should at competitive national or international venues.  [Note: average of 1 to 2 presentations in teaching, research, OR service per year are recommended for promotion in balanced case] | Presented research findings widely: majority of presentations should be at competitive national or international conferences.  [Note: average of 1 to 2 research presentations per year at national or international venues are recommended for promotion to associate and full professor] | Presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| No funding for research | Sought or obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding to support research | Obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding support for research AND obtained, or made continuing efforts to obtain, competitive external funding with indications of promise of success. | Has consistently obtained external competitive funding to support research | External and internal grants submitted and/or funded. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded, impact score) |
| No awards or recognition of research | Received local awards or recognition for research | Received local, regional, or national awards or recognition for research | Received national or international awards or recognition for significant research accomplishments or leadership | Competitive awards and recognition |
| *Does not integrate principles of DEI in research3* | *Included some DEI focus in research. Focus could include (but is not limited to) studying underrepresented groups, addressing issues related to health disparities or health system inequities, forming diverse research teams, mentoring underrepresented students and fellows in research, etc. 3* | *Routinely included DEI focus in research. Focus could include (but is not limited to) studying underrepresented groups, addressing issues related to health disparities or health system inequities, forming diverse research teams, mentoring underrepresented students and fellows in research, etc. 3* | *Consistently included a substantial DEI focus in research, Focus could include (but is not limited to) studying underrepresented groups, addressing issues related to health disparities or health system inequities, forming diverse research teams, mentoring underrepresented students and fellows in research, etc. 3* | *(See additional evidence listed under DEI Balanced Case table.)* |
| 1. Underlined criteria are required for all tenure-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3 Criteria in italics are specific to DEI*  *4* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 2: TENURE TRACK - TEACHING CRITERIA** | | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent | Examples of Evidence |
| Has not presented information on teaching load | Clearly presented information on teaching load1 | Clearly presented information on teaching load | Clearly presented information on teaching load | Documentation of teaching load |
| Role on collaborative projects is not articulated | Clearly articulated role on teaching projects - provided meaningful contribution to projects | Clearly articulated role on collaborative teaching projects – played key role in projects | Clearly articulated role on collaborative teaching projects – assumed leadership role for projects | Documentation of contributions to all collaborative research projects |
| Engaged in teaching. advising, or mentoring that was viewed as inadequate as evaluated by students, mentees, and peers with no evidence of student achievement | Engaged in quality teaching, advising, and mentoring as evaluated by students, mentees, and peers with evidence of impact on student achievement1 | Engaged in high quality teaching, advising, and mentoring as evaluated by students, mentees, and peers with evidence of strong impact on student achievement | Engaged in outstanding teaching, advising, and mentoring as evaluated by students, mentees, and peers with evidence of exceptional impact on student achievement | Student evaluations including quantitative and qualitative data; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions  Peer reviews of teaching; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions  Evidence of student achievement (e.g., course products, awards and honors, publications, and presentations)  Evidence of mentee achievement (e.g., publications, presentations, grants/awards, career advancement) |
| Has not presented teaching philosophy | Presented relevant teaching philosophy | Presented a thoughtful teaching philosophy and discussion of how it guides teaching practices | Presented a sophisticated teaching philosophy grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory and comprehensive discussion of how it guides teaching practices | Candidate statement outlining teaching philosophy |
| Has not engaged in course or curriculum development | Conducted new course development or curricula revision with evidence of effectiveness | Conducted new course development or significant curricular revision reflecting an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes. | Leads substantive course and/or curricular revisions, including innovations in pedagogical approaches, with demonstrated outcomes/impact | Curricular and course materials  Evaluation plans and instruments  Documented course and curricula outcomes |
| Has no publication record of scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Regularly disseminated results of scholarly work related to teaching/learning in academic journals and/or other professional venues | Maintained sustained publication record including peer-reviewed publications of scholarly work related to teaching/learning; some publications should be in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author.2  [Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed teaching, research, OR service publications a year are recommended for promotion in a balanced case, meaning most candidates will have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by substantial focus on other teaching activities but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate professor with tenure) or sustained national reputation (full professor).] | Maintained sustained publication record including peer-reviewed publications of scholarly work related to teaching/learning; a substantial number of publications should be in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author.2  [Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed teaching publications per year in are recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications (cumulative) for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by substantial focus on other teaching activities but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate professor with tenure) or sustained national reputation (full professor).] | Peer-reviewed journal articles with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works related to teaching (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs) with evidence of impact (e.g., readership, adoption by organizations, influence on policy and practice)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to teaching/learning (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics4) |
| Has not presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning at local or regional venues | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning regularly: some presentations should be at competitive national or international venues.  [Note: average of 1 to 2 presentations in teaching, research, OR service per year are recommended for promotion in a balanced case] | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning widely: majority of presentations should be at competitive national or international conferences.  [Note: average of 1 to 2 teaching presentations per year at national or international venues are recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure and full professor] | Teaching presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| Has not sought funding to support scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Sought or obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding to support scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding support for scholarly work related to teaching/learning AND obtained, or made continuing efforts to obtain, competitive external funding with indications of promise of success. | Has consistently obtained external competitive funding support for scholarly work related to teaching/learning | External and internal grants related to teaching submitted and/or funded. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded, impact score) |
| No awards or recognition of teaching practice or scholarship | Received local awards or recognition for teaching accomplishments or scholarship | Received local, regional, or national awards or recognition teaching accomplishments or scholarship | Received national or international awards or recognition for significant teaching accomplishments, scholarship, or leadership | Competitive awards and recognition |
| No evidence of impact of teaching practices on colleagues | Indications of some impact of teaching practices on colleagues | Indications of substantial positive impact on teaching practices of colleagues. | Evidence of adoption of work by others (locally and nationally) | Evidence of teaching practices adopted by colleagues or other programs |
| *Does not integrate principles of DEI in teaching3* | *Included some DEI focus in teaching. Focus could include (but is not limited to) inclusive teaching practices, curriculum development or revisions related to DEI, mentorship and advising of students from underrepresented groups, mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups in teaching, teaching scholarship related to DEI, etc. 3* | *Routinely included DEI focus in teaching. Focus could include (but is not limited to) inclusive teaching practices, curriculum development or revisions related to DEI, mentorship and advising of students from underrepresented groups, mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups in teaching, teaching scholarship related to DEI, etc. 3* | *Consistently included a substantial DEI focus in teaching. Focus could include (but is not limited to) inclusive teaching practices, curriculum development or revisions related to DEI, mentorship and advising of students from underrepresented groups, mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups in teaching, teaching scholarship related to DEI, etc. 3* | *(See additional evidence listed under Balanced DEI Case table.)* |
| 1. Underlined criteria are required for all tenure-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3 Criteria in italics are specific to DEI*  *4* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 3: TENURE TRACK - SERVICE CRITERIA** | | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent |  |
| Has no or minimal engagement in department, school of nursing, campus, university, professional, or community service activities | Active participation in routine department, school of nursing, campus, university, professional, or community service activities.1 | Has significant role in department, school of nursing, campus, university, professional or community service activities over a sustained period. | Leadership in department, school of nursing, campus, university, community, or professional service activities over a sustained period | Evidence of involvement in department, school of nursing, campus, or university service  Evidence of community involvement including community engagement and outreach activities, community board services, consultation to community groups, policy work, community program development, etc.  Evidence of professional service activities including editorial and grant review activities, editorial and review panel membership, involvement and/or leadership in professional organizations.  External assessments from constituents as to significance of contributions and impact of service activities |
| Service activities not related to professional expertise or academic work5 | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work5 that has local impact | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work5 that has an impact beyond local constituents | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work5 that has state/regional or national or international impact | Candidate statement clearly outlines relationship of service accomplishments to professional expertise or academic work5 |
| Role in service activities not articulated | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities | Documentation of contributions to all service activities |
| No or little dissemination of service activities | Disseminated of service activities in scholarly journals and/or other venues | Maintained sustained publication record including peer-reviewed service publications; some service publications should be in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author.2  [Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed publications in research, teaching, OR service are recommended per year for promotion in a balanced case, meaning most candidates would have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by substantial focus on other service activities but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate) or sustained national reputation (full).] | Maintained sustained publication including peer-reviewed service publications; a substantial number of service publications should be in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author.2  (Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed service publications per year in are recommended for promotion, meaning that most candidates would have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications (cumulative) for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by sustained focus on other service activities but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate) or sustained national reputation (full).] | Peer-reviewed journal articles with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works related to service with evidence of impact (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs, news reports, websites, blogs, altmetrics4)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to service (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics4)  Intellectual property (e.g., patents, copyright) |
| No presentations of service activities at local or regional venues | Presented service activities at local or regional venues | Presented service activities regularly: some service presentations at competitive national or international venues  [Note: average of 1 to 2 presentations in teaching, research OR service per year are recommended for promotion in balanced case] | Presented service activities widely: majority of service presentations at competitive national or international conferences  [Note: average of 1 to 2 service presentations per year at national or international venues are recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure and full professor] | Service presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote, new outlets, podcasts), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| No funding for service activities | Sought or obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding to support service activities | Obtained department, school, campus, university or local funding to support service activities AND obtained, or made continuing efforts to obtain, competitive external funding with indications of promise of success. | Has consistently obtained external competitive funding to support service activities | Submitted and funded external and internal grants. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded) |
| No awards or recognition of service activities | Received local awards or recognition for service activities | Received local, regional, or national awards or recognition for service activities | Received national or international awards or recognition for significant service leadership | Competitive service awards and recognition. |
| *Does not integrate principles of DEI in service3* | *Included some DEI focus in service activities. Focus could include (but is not limited to) service on department school, or campus committees related to DEI; community service or outreach to underrepresented communities; policy work related to DEI; recruitment and/retention of diverse students and faculty, etc. 3* | *Routinely included DEI focus and significant contributions in service activities. Focus could include (but is not limited to) service on department school, or campus committees related to DEI; community service or outreach to underrepresented communities; policy work related to DEI; recruitment and/retention of diverse students and faculty, etc. 3* | *Consistently included a substantial DEI focus and leadership in service activities. Focus could include (but is not limited to) department school, or campus committees related to DEI; community service or outreach to underrepresented communities; policy work related to DEI; recruitment and/retention of diverse students and faculty, etc. 3* | *(See additional evidence listed under Balanced DEI Case table.)* |
| 1. Underlined criteria are required for all tenure-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3 Criteria in italics are specific to DEI*  *4* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com).  *5* Academic work is characterized by command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contributions to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity, and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 4: TENURE TRACK – BALANCED CASE IN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CRITERIA** | | | | | |
| Satisfactory - Research | Satisfactory - Teaching | Satisfactory - Service |  | Excellence - DEI | Examples of Evidence |
| Research program clearly articulated | Clearly presented information on teaching load1 | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities |  | *Clearly articulated role and contributions to DEI initiatives3* | Documentation of role and contributions to DEI initiatives |
| Performed research relevant to the science of nursing or related field.  *Performed research related to a DEI (e.g., focus on DEI related topic, studying underrepresented populations, addressing health inequities in research)3* | Engaged in quality teaching, advising, and mentoring as evaluated by students, mentees, and peers with evidence of impact on student achievement1  *Engaged in inclusive teaching practices (e.g., including DEI course content/activities, teaching multicultural courses, incorporating diversity perspectives in classroom teaching) as evaluated by students, mentees, and peers with evidence of impact on student achievement3* | Active participation in routine school, campus, university, professional, or community service activities1  *Active participation in routine school, campus, university, professional, or community service activities related to DEI (e.g., serving on search committees when diverse representation is requested, serving on committees related to DEI initiatives, participating in community-based initiatives related to DEI) 3* |  | *Provided leadership or significant contributions to interrelated activities and accomplishments as an IUI faculty member that supported and advanced DEI initiatives3* | Candidate statement outlines integration of DEI activities and their benefit to the university |
| Clearly articulated role on collaborative projects; provided meaningful contribution to projects  *Clearly articulated role on collaborative projects; provided meaningful contribution related to DEI on projects3* | Presented relevant teaching philosophy  *Presented relevant teaching philosophy that includes focus on inclusive teaching practices3* | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work that has local impact  *Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise in DEI and reflect academic work that has local impact related to DEI3* |  | *Clearly articulated philosophy of DEI3* | Candidate statement includes DEI philosophy |
| Disseminated results of research in scholarly journals and/or other venues1  *Disseminated results of research related to DEI in scholarly journals and/or other venues3* | Conducted new course development or curricula revision with evidence of effectiveness  *Conducted new course development or curricula revision related to DEI with evidence of effectiveness3* | Disseminated service activities in scholarly journals and/or other venues  *Disseminated of service activities related to DEI in scholarly journals and/or other venues3* |  | *Provided leadership in community engagement initiatives that benefit underrepresented groups3* | Documentation of DEI contributions with supporting evidence from constituents |
| Presented research at local or regional venues  *Presented research related to DEI at local or regional venues3* | Regularly disseminated results of scholarly work related to teaching/learning in scholarly journals and/or other venues  *Regularly disseminated results of scholarly work related to teaching/learning and DEI in scholarly journals and/or other venues3* | Presented service activities at local or regional venues  *Presented service activities related to DEI at local or regional venues3* |  | *Made significant contributions to activities that benefit diverse university students, faculty, and staff. 3* | Documentation of mentoring underrepresented students, faculty, or staff with evidence of mentee outcomes  Documentation of DEI contributions with supporting evidence from constituents |
| Sought or obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding to support research  *Sought or obtained department, campus, or local funding to support research related to DEI3* | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning at local or regional venues  *Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning and DEI at local or regional venues3* | Sought or obtained department, campus, or local funding to support service activities  *Sought or obtained department, campus, or local funding to support service activities* related to DEI*3* |  | *Made significant contributions to national or international service initiatives that support or advance DEI3* | Documentation of DEI contributions with supporting evidence from constituents |
| Received local awards or recognition for research  *Received local awards or recognition for research related to DEI3* | Sought or obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding to support scholarly work related to teaching/learning  *Sought or obtained department, school, campus, university, or local funding to support scholarly work related to teaching/learning and DEI3* | Received local awards or recognition for service activities  *Received local awards or recognition for service activities related to DEI3* |  | *Performed significant and sustained research or scholarship related to DEI (e.g., social determinants of health, the health of historically marginalized populations, health system inequities) 3* | Candidate statement outlines research program or DEI scholarship, including future directions |
|  | Received local awards or recognition for teaching accomplishments or scholarship  *Received local awards or recognition for teaching accomplishments or scholarship related to DEI3* |  |  | *Provided peer review for journals and conferences that disseminate scholarship related to DEI or granting agencies that fund DEI activities3* | Documentation of review activities as focused on DEI |
|  | Participated in professional development, including mentoring other peers  *Engaged in mentoring or advising activities with focus on underrepresented students or peers3* |  |  | *Sponsored fellowship and training grants to support career development for historically marginalized students and fellows3* | Documentation of mentoring or advising activities with focus on underrepresented students or fellows with evidence of student outcomes |
|  |  |  |  | Maintained sustained publication record including peer-reviewed DEI publications; a substantial number of DEI publications should be in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author.2  [Note: An average of 1 to 2 peer-reviewed publications per year are recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates would have approximately 8 to 10 publications for promotion to associate professor with tenure and 16 to 20 publications (cumulative) for promotion to full professor.] 3  In some cases, number of publications may be influenced by substantial focus on other DEI activities but should reflect an emerging national reputation (associate professor with tenure) or sustained national reputation (full professor).] 3 | Peer-reviewed DEI publications with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works related to DEI (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs, news reports, websites, blogs,) with evidence of impact (e.g., altmetrics4)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to DEI (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics4)  Intellectual property related to DEI (e.g., patents, copyright) |
|  |  |  |  | *Presented DEI work in high quality national or international venues.*  *(Note: average of 1 to 2 DEI presentations per year at national or international venues are recommended for promotion to associate professor with tenure and full professor) 3* | DEI presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
|  |  |  |  | *Has consistently obtained external competitive funding to support DEI research or scholarship* | External or internal grants that are related to DEI and/or that benefit marginalized and minoritized communities. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI, project leader), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded). |
|  |  |  |  | *National, international, local (campus), and/or community-based awards and/or recognition for DEI initiatives3* | Documentation of awards and recognition related to DEI |
| 1. Underlined criteria are required for all tenure-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3 Criteria in italics are specific to DEI*  *4* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | | | | | |

# Appendix E: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence for Advancement – Clinical Track Faculty

All clinical-track faculty declare an area of excellence [teaching, service, balanced case (teaching and service), DEI] for advancement. The area of excellence should be discussed with the candidate’s chair upon hire. Clinical-track faculty in the IUSON may advance in one of the following ways:

**Excellence in Teaching**

***Clinical Associate Professor*:** To advance to associate rank with a declared area of excellence in teaching, *candidates must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in the area of teaching*.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching (Table 5) and satisfactory in service (Table 6).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical-track candidates below.

***Clinical Professor*:** To advance to full rank with a declared area of excellence in teaching, candidates *must demonstrate a record of sustained, nationally or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in the area of teaching.*

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching (Table 5) and satisfactory in service (Table 6).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical-track candidates below.

**Excellence in Service**

***Clinical Associate Professor*:** To advance to associate rank with a declared area of excellence in service, *candidates must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in the area of service*.

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in service (Table 6) and satisfactory in teaching (Table 5).

For faculty with administrative appointments, service must include outcomes that exceed work routinely required of the appointment.  For faculty engaged in clinical practice, service must exceed routine, required, or expected patient or client outcomes or clinical performance. In both cases, service must include academic work that reflects application of relevant scholarly expertise, contributions to a body of knowledge, innovation, and/or impact that extends beyond the local context.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical-track candidates below.

***Clinical Professor*:** To advance to full rank with a declared area of excellence in service, candidates *must demonstrate a record of sustained, nationally or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in the area of service.*

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in service (Table 6) and satisfactory in teaching (Table 5).

For faculty with administrative appointments, service must include outcomes that exceed work routinely required of the appointment.  For faculty engaged in clinical practice, service must exceed routine, required, or expected patient or client outcomes or clinical performance. In both cases, service must include academic work that reflects application of relevant scholarly expertise, contributions to a body of knowledge, innovation, and/or impact that extends beyond the local context.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical-track candidates below.

**Balanced Case**

***Clinical Associate Professor*:** To advance to associate rank with a balanced case, *candidates must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching and service.*

Candidates must meet criteria for highly satisfactory in both teaching (Table 5) and service (Table 6). Peer reviewed dissemination is required in both areas.

Because it can be particularly challenging to meet the criteria for highly satisfactory in both areas (teaching, service) for advancement to clinical associate professor, candidates should discuss this option with their chair before declaring intent to advance on a balanced case.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for clinical-track candidates below.

***Clinical Professor*:** To advance to full rank with a balanced case, *candidates* *must demonstrate a record of sustained, nationally or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in the areas of teaching and service.*

Candidates must meet criteria for highly satisfactory in both teaching (Table 5) and service (Table 6). Peer reviewed dissemination is required in both areas.

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical track candidates below.

**Balanced Case in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

A balanced case in DEI is based on an array of interrelated activities and accomplishments as a faculty member aligned with diversity, equity, and inclusion.

***Clinical Associate Professor*:** To advance to associate rank with a balanced case in DEI, *candidates must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in DEI.*

Candidates must demonstrate satisfactory performance in areas of responsibility: teaching and service (Table 7) and meet criteria for excellent in DEI (Table 7).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the table. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical-track candidates below

***Clinical Professor*:** To advance to full rank with a balanced case in DEI, *candidates* *must demonstrate a record of sustained, nationally or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in the area of DEI.*

Candidates must demonstrate satisfactory performance in areas of responsibility: teaching and service (Table 7) and meet criteria for excellent in DEI (Table 7).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the tables. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all clinical-track candidates below.

**Requirement for all candidates for advancement**

All candidates who seek advancement during the AY 23/24 or after in the School of Nursing must meet at least one of the satisfactory criteria for DEI in any of three areas (teaching, research, service). The area does not need to be in the area of excellence. For example, candidates seeking advancement in research may meet this requirement by meeting one of the satisfactory criteria under teaching (e.g., incorporate diversity perspectives in classroom teaching).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 5: CLINICAL TRACK - TEACHING CRITERIA** | | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent | Examples of Evidence |
| Has not presented information on teaching load | Clearly presented information on teaching load1 | Clearly presented information on teaching load1 | Clearly presented information on teaching load1 | Documentation of teaching load |
| Role on collaborative projects is not articulated | Clearly articulated role on collaborative teaching projects - provided meaningful contribution to projects | Clearly articulated role on collaborative teaching projects – played key role in projects | Clearly articulated role on collaborative teaching projects – assumed leadership role for projects | Documentation of contributions to all collaborative teaching projects |
| Has not presented teaching philosophy | Presented relevant teaching philosophy1 | Presented a thoughtful teaching philosophy and discussion of how it guides teaching practices1 | Presented a sophisticated teaching philosophy grounded in knowledge of pedagogical theory and comprehensive discussion of how it guides teaching practices1 | Candidate statement outlining teaching philosophy |
| Engaged in teaching that was viewed as inadequate as evaluated by students and peers with no evidence of student achievement | Engaged in quality teaching as evaluated by students and peers with satisfactory teaching and learning outcomes1 | Engaged in high quality teaching as evaluated by students and peers with evidence of good teaching and learning outcomes1 | Engaged in outstanding teaching as evaluated by students and peers with extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes1 | Candidate statement demonstrates a scholarly and reflective approach to teaching  Student evaluations including quantitative and qualitative data; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions  Peer reviews of teaching; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions  Evidence of student achievement (e.g., course products, awards and honors, publications, and presentations) |
| Has not engaged in course or curriculum development | Conducted new course development or curricula revision with evidence of effectiveness | Conducted new course development or significant curricular revision reflecting an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes. | Lead substantive course and/or curricular revisions, including innovations in pedagogical approaches, with excellent outcomes/impact | Curricular and course materials  Evaluation plans and instruments  Documented course and curricula revisions with evidence of student or program outcomes |
| Has not engaged in mentoring or advising | Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented with evidence of impact on. student achievement | Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented with evidence of strong impact on student achievement | Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented with evidence of exceptional impact on student achievement | Candidate statement demonstrates a scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring  Evidence of mentee achievement (e.g., publications, presentations, grants/awards, career advancement) and satisfaction |
| Has no publication record of scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Some disseminated record of scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Record of dissemination of scholarly work related to teaching/learning; some dissemination must be in national peer-reviewed publications or retrievable scholarly works in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author/contributor.2  [Note: An average of 1 peer-reviewed teaching or service publication or other form of high impact public dissemination a year is recommended for promotion in a balanced case, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to associate professor and 10 to 14 publications/scholarly works for promotion to professor.  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other teaching or service activities | Sustained record of dissemination of scholarly work related to teaching/learning; some dissemination must be in national peer-reviewed publications or retrievable scholarly works in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author/contributor.2  [Note: An average of 1 peer-reviewed teaching publication or other form of high impact public dissemination per year is recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to associate professor and 10 to 14 publications/scholarly works (cumulative) for promotion to full professor.  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other teaching activities | Peer-reviewed journal articles related to teaching with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works related to teaching (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs) with evidence of impact (e.g., readership, adoption by organizations, influence on policy and practice)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to teaching/learning (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics4) |
| Has not presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning at local or regional venues | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning: some presentations should be at competitive national or international venues.  [Note: One presentation in teaching or service per year is recommended for promotion in a balanced case] | Presented scholarly work related to teaching/learning: majority of presentations should be at competitive national or international conferences.  [Note: One teaching presentation per year is recommended for promotion to associate professor and professor] | Teaching presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| Has not sought funding to support scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Has sought funding support for scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Has obtained some funding to support for scholarly work related to teaching/learning | Has obtained significant funding support for scholarly work related to teaching/learning | External and internal grants related to teaching submitted and/or funded. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded, impact score) |
| No professional development in teaching (examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback) | Some level of professional development in teaching (examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback) | Consistent level of professional development in teaching (examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback) | High level of professional development in teaching (examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback) | Professional development activities (workshops or conferences, consultations, educational programs) with evidence of impact (e.g., improved teaching practices, development of new programs, introduction of new pedagogies) |
| No awards or recognition of teaching practice or scholarship | Received local awards or recognition for teaching accomplishments or scholarship | Received local, regional, or national awards or recognition for teaching accomplishments or scholarship | Received national or international awards or recognition for significant teaching accomplishments, scholarship, or leadership | Competitive awards and recognition |
| No evidence of impact of teaching practices on colleagues | Indications of some impact of teaching practices on colleagues | Indications of positive impact on teaching practices of colleagues. | Evidence of adoption of work by others (locally and nationally) | Evidence of teaching practices adopted by colleagues or other programs  Evidence of substantial positive impact on teaching practices of colleagues |
| *Does not integrate principles of DEI in teaching3* | *DEI criteria can include (but is not limited to) inclusive teaching practices, curriculum development or revisions related to DEI, mentorship and advising of students from underrepresented groups, mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups in teaching, teaching scholarship related to DEI, etc. 3* | *DEI criteria can include (but is not limited to) inclusive teaching practices, curriculum development or revisions related to DEI, mentorship and advising of students from underrepresented groups, mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups in teaching, teaching scholarship related to DEI, etc. 3* | *DEI criteria can include (but is not limited to) inclusive teaching practices, curriculum development or revisions related to DEI, mentorship and advising of students from underrepresented groups, mentoring faculty from underrepresented groups in teaching, teaching scholarship related to DEI, etc. 3* | *(See additional evidence listed under Balanced DEI Case table.)* |
| 1. Underlined criteria are required for all clinical-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3 Criteria in italics are specific to DEI*  *4* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 6: CLINICAL TRACK - SERVICE CRITERIA** | | | | |
| Unsatisfactory | Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Excellent |  |
| Had no or minimal engagement in department, school of nursing, campus, university, professional, or community service activities | Active participation in routine department, school of nursing, campus, university, professional, or community service activities.1 | Had significant role in department, school of nursing, campus, university, professional or community service activities. | Had leadership roles in department, school of nursing, campus, university, community, or professional service activities over a sustained period | Evidence of involvement in department, school of nursing, campus, or university service  Evidence of community involvement including community engagement and outreach activities, community board services, consultation to community groups, policy work, community program development, etc.  Evidence of professional service activities including editorial and grant review activities, review panel membership, involvement and/or leadership in professional organizations.  Candidate statement reflects how service activities support the mission of the School of Nursing, University, community, or profession of nursing  External assessments from constituents or colleagues as to significance of contributions and impact of service activities |
| Role in service activities not articulated | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities | Clearly articulated role and contributions to all service activities | Documentation of contributions to all service activities |
| Service activities not related to professional expertise or academic work5 | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work5 that has local impact1 | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work5 that has an impact beyond local constituents1 | Service activities are a direct reflection of professional expertise and reflect academic work5 that has state/regional or national or international impact1 | Candidate statement clearly outlines relationship of service accomplishments to professional expertise or academic work5 |
| Provides services to patients or clients that does not exceed normative levels of activity and quality | Provides services to patients or clients that results in positive outcomes resulting in local recognition | Provides services to patients or clients that results in excellent outcomes resulting in regional or national recognition | Provides services to patients or clients that results in exceptional outcomes resulting in national/international acclaim | Documentation of variety and extent of patient or client care beyond clinical service expected as part of normal workload  Documentation that indicates clinical service has had an impact beyond direct recipient of care |
| No or little dissemination of service activities | Dissemination of service activities in at local venues | Record of dissemination of scholarly work related to service; some dissemination must be in national peer-reviewed publications or retrievable scholarly works in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author/contributor.2  [Note: An average of 1 peer-reviewed service or teaching publication or other form of high impact public dissemination a year is recommended for promotion in a balanced case, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to associate professor and 10 to 14 publications/scholarly works for promotion to professor.]  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other service activities. | Sustained record of dissemination of scholarly work related to service; most dissemination is in national peer-reviewed publications or retrievable scholarly works in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author/contributor.2  [Note: An average of 1 peer-reviewed service publication or other form of high impact public dissemination per year is recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to associate professor and 10 to 14 publications/scholarly works (cumulative) for promotion to full professor.]  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other service activities. | Peer-reviewed journal articles with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works related to service with evidence of impact (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs, news reports, websites, blogs, altmetrics4)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to service (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics4)  Intellectual property (e.g., patents, copyright) |
| No presentations of service activities at local or regional venues | Presented service activities at local venues | Presented service activities; some service presentations at competitive regional/state or national/ international venues  [Note: One presentation in teaching or service per year is recommended for promotion in balanced case for promotion to associate and full professor] | Presented service activities; majority of service presentations at competitive national/international conferences  [Note: average of one service presentation per year at national or international venues is recommended for promotion to associate and full professor] | Service presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote, new outlets, podcasts), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| No funding for service activities | Has sought funding support for scholarly work related to service activities | Has obtained some funding to support for scholarly work related to service activities | Has obtained significant funding support for scholarly work related to service activities | Submitted and funded external and internal grants. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded) |
| No awards or recognition of service activities | Received local awards or recognition for service activities | Received local, regional, or national awards or recognition for service activities | Received national or international awards or recognition for significant service leadership | Competitive service awards and recognition. |
| *Does not integrate principles of DEI in service3* | *DEI criteria could include (but is not limited to) service on department school, or campus committees related to DEI; community service or outreach to underrepresented communities; policy work related to DEI; recruitment and/retention of diverse students and faculty, etc. 3* | *DEI criteria could include (but is not limited to) service on department school, or campus committees related to DEI; community service or outreach to underrepresented communities; policy work related to DEI; recruitment and/retention of diverse students and faculty, etc. 3* | *DEI criteria could include (but is not limited to) department school, or campus committees related to DEI; community service or outreach to underrepresented communities; policy work related to DEI; recruitment and/retention of diverse students and faculty, etc. 3* | *(See additional evidence listed under Balanced DEI Case table.)* |
| 1 Underlined criteria are required for all clinical-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3 Criteria in italics are specific to DEI*  *4* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com).  *5* Academic work is characterized by command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise; contributions to a body of knowledge; imagination, creativity, and innovation; application of ethical standards; achievement of intentional outcomes; and evidence of impact. | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 7: CLINICAL TRACK – BALANCED CASE IN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CRITERIA** | |
|  | Examples of Evidence |
| **A. Is Satisfactory Teacher1** | Peer evaluations  Student evaluations and evidence of student learning  Reflection on professional development in teaching |
| **B. Participates in appropriate service to unit and campus1** | Evidence of involvement in department, school of nursing, campus, or university service |
| **C. Excellence in DEI** |  |
| Clearly articulated philosophy of DEI | Candidate statement includes a reflective and sophisticated DEI philosophy |
| Has interrelated activities and accomplishments in teaching and service that advances the mission of the School of Nursing, the University, the community, and the profession of nursing regarding DEI. Can include:   * Inclusive teaching practices * Integration of DEI content (e.g., social determinants of health, health disparities) and activities (e.g., DEI readings and reflections) in teaching * Course and curriculum development related to DEI * Leading workshops or providing consultations on inclusive teaching practices * Recruitment and retention of diverse or underrepresented students * Mentoring and advising of underrepresented student and student groups * Recruitment and retention of diverse or underrepresented faculty and staff (e.g., serving on search committees when diverse membership requested, doing outreach) * Unit/campus service related to DEI mission * Community engagement or outreach with diverse and underrepresented groups (e.g., board membership, consultation, task force membership) * Professional activities or policy work aimed at DEI initiatives | Candidate statement articulates how DEI activities and accomplishments in teaching and service are interrelated and tied to mission of the School of Nursing and the University  Candidate statement demonstrates a scholarly and reflective approach to teaching and mentoring as related to DEI  Peer and student evaluations (quantitative and qualitative) of inclusive teaching practices; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions to increase inclusivity  Course/curricula revisions related to DEI with evidence of student or program impact  Evidence of achievement of diverse and underrepresented students and mentees (e.g., publications, presentations, grants/awards, career advancement)  Description of involvement in department, School of Nursing, campus, or university service as related to DEI with evidence of impact (e.g., recruitment of diverse faculty, successful outcomes related to the advancement of unit DEI mission)  Evidence of community or professional involvement as related to DEI with evidence of impact and documentation of outcomes from constituents  Evidence of professional service activities including editorial and grant review activities, editorial and review panel membership, involvement and/or leadership in professional organizations that are related to DEI. |
| Served in an essential and generative role in DEI activities. | Documentation of role and contributions to DEI initiatives and dissemination |
| Record of dissemination of scholarly work related to DEI; some dissemination must be in national peer-reviewed publications or retrievable scholarly works in high impact venues and show prominence as primary or senior author/contributor.2  [Note: An average of 1 peer-reviewed publication or other form of high impact public dissemination related to DEI a year is recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to associate professor and 10 to 14 publications/scholarly works for promotion to professor.]  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other DEI activities. | Peer-reviewed DEI publications with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics4)  Other published works related to DEI (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs, news reports, websites, blogs,) with evidence of impact (e.g., altmetrics3)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to DEI (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics3)  Intellectual property related to DEI (e.g., patents, copyright) |
| Presented DEI activities: majority of DEI presentations at competitive venues with high impact.  [Note: average of one DEI presentation per year is recommended for promotion to associate and full professor] | DEI presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote, new outlets, podcasts), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| Local (School of Nursing, university), community-based, or national/international awards and/or recognition for DEI initiatives3 | Competitive awards/recognition related to DEI |
| 1 Underlined criteria are required for all clinical-track faculty seeking promotion in a balanced DEI case per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | |

# Appendix F: Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence for Advancement – Lecturer Track Faculty

All lecturer-track faculty declare an area of excellence in teaching or DEI. Lecturer-track faculty in the IUSON may advance in one of the following ways:

**Excellence in Teaching**

***Senior Lecturer*:** To advance to senior lecturer, *candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching based a distinct teaching philosophy and resulting in extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes and demonstrate leadership in support of teaching and learning.*

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching (Table 8).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the table. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all lecturer-track candidates below.

***Teaching Professor*:** To advance to rank of Teaching Professor, *candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching based a distinct teaching philosophy and resulting in extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes, demonstrate leadership in support of teaching and learning, and have peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship relevant to teaching and learning.*

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching (Table 8).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the table. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have meet the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all lecturer-track candidates below.

**Balanced Case in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

A balanced case in DEI is based on an array of interrelated activities and accomplishments as a faculty member aligned with diversity, equity, and inclusion.

***Senior Lecturer*:** To advance to senior lecturer, *candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching based a distinct teaching and DEI philosophy and resulting in extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes related to DEI and demonstrate leadership in support of teaching and learning related to DEI.*

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching related to DEI (Table 9).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the table. Rather candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have met the standards listed above.

In addition, see requirements for all lecturer-track candidates below.

***Teaching Professor*:** To advance to rank of Teaching Professor, *candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching based a distinct teaching and DEI philosophy and resulting in extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes related to DEI, demonstrate leadership in support of teaching and learning related to DEI, and have peer reviewed dissemination of scholarship relevant to teaching and learning related to DEI.*

Candidates must meet criteria for excellent in teaching related to DEI (Table 9).

Candidates do NOT need to engage in all activities or have all the evidence listed on the table. Rather, candidates should use criteria to demonstrate that they have meet the standards listed above.

**Requirement for all candidates for advancement**

All candidates who seek advancement after the AY 23/24 in the School of Nursing must meet at least one of the satisfactory criteria for DEI in any of three areas (teaching, research, service). The area does not need to be in the area of excellence. For example, candidates seeking advancement in research may meet this requirement by meeting one of the satisfactory criteria under teaching (e.g., incorporate diversity perspectives in classroom teaching).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 8: LECTURER-TRACK – TEACHING CRITERIA** | |
| Criteria | Examples of Evidence |
| **Satisfactory in service:**  Routine, required, and expected service to university, discipline, and community.  Department service that is more than participation. | Evidence of involvement in department, school of nursing, campus, or university service with evidence of impact |
| **Excellence in teaching:** |  |
| Distinct teaching philosophy | Candidate statement outlining teaching philosophy |
| Achievement of excellence in instruction | Candidate statement demonstrates a scholarly and reflective approach to teaching  Student evaluations including quantitative and qualitative data; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions  Peer reviews of teaching; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions |
| Extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes | Evidence of student achievement (e.g., course products, awards and honors, publications, presentations, advanced education) |
| Excellent achievement in course and curriculum development | Documented course and curricula revisions with evidence of student or program outcomes  Curricular and course materials (course outlines, innovative assignments, and exams) |
| Development of innovative pedagogies | Candidate statement addresses development of innovative pedagogies  Evidence of adoption of innovations by other teachers |
| Development of innovative teaching materials | Teaching materials and products (clinical and didactic)  Evidence of adoption of teaching materials by other teachers |
| Development of innovations in assessment and evaluation of student, course, and program outcomes | Evaluation plans, measures, tools, assessment techniques (clinical and didactic)  Evidence of adoption of evaluation materials by other teachers |
| Record of internally or locally publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed publications/scholarly works in teaching (senior lecturer) or record of regionally or nationally publicly disseminated and peer reviewed publications/scholarly works in teaching (teaching professor only)  Note: An average of 1 publicly disseminated or peer-reviewed publication/scholarly work related to teaching/learning a year is recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to senior lecturer and 10 to 14 scholarly works for promotion to teaching professor.  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other teaching activities | Peer-reviewed journal articles with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics3)  Other published works related to teaching (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs) with evidence of impact (e.g., readership, adoption by organizations, influence on policy and practice)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to teaching/learning (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics3) |
| Record of presentation of significant contributions to knowledge base in teaching/learning  [Note: One presentation in teaching per year is recommended for promotion] | Teaching presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics4) |
| Mentoring characterized by scholarly approach resulting in student achievements linked to mentoring | Candidate statement demonstrates a scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring  Evidence of mentee achievement (e.g., publications, presentations, grants/awards, career advancement) and satisfaction |
| Advanced the unit’s teaching mission through service (e.g., mentoring faculty, curriculum committees, teaching award committees) | Description of service activities with demonstrated impact |
| Recognized for outstanding teaching practices | Local, state/regional, national/international teaching awards |
| Participates in professional development opportunity | Teaching conferences, workshops, interprofessional collaboration, consultations |
| Participated (senior lecturer) or provided leadership for (teaching professor) national nursing education or other teaching organizations | Evidence of national service commitments with evidence of role and impact  Evidence of board membership, editorial positions, and review activities |
| Has obtained or showed significant movement toward of receiving funding (senior lecturer) or has a sustained record of receiving funding (teaching professor) for scholarship related to teaching/learning | External and internal grants related to teaching submitted and/or funded. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded, impact score) |
| 1 Underlined criteria are required for all lecturer-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  3 Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TABLE 9: LECTURER TRACK – BALANCED CASE IN DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION CRITERIA** | |
|  | Examples of Evidence |
| **A. Is Satisfactory Teacher1** | Peer evaluations  Student evaluations and evidence of student learning  Reflection on professional development in teaching |
| **B. Participates in appropriate service to unit and campus1** | Evidence of involvement in department, school of nursing, campus, or university service |
| **C. Excellence in DEI** |  |
| Clearly articulated philosophy of DEI | Candidate statement includes a reflective and sophisticated DEI philosophy |
| Has interrelated activities and accomplishments in teaching that advances the mission of the School of Nursing, the University, the community, and the profession of nursing regarding DEI. Can include:   * Inclusive teaching practices * Integration of DEI content (e.g., social determinants of health, health disparities) and activities (e.g., DEI readings and reflections) in teaching * Course and curriculum development related to DEI * Leading workshops or providing consultations on inclusive teaching practices * Recruitment and retention of diverse or underrepresented students * Mentoring and advising of underrepresented student and student groups * Recruitment and retention of diverse or underrepresented faculty and staff (e.g., serving on search committees when diverse membership requested, doing outreach) * Development of teaching and assessment materials that reflect integration of DEI in teaching | Candidate statement articulates how DEI activities and accomplishments in teaching and service are interrelated and tied to mission of the School of Nursing and the University  Candidate statement demonstrates a scholarly and reflective approach to teaching and mentoring as related to DEI  Peer and student evaluations (quantitative and qualitative) of inclusive teaching practices; discussion of how evaluations were used to change teaching practices or inform course and curricular revisions to increase inclusivity  Course/curricula revisions related to DEI with evidence of student or program impact  Evidence of achievement of diverse and underrepresented students and mentees (e.g., publications, presentations, grants/awards, career advancement) linked to teaching or mentoring  Description of involvement in department, School of Nursing, campus, or university service as related to DEI with evidence of impact (e.g., recruitment of diverse faculty, successful outcomes related to the advancement of unit DEI mission)  Evidence of community or professional involvement as related to DEI with evidence of impact and documentation of outcomes from constituents  Evidence of professional service activities including editorial and grant review activities, editorial and review panel membership, involvement and/or leadership in professional organizations that are related to DEI. |
| Served in an essential and generative role in DEI activities. | Documentation of role and contributions to DEI initiatives and dissemination |
| Record of publicly disseminated teaching practices related to DEI internally or locally (senior lecturer) or peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching related to DEI regionally or nationally (teaching professor only)  Note: An average of 1 publicly disseminated or peer-reviewed publication/scholarly work related to teaching/learning or DEI a year is recommended for promotion, meaning most candidates will have approximately 5 to 7 publications/scholarly works for promotion to senior lecturer and 10 to 14 scholarly works for promotion to teaching professor.  In some cases, number of publications/scholarly works may be influenced by substantial focus on other teaching activities | Peer-reviewed DEI publications with evidence of impact (e.g., journal metrics, citations, reach of journal, altmetrics3)  Other published works related to DEI (e.g., papers, books, book chapters, monographs, news reports, websites, blogs,) with evidence of impact (e.g., altmetrics3)  Public dissemination of scholarly work related to DEI (e.g., podcasts, media interviews, videos, webcasts) with evidence of impact (e.g., audience reach, altmetrics3)  Intellectual property related to DEI (e.g., patents, copyright) |
| Presented DEI activities: majority of DEI presentations at competitive venues with high impact.  [Note: One presentation in DEI per year is recommended for promotion] | DEI presentations with evidence of impact. Indicate venue (local, regional, national, international); nature of presentation (oral, poster, panel, keynote, new outlets, podcasts), competitiveness of submission, and reach of conference (e.g., attendance, prestige, altmetrics3) |
| Recognition of outstanding teaching practices related to DEI | Local (School of Nursing, university), community-based, or national/international awards and/or recognition for DEI initiatives3 |
| Has obtained or showed significant movement toward of receiving funding (senior lecturer) or has a sustained record of receiving funding (teaching professor) for scholarship related to DEI and teaching/learning | External and internal grants related to teaching submitted and/or funded. Indicate funding source, amount of award, role (e.g., PI, Co-PI), length of project, and status (e.g., funded, pending, not funded, impact score) |
| 1 Underlined criteria are required for all lecturer-track faculty per University Guidelines  2 Primary author = persons who made the most significant contribution to the work (typically listed as first author); senior author = senior member of the research team who drove the concept, organized the project, or provided guidance throughout the execution of the project (often listed as the last author)  *3* Altmetrics are metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics. They can include (but are not limited to) citations on Wikipedia and in public policy documents, discussions on research blogs, mainstream media coverage, bookmarks on reference managers like Mendeley, and mentions on social networks such as Twitter (see Altmetrics.com). | |

# Appendix G: Sample Letters for Soliciting External Reviewers

**First Contact/Invitation**

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_,

Your name has been provided to me as a potential external reviewer for <insert faculty name>, who is applying for promotion to <insert rank> of Nursing at Indiana University School of Nursing. She has identified <teaching/research/service> as her area of excellence. The external review is due in my office by \_\_\_\_\_.

The Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case.

I appreciate the time and effort it takes to perform this important service. Please let me know whether or not you will be able to meet this request. If you are interested in doing the review, we will forward the candidate’s materials to you immediately. Thank you very much for your consideration of this request and I look forward to hearing from you. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

**Letter Sent with Dossier Materials**

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_,

Dr. <insert faculty name> is being considered for promotion at the rank of <insert rank> in the Department of <insert department name> within the Indiana University School of Nursing. Dr. <insert faculty name> has identified <teaching/research/service/DEI> as the area of excellence and thus the area where the evaluation by peers is most important. In considering her candidacy, we would appreciate your evaluation of the professional activities (i.e., teaching or creative activity, or professional service) for which you have sufficient knowledge regarding the performance of Dr. <insert faculty name>. We would be particularly grateful for your comments on the significance of this work and the ways it has been executed relative to other work in your field.

As you comment on Dr. <insert faculty name> scholarly work, we would welcome comments on the quality of the publications and journals that have been listed as well as other creative work and exhibition media. Comments on Dr. <insert faculty name> teaching might include your evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, other teaching materials, and publications on teaching as well as any personal experience you may have of her teaching. If you were aware of Dr. <insert faculty name> contributions to professional organizations or the discipline through her professional service activities or publications in this area, we would welcome your comments in this area as well. To assist you in your evaluation, I am enclosing curriculum vitae, the candidate’s statement, and copies of recent publications and teaching materials.

Please focus your review on the quality and impact of the candidate’s work. We are not asking you to recommend for or against promotion, nor are we asking if the candidate might receive promotion at your institution. IUPUI has developed a set of standards for assessing the scholarly work of colleagues in teaching and professional service. A copy of the standards is enclosed for your reference. While we encourage you to respond to this request in whatever form best reflects your ability to assess the candidate, we will consider these points when making a decision on advancement.

The IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that requested references come from individuals with no close connections to the candidate (i.e., former or current mentors, students, co-authors, research partners). Therefore, if such a conflict exists, please let us know as soon as possible that you will not be able to serve as a reviewer in this case. If you are able to serve as a reviewer, please complete the External Referee Form and return it with your review summary. Also, please include a copy of your vita or a brief biography to provide reviewers at all campus levels with context for your comments.

We hope you understand how much we appreciate your assistance as we consider Dr. <insert faculty name> candidacy. It is important to understand her contributions from a perspective beyond our campus. We are aware of the time a review such as this takes and understand it can be a difficult commitment to make, but we assure you that your help with this process is invaluable.

A group of faculty members serving in a promotion and/or tenure advisory capacity will see your letter. The candidate may request access to, and the University is legally compelled to give access to, the entire dossier. We can appreciate concerns you might have about writing a candid assessment under this condition, but we sincerely hope you will agree to assist us. If upon reflection you feel that you cannot be completely candid, however, we will respect your decision not to write an evaluation.

In order to complete Dr. <insert faculty name> dossier for University review, we would appreciate receiving your comments by <insert date>. I hope you will be able to assist us.

**Thank You Letter to External Reviewer – Sent with small IUSON swag gift**

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_,

I am writing to thank you for the external letter of review that you provided for Dr. <insert faculty name> application for promotion to clinical associate professor at Indiana University School of Nursing.

I want to express my appreciation for your contribution to this process. I know this is a time-consuming task and thank you for your willingness to provide a review.

# Appendix H: Comments Regarding External Reviews, Peer Review, and External Assessment

**Peer Review**

1. The evaluation by peers of teaching, research and creative activity, service, and DEI activities is the bedrock on which promotion and/or tenure decisions are based.
2. This evaluation should occur continuously across the career in the form of regular peer review of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.
3. At intervals where candidates seek promotion and/or tenure, an additional level of peer review of the overall record is needed.
4. These two types of peer review, ongoing review of teaching, research and creative activity, service, or DEI activities and assessment of the overall record, are both important and subject to different considerations.

**Ongoing Review**

1. Traditionally, peer review of research and creative activity has been a standard feature of faculty work.
2. Evaluation of work submitted to journals, juried shows, or other outlets for dissemination is considered the routine way to document the quality of this work.
3. Expectations for peer review of the quality and impact of teaching and professional service are now well established at IUPUI.
4. Peer evaluation of teaching or professional service is expected for all candidates with teaching or professional service as an area of performance and it is required for those whose advancement is based on excellence in teaching or professional service or on a balanced case. In the absence of a clear reason for the omission, dossiers without peer evaluations may be returned as incomplete. Ongoing peer review need not occur every year, but there should be a record of sustained peer review over the interval since appointment or last promotion.
5. Ongoing peer review may be provided by local, national, or international peers.
6. To be credible, peer reviewers must be identified according to their expertise or competence to comment.
7. These peer reviews should be requested at intervals by the department chair as part of the department’s peer review policies and procedures and conducted in the standard way specified by the academic unit.

**External Assessment**

External assessment is essential to provide the committees evaluating each candidate for promotion and/or tenure an objective evaluation of the value and impact of the candidate’s work within the discipline, and to demonstrate that each candidate for associate professor has achieved an emerging national reputation and that each candidate for full professor has achieved a sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered. External assessment is a summative evaluation process with associated rank requirements.

As IUPUI grows in complexity and as the nature of faculty and librarian work evolves, expectations for the form of independent, external assessment of the overall record appropriate to each type of faculty appointment continues to be refined.

1. External assessment (ordinarily in the form of a letter or verified email note) is expected at the clinical track and tenure track ranks. To provide each candidate maximal opportunity for success, **at least six assessment letters are required for clinical track and tenure track. Cases that come to the campus level without six acceptable “arm’s-length” letters will be returned to the school.**
2. **External Reviewer for Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Advancement to Senior Lecturer | Advancement to Teaching Professor |
| External Reviewers | Reviewers can be from IU, PU, or IUI as long as they have no close associations with the candidate and are outside the candidate’s department (or school, if there are no departments). | At least two reviewers must be outside the IU and PU systems. Up to 4 reviewers may be from IU, PU, or IUI as long as they have no close associations with the candidate and are outside the candidate’s department (or school, if there are no departments). |
| External Reviewers | Up to 2 reviewers may be from other IU or PU campuses; at least 4 reviewers must be outside of the IU and PU systems. |

1. If a candidate is reapplying for promotion within three years of a previous dossier submission (whether as a result of denial of promotion or withdrawal of the case prior to final decision), all original external letter writers must be contacted with a request to update their letter with the new dossier information. If provided, the new letter is substituted in the dossier. If not, the original letter must be retained in the dossier. Three additional new letters should be sought at the time of resubmission.
2. The candidate should not be involved in the selection of external reviewers, with two exceptions: 1) the candidate should be allowed to list those he or she would definitely not want to serve as an external reviewer, and 2) the candidate may provide a list of key scholars in the field if these are not known to the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator or the designee of the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator. The candidate must discuss this list with their academic administrator and should indicate clearly on the list that each meets the “arm’s length" or independent criteria outlined below. Department chairs, IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator, or deans are not required to use the external reviewers identified by candidates.
3. Chairs/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and dean may seek additional guidance to identify potential external reviewers, for example, from chairs of similar departments in other universities, from senior faculty in the department/campus in the same or related specialty, or from the scholars quoted in the candidate’s publications. Reviewers do not have to be scholars in the identical sub-specialty as the candidate. Department chairs/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrators should not inform candidates about the identities of the final external reviewers. Biographic summaries of external reviewer should be provided by the department chair /IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator and are not to be written by the candidate.
4. **Criteria Defining “Arm’s Length” or Independence of External Reviewers:** The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be as independent as possible. To qualify as “arm’s length” or independent, reviewers providing external assessment should have no personal, professional, or academic relationship with the candidate that would cause them to be invested in the candidate’s promotion. Specific examples of reviewers to avoid include (but are not limited to): 1) former or current mentors, 2) co-authors or scholarly collaborators in the last five years. Exceptions can be made in the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research or service panels. The department chair needs to specifically make the case for including such a reviewer. If in doubt, please contact the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that referees are objective and credible; persons closely associated with the candidate may not be as objective as those who are not personally associated. Reviews deemed to not comply with the “arm’s length” criteria will not count toward the six needed reviews.
5. **Academic external reviewers must be at a rank higher than the current rank of the candidate**, and at a peer (or higher) institution. When there are highly qualified academic reviewers who are considered top experts in the field, but they do not meet the rank or peer institution guidelines, the chair must provide sufficient explanation as to why they have been selected as an appropriate reviewer.
6. **Non-academic external reviewers** may be included when a clear explanation of the relevance of such a review is presented by the department chair/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrator. It is always in the best interest of the candidate to select the strongest pool of external reviewers possible.
7. Unit/school practices may vary in regard to who solicits external assessment letters, but the candidate should not solicit or receive his or her own letters. Department chairs/IUB, IUFW, or IUC administrators should indicate how the external reviewers were selected and a sample of the letter sent from the unit/school to external reviewers should be included in the dossier of each candidate. Make sure the External Referee Form is completed and returned by the reviewers (see Appendices).
8. General expectations for external assessment vary with type of appointment.

# Appendix I: Department Chair’s/IUB, IUFW, or IUC Administrator ’s Assessment of Dissemination Outlets in the Candidate’s Area of Excellence

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate: |  | Department/Campus: | CHS  SNC  IUB  IUFW  IUC |
| Area of Excellence: |  | Current Rank: |  |

**Journal Publications**

The dossier does/does not provide evidence of dissemination in the area of excellence. Specifically, in rank, the candidate has published a total of       peer-reviewed journal articles (      as first author) and has       additional papers in press.

The candidate’s scholar metrics as reported in her dossier / or as identified via (Google Scholar or Scholar Works or AltMetrics or ResearchGate or Other) are based on       publications generating       citations while in rank (total career citations =     ), an h-index of       and an i10 index of     .

**Stature/Quality of Journals and Journal Articles**

*List each journal on a separate line and in parentheses indicate # of articles published in that journal.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1-year impact factor** | **5-year impact factor** |
| **Teaching:** | | |
|  |  |  |
| **Research:** | | |
|  |  |  |
| **Service:** | | |
|  |  |  |
| **DEI:** |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Other Dissemination Venues**

The CV reflects a total of       peer-reviewed presentations including       local,       regional,       national, and       international. Some of the venues and their stature include:



**Grants (for tenure, tenure probationary, and scientist ranks only)**

The candidate submitted       grants to internal agencies and       to external agencies while in rank. The associate dean for research (see internal support letter for details) will validated all grant submissions.

**Funded Research as PI *(****Provide a summary of the grants)*

**Funded Research as Co-I *(****Provide a summary of the grants)*

**Unfunded Research** *(Provide a summary of the grants)*