



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Standards of Excellence in Research for Promotion and Tenure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Scope
Overview
Guidelines
Forms
Definitions
Related Information
History

Effective: 03/01/2007
Last Updated: 5/01/2014

Responsible University Office:
Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Responsible University Administrator
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Policy Contact:
Director, Faculty Affairs

Scope

IU School of Medicine:

Faculty members
Department chairs
School and Department Promotion and Tenure Committees
Dean
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (EAD)
Director, Faculty Affairs
Assistant Director, Faculty Systems

Overview

Research is fundamental to the mission of IUSM and is expected of faculty on the tenure and scientist track. While some clinical track faculty may also conduct research, it is not a specific area reviewed for the purpose of promotion. Research effort includes activities in basic science, health services, social science, educational, translational research, and clinical trials. This document defines the standards for excellent or satisfactory contributions in research for the purpose of promotion and/or tenure.

Guidelines

1. RESEARCH PORTFOLIO

- a. **Excellence in Research.** A candidate seeking to establish excellence in research as the basis for promotion to associate professor and for tenure will normally be expected to have developed an independent and focused research program supported by external research funding and beginning to produce significant publications or other scholarly output. The School of Medicine is also supportive of productive collaborative research and recognizes that biomedical science increasingly requires integrated projects in which faculty from different disciplines and with different expertise work as a team. Thus, an individual may also achieve excellence in research through contributions that have helped shape collaborative projects, provided the candidate can show evidence of an emerging national reputation for excellence based on his or her unique intellectual contribution to those projects and the scholarship they generate.

The candidate will have played critical role(s) as a member of collaborative, externally-funded research team(s). In both cases, the candidate would be expected to have produced or significantly contributed to publications (or other scholarly output) and demonstrated emerging excellence regionally and nationally. For promotion to professor, maturation of a research program and/or playing a greater leadership role on research team(s) with a continued record of research excellence is required. The candidate's accomplishments and contribution to the field in rank, individually, or in the context of a collaborative research team, would be recognized nationally and internationally. In the candidate's dossier, the 3-5 most significant papers in rank should be included. However, the review process will assess the candidate's overall productivity and scholarly contributions in rank based on the curriculum vitae and, importantly, letters solicited from objective colleagues and collaborators or their research team members (see Section 3).

Excellence in research is typically achieved by a focused research program in which successive achievements build upon each other to enrich the overall theme. The creativity stemming from such a thematic focus could foster further integrated interdisciplinary research or stimulate new areas of application to the clinical realm. A collection of unrelated projects, publications or other forms of scholarly output does not substitute for an overall research theme. The emergence of a theme is especially important in judging younger faculty who may not have an extensive research portfolio when they present for promotion to associate professor or for tenure. For faculty seeking promotion to professor, a focused body of achievement is anticipated although it is acknowledged that interests and composition of the research team(s) may change over time.

For those faculty members who are members of collaborative research teams, due credit will be given for such creative activity where significant intellectual input is documented. An essential factor will be to demonstrate that the scholarly activity reaches a level comparable to that described above for faculty directing an independent research program. An individual can achieve excellence in research as an essential contributor to successful collaborative projects, but must meet the requirement of having a focus, noted above, as well as the criteria discussed in Sections 2, 3, and 4.

Independence is taken to mean that a faculty member is the primary decision maker for a research program, or in the case of collaborative work, his or her portion of the program. Typical indicators of independence include being principal investigator on grants, being senior and/or corresponding author on papers, and receiving individual recognition for his or her work (Section 4). In those cases where the candidate's primary role has been as an essential member of a collaborative research team, the individual is expected to explain and document the importance of his or her intellectual contributions to the program. Senior members of the research team should provide supporting letters of reference to further explain and document the importance of the candidate's unique intellectual contributions to the program.

- b. **Satisfactory Research.** For faculty in the tenure track who are advancing based on excellence in service or teaching, evidence of satisfactory research is expected in the form of publications or other scholarship. Involvement in grants is also highly valued. Criteria for evaluating the research mission as satisfactory are similar in principle to those described above for judging excellence but with less rigorous standards regarding independence, recognition and productivity. However, the key principle is that scholarship is expected. Intellectual input into research can be made by providing an essential expertise or by contributing to the design of the project as a member of a research team. For individuals advancing based on service or teaching as an area of excellence, research activity that also relates to the area of excellence helps form a focused portfolio.
- c. **Excellence in Research for Non-tenure Track Ranks.** Faculty hired into the previous scientist track and the current research professor track advance in rank based on excellence in research. Achievement of excellence is, in spirit, based on criteria similar to those applied to tenure track faculty. It is acknowledged, however, that most non-tenure track faculty are associated with another tenure track faculty member who pays part or all of the salary and provides research space. It is unreasonable to expect, therefore, the degree of independence or team-based contributions expected in the tenure track such as having independent funding or publications.

2. PUBLICATION AND FUNDING

a. **Publication Record.** A critical element in establishing excellence in research or scholarly activity is a record of retrievable scholarly accomplishment, which in the past has been the publication of original and creative articles in journals that utilize peer review. Peer reviewed articles are those that have undergone anonymous review by objective experts in the field usually selected by an editor of the journal. In evaluating a publication record, several factors will be considered.

- i. Volume of publication, which is easily quantifiable, cannot be ignored but will not be the only index of excellence and contribution to the disciplines. It is recognized that faculty generally seek to publish as often as possible and in the best possible journals. Still, the stature of the journals in which a candidate publishes is important and can be difficult to assess. Publication in the premier peer-reviewed, high impact general science or medical journals (for example, Science, Nature, Cell, New England Journal of Medicine, Lancet) is a clear demonstration of peer appreciation of the published work. More commonly, publication in the “top tier” journals of a candidate’s discipline, such as major society journals, is a significant indicator of the quality of a candidate’s work and an expectation of the IUSM. It is also appreciated that valid and significant publications will appear in what are generally viewed as less important journals and credit will be accorded; however, publication in lesser journals will count less in the evaluation of the candidate’s publication record. For some departments and disciplines, there may be several top tier journals and it is important to appreciate that any given journal’s reputation and importance may change with time.

Published abstracts are not generally accorded the weight of peer-reviewed papers. Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that having abstracts accepted to certain large meetings is through a competitive process and is subject to significant peer review. Examples are the American Diabetes Association Scientific Sessions or the American Society of Hematology meeting. The candidate should document whether any abstracts listed fall into this category. The candidate should also highlight abstracts in their curriculum vitae selected for oral or selected poster presentations at national or international meetings, as these are generally considered more prestigious.

- ii. Evaluation of the stature of the journals in which a candidate publishes should be made by the primary committee, the department and/or division head, or statewide center director. It is acknowledged that a journal viewed well by one department may be less appreciated in another. Additionally, considerable weight

will be given to the opinion of external letter writers who should be specifically asked to judge the prestige of the journals in which the candidate's papers are published.

- iii. Non peer-reviewed publications are judged on a case-by-case basis. For example, the proceedings of a meeting, while not without merit, would normally be considered less important than an invited review in a prestigious journal, a chapter in a major text book or an important editorial. Some such publications may contribute to establishing recognition.
- iv. Being senior or lead author is important. It is essential for establishing excellence in research to be the senior or lead author on a number of publications; yet it is understood that the relative importance of the position in the list of authors in multi-author papers may depend on the discipline. For example, in many clinical investigations, being first author is most important; although sometimes being last author also has significance. In the basic sciences, a mature researcher will often place students or post-doctoral fellows as first author, placing his or her name last. The value of middle authorship is often hard to evaluate. A key principle is that the candidate and the division chief or department chair should document the candidate's role in important publications. This is particularly important in team science; thus candidates are advised to describe their role in such collaborative projects in the dossier in such places as annotations on their CV, descriptions in the personal statement, etc. Including letters from collaborators, co-authors, or senior research team members can further clarify and strengthen the candidate's role (see IUPUI "Reference Letter" section). Clear documentation of one's role is essential for faculty whose research portfolio is mostly team science based. Junior faculty seeking to establish independence from senior faculty or mentors with whom they continue to publish should also document their specific role in the research project using similar letters.
- v. Faculty members are increasingly publishing in non-traditional media, including the production of CDs, websites, blogs, and other social media and electronic formats. Appropriate credit will be given to such creative activity using the same criteria as discussed above for conventional publications; that is, it is essential that the activity is disseminated, retrievable, and peer-reviewed. Non peer-reviewed materials are weighed less than items that undergo peer review. The role of the candidate must be documented. Since the usual standards (e.g. stature of a particular journal) may not be apparent, the onus is on the candidate to provide objective documentation.

- vi. Establishing satisfactory research for those candidates seeking promotion based on excellence in service or teaching in the tenure track also requires documentation of such research activity through publications or other forms of scholarship. However, for documenting such satisfactory clinical or basic science research, the criteria for evaluating authorship [in terms of both quantity of publications and authorship role] are less stringent than that required for documenting excellence in research. On the other hand, documenting scholarship in a declared area of excellence [such as in the missions of service or teaching/education] would require publications in which the candidate is the senior or lead author.
- b. **Funding.** External funding, which is important to facilitate research and the development of scholarship, is expected. Significant percent effort on funding from competitive peer-reviewed sources additionally indicates objective recognition of a faculty member's research program. It is expected that a faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion to associate professor based on excellence in research will have had success in securing external funding as PI or Co-PI; or in unusual circumstances with significant external funding as Co-I, along with the high likelihood of sustaining future funding as an individual or essential member of a research team. Promotion to professor would normally require a sustained record of external funding of research.
- i. Peer-reviewed grants from national agencies (e.g. National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of Defense) have the greatest prestige. Individual projects that are components of large center or program project grants to these agencies are considered essentially equivalent to investigator-initiated grants, provided that the individual project has been funded (it is recognized that individual projects within the larger center/program projects are sometimes not funded, even though the center/program project is funded on the merits of other projects). Grant support from national societies that offer a competitive grant program (such as the American Diabetes Association, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, Leukemia and Lymphoma Society, Multiple Sclerosis Society) is viewed very positively. Similarly, securing competitive grants from major foundations (such as the Hartford Foundation, The MacArthur Foundation, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Susan B. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation, and March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation), Associations (Muscular Dystrophy) and Trusts (such as The Wellcome Trust, the Pew Charitable Trust) are also noteworthy achievements. For young investigators, career development awards represent a significant achievement.

Investigator-initiated awards from pharmaceutical companies are acknowledged as being significant although they do not rise to the level of prestige of peer-reviewed grants. Playing a leading role as a coordinator of a multi-center pharmaceutical trial is also viewed very positively.

- ii. A faculty member achieving excellence in research has historically been Principal Investigator (PI) on a substantial part of the candidate's funding. A possible exception is the case of center or program project grants, as noted in the preceding paragraph. Being a Co-PI in a NIH multiple PD/PI model grant would be considered equivalent. Credit will also be accorded for a role as co-investigator. If funding from grants on which the candidate is not PI is to be considered in making the case for excellence in research (for example, if the candidate is an essential member of a collaborative research team), it is imperative that the nature and significance of the candidate's contribution be carefully documented by the candidate, collaborators and other evaluators. As it is a service function, being the leader of a Core facility in a center or program project grant is meritorious but ordinarily not weighed heavily in establishing research excellence.
- iii. As a principle, the School does not evaluate success in attracting external funding strictly in terms of the monetary value. It is also recognized that different types of research demand different levels of funding. Nonetheless, it is appreciated that small grants do not weigh as much as, for example, an NIH R01 grant. For advancement to professor, the level of scholarship will have necessitated significant and sustained external funding.
- iv. Candidates are invited to submit NIH Summary Statements or the equivalent from other agencies as impartial evaluations of one's work.

c. Intellectual Property

- i. Patents. The School is supportive of faculty who protect and profit from intellectual property developed at Indiana University by filing patents. A patent award is recognized as evidence of creative activity and the development of new knowledge. A patent has undergone stringent external review by the US patent office and is a form of retrievable output that requires a substantial investment of intellectual effort. A patent is therefore a potential indicator of a successful research program though it is recognized that, like publications, not all patents have equal weight. Some are never licensed and effectively used whereas others may generate revenue for the university, school and department. Also, as with traditional publications, an individual's role in a patent application is

important and the onus is placed on the applicant to document, if necessary through letters from co-inventors, his or her contribution. Minimally, the candidate must be listed as a co-inventor.

- ii. **Licensing/Royalties.** Intellectual resources deriving from a faculty member's research, though not patentable, may be marketable. Included might be the licensing of materials available from the research program in exchange for a flat fee or for royalties based on sales. Another example would be royalties from a successful text book. Licensing of products or the award of royalties does not have the weight of peer reviewed appreciation of a research program, but does indicate recognition and value. Together with publications and external funding, however, licensing and royalties can support the cohesiveness of a research program.

3. PEER EVALUATION

An important form of peer evaluation is by letters. Three types of letter are relevant to evaluating research quality: 1) letters from reviewers at "arm's length" from outside of the university; 2) letters from the department chair (and the regional center director if applicable); and 3) letters from colleagues from within and outside the institution clarifying the role and importance of the candidate in collaborative efforts.

- a. **External Letters.** A minimum of six letters is required by IUPUI from qualified evaluators at other institutions who can attest to the quality of the candidate's research within the framework of the School of Medicine and campus guidelines.

These letters are especially important in documenting emerging or established recognition at the national or international level. They should address the quality of the candidate's research program, overall publication record and the prestige of the journals in which articles are published. The letter should evaluate also whether the research program has achieved a cohesive theme. The stature within the discipline of the letter writer contributes to the weight accorded the letter. Objective evaluations are required and letter writers must meet the IUPUI "arm's length" criterion. To qualify as "arm's length", 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.

- b. **Letters from department and/or division heads or regional center directors.** These required letters provide insight into how a candidate's research is valued at the unit level, and an assessment of the candidate's performance both in the context of the expectations of the discipline and unit.

- c. Letters from colleagues.** All letters of evaluation from a candidate's colleagues, local to the institution or from other institutions, are given serious consideration. These letters are especially valuable when they can clarify the role and importance of the candidate in collaborative research, whether in specific research projects, published papers, other scholarly output, or grants. Such letters are expected and essential for candidates with critical roles on collaborative research teams.

4. RECOGNITION

In addition to publications, grant funding, and letters from objective researchers in the field, a number of other indicators provide evidence of an individual's reputation and stature in the field. Examples are given below but an otherwise well qualified candidate would not be penalized for not having accumulated all of the following.

a. Promotion to Professor

- i.** Editorial boards and manuscript review. It is likely that a faculty member with a mature and successful research program would be asked to review a significant number of manuscripts for journals. To be or to have been a member of editorial board(s) is considered very positively, obviously the more important the journal(s) the better. In some instances, documentation of meritorious editorial service in the form of a certificate, published list of the number of papers reviewed, or letter from senior editors can be used for documentation.
- ii.** Study sections and grant review. Similar to requests for manuscript review, solicitations to review grant applications are viewed positively. Such activity can range from requests to review individual grants, through acting as an ad hoc reviewer on a study section or review panel, to full membership or chairing such review groups. Full membership of National Institutes of Health study sections is deemed especially meritorious. Participation in national society or association review boards (e.g., American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, or American Diabetes Association) is highly valued.
- iii.** Invited authorships. Invitations to contribute reviews, editorials, commentaries, or perspectives in significant journals or chapters in important books or textbooks are recognition of an individual's stature and visibility in the field.
- iv.** Invited speaking engagements. Invitations to speak at symposia, congresses or scientific meetings are additional measures of the success of a research program. More prominent lectures at meetings carry more weight. For example, a plenary lecture at a

major society meeting is more significant than having an abstract selected for a 15-minute oral presentation, but both have value. Presentation at a large national meeting has more weight than speaking at a small specialist meeting, though both are important. Chairing a session, organizing a session or organizing a meeting are further indicators of recognition. Invitations to present seminars or grand rounds at other major research institutions or universities are another index of scientific reputation.

- v. Participation in affairs of professional societies. Appointments to office and committees in national professional societies, particularly if by election, are viewed positively. In some cases, election to membership of elite societies itself carries prestige (e.g., American Society of Clinical Investigation).
- vi. Honors and awards. Accolades for research achievement may also come in the form of honors, awards or prizes. These vary in prestige, depending on the scope, local versus national, and the stature of the awarding body. Included would be MERIT awards from the National Institutes of Health, which represent high-level peer recognition of an individual's research program.
- vii. Consultancies. In some research areas, consultancies for companies or other organizations may represent a positive judgment of an individual's reputation.

b. Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Granting of Tenure

Indicators of recognition are similar to those listed for advancement to professor but it is understood that, at an earlier career stage, a faculty member will have a more modest dossier in this regard. The principle is that the candidate should be building a reputation and should have emerging recognition at the national level. Reviewing papers and grants, nationally or locally, are positive indicators. Invitations to present seminars or to speak at congresses and meetings, locally or nationally, are likewise important gauges of visibility. Invited reviews and participation in study sections or grant review boards is a strong index of recognition but may not always be achieved at this stage.

Forms

[IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Research Performance](#)

Definitions

FSC – Faculty Steering Committee
SEC – School Executive Committee

Related Information

[Promotion and Tenure @ IUSM Website](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Service for Promotion and Tenure](#)
[Standards of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion and Tenure](#)
[IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

History

Reviewed	Approved
5/2006	5/10/2007 FSC; 5/21/2007 SEC; 5/2007 IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties
9/2012	2/20/2014 FSC; 4/7/2014 SEC

The initiative to develop School of Medicine-specific standards of excellence first began in 2003. A task force was appointed with Dr. Aśok Antony (then Chair of the School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure and Contract Committees) appointed as Chair of the task force. Three subcommittees were appointed, one for each mission area: Research, chaired by Peter J. Roach; Service, chaired by Thomas G. Luerssen from 2003-2006 and Sharon P. Andreoli from 2006-2007; and Teaching, chaired by Debra K. Litzelman. Dr. Antony and Deborah Cowley, Director of Academic Administration, were members of all three subcommittees. A preliminary version of the standards of excellence were disseminated for review in May 2006. The final document was approved on May 10, 2007 by the IUSM Faculty Steering Committee and May 21, 2007 by the IUSM Executive Committee, and was then subsequently approved by then IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties, Dr. Uday Sukhatme.

In fall 2012, the IUSM received a national award from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and American Council on Education to accelerate faculty career flexibility. As part of the award, a committee was appointed to review IUSM faculty appointment types and promotion and tenure criteria. This committee identified the need to update the standards of excellence in research to better reflect current criteria used by the school committee and to articulate how collaborative research or “team science” would be evaluated. The revised standards were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 20, 2014, presented at the School Executive Committee on April 7, 2014, and approved on May 12, 2014. Similarly, subcommittees were appointed to revise the standards of

excellence in teaching and service, which were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 16, 2017 and by the School Executive Committee on May 1, 2017.

IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Research Performance

Please note that one does NOT need to engage in all of the listed contributions or have all of the evidence listed within each category.

Type	Examples of Evidence	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Disciplinary or Professional Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of peer reviewed publication with evidence of impact (e.g., journal impact factor and/or citations) Presentations Invited lectureships Personal statement has clear articulation of research program Documentation of contributions to team science External letters US Patent, copyright, or other intellectual property List of grants submitted and/or funded List of other sources of support for research (e.g., industry, foundation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research has not been regularly conducted or there is no evidence of dissemination Evidence comes only from colleagues, collaborators, or ex-learners Individual role and level of collaborative work is unspecified Research is of poor quality No research program has been presented No evidence of attempts to seek grant funding/ support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate has performed research that is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice Candidate has disseminated the results of research in scholarly journals and other appropriate venues Research program is clearly articulated Candidate has articulated the role they have played in collaborative work Evidence of attempts to obtain grant funding which show promise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that clearly demonstrate attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations and publications and recognition of the quality of research Candidate's work has attracted favorable peer review and peer commentary notes promise Sustained contributions Successful grant and external support has been obtained and continuing efforts and promise are documented
Peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External letters Study section member Scientific review committee Journal editor Journal reviewer Abstract reviewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local and external peer reviews have evaluated the work as unsatisfactory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Departments provide clear information about the stature of journals and the significance of the research publications Departments affirm the candidates' plans for continued research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations, and publications
Scholarly activities, including awards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awards and other recognition Internal and external letters Unsolicited letters from mentees Elected member of professional/disciplinary organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None are documented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissemination and recognition has occurred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others Departmental evaluations document the stature of the work Regular and significant dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Standards of Excellence in Service for Promotion and Tenure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Scope
Overview
Guidelines
Forms
Definitions
Related Information
History

Effective: 03/01/2007
Last Updated: 5/31/2017

Responsible University Office:
Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Responsible University Administrator
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Policy Contact:
Director, Faculty Affairs

Scope

IU School of Medicine:

Faculty members
Department chairs
School and Department Promotion and Tenure Committees
Dean
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (EAD)
Director, Faculty Affairs
Assistant Director, Faculty Systems

Overview

Service is defined as the application of a faculty member's knowledge, skills, and expertise as a member of a discipline or profession in such a way as to benefit the discipline or profession, the institution, students, patients, and the community in a manner consistent with the mission of the School of Medicine. Service contributions can include a wide variety of activities including but not restricted to the provision of clinical care,

educational activities and the support of educational activities, research and the support of research programs or projects, administration, or governance.

Faculty service in the School of Medicine is most highly valued when 1) the work of the faculty member yields improvements and is innovative, 2) the faculty member provides leadership and is recognized for their contributions, 3) the service is collaborative in nature, 4) the outcomes and impact of the work are disseminated, and 5) the faculty member is seen as a valuable citizen in the school. The important element is not only the provision of the service, but instead how the candidate's unique contribution occurs in each category and the impact of the service on those being served. The strongest dossiers will include contributions to patients, learners, the discipline or profession, and the community. Examples of types of service contributions that can be documented in a promotion dossier are included in the full description of each of these categories.

Candidates seeking promotion on the tenure track on the basis of excellence in service must also demonstrate satisfactory contributions in research and teaching. Candidates seeking promotion on the clinical track on the basis of excellence in service must demonstrate satisfactory contributions in teaching.

Guidelines

SATISFACTORY SERVICE

For those faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure with research or teaching as the area of excellence, satisfactory service must be documented for both quantity and quality. There are several ways for faculty to provide satisfactory service when their declared area of excellence is either teaching or research.

Satisfactory service to patients can be accomplished by any clinical activity that relates to providing care for patients. Service to students may include all of the normal mentoring and career advising that would be expected of any university faculty. Service to the profession may include participation in the local, regional or national professional societies over and above basic membership. This includes but is not limited to membership on various committees, contribution to newsletters or other media, and holding an office in a society. It also includes reviewing of manuscripts submitted to society journals and abstracts for presentation at meetings. Finally, it includes activities such as participation in site visits on behalf of an extramural granting agency or being a reviewer for an intramural or extramural granting organization. Service to the community may include activities such as the education of laypersons in various organizations such as schools, colleges, corporations or civic organizations, as well as other forms of civic engagement.

Citizenship is an essential aspect of faculty service and is expected of all faculty ranks. Thus, faculty members are expected to engage in committees and other activities at the department, school, and/or campus level. There should be corroborating letters of support or other documentation from the chair of the department or his/her designee, or other individuals that indicate that the candidate exhibits several attributes of professionalism by his/her participation in the functioning of the department or school.

EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE

There are three essential elements involved in the evaluation of excellence in service. These are:

- Type, value, and impact of the service contributions
- Scholarship/dissemination in the area of declared service contribution
- Recognition of achievements regionally, nationally, and/or internationally

Advancement in academic rank on the basis of excellence in service is justified when the record of accomplishment in the service activity meets or exceeds departmental expectations and institutional standards. For those candidates seeking promotion based on excellence in service, a promotion is justified when there is demonstrated impact, growth, and achievement in the defined area of service contribution over time and in rank. Candidates must have a record of disseminating their work. The dossier must also make the case of a history of achievement and that such achievements will be ongoing. For tenured and tenure track faculty this sustained and sustainable performance should result in the recognition that the candidate is in the process of becoming, or, for the rank of professor, has become, a national leader in his or her declared area of service.

The granting of tenure involves recognition of past achievements and an expectation that such achievements and further career development will be forthcoming. The dossier must provide evidence, especially in the personal statement, that the candidate has a plan for continued achievements. Recognition that future achievements are likely to be forthcoming may also be indicated in internal reference letters of support and in the evaluation letters from external reviewers of the dossier.

Promotion to Associate Professor Based on Excellence in Service

Promotion to associate professor based on excellence in service requires the identification of a specific role, program or other contribution that advances the mission of the department and the school. The candidate must provide evidence of development in his or her area or academic niche, and supporting documentation that indicates recognition at the local, regional, or national level. Some examples of this degree of achievement include the documentation of increased patient referrals, an improvement in local or regional quality of care, requests for editorial review, presentations at local, regional or national meetings, and the receipt of local or regional awards. A record of scholarship in rank is essential and must be well documented. Internal reference letters from colleagues and associates should provide documentation of achievements. Further, independent evaluations of the dossier conducted by external reviewers are required. The dossier must provide evidence that the candidate's service has become an important element in the overall mission of the department or school and that the faculty member has an emerging reputation in their area or discipline.

Promotion to Professor Based on Excellence in Service

Promotion to professor based on excellence in service requires the demonstration of sustained and sustainable national recognition in the defined area of expertise. A record of widely known, highly regarded and authoritative publications and other

scholarly products is an indicator of national recognition. Beyond the requirements for scholarship, national recognition of service contributions include but are not limited to invited visiting professorships at major universities or hospitals, election as an officer or major committee chair in a national society or other professional organization, appointment to an editorial board of a national or international publication, election to exclusive or prestigious societies or organizations, and the receipt of national awards. National recognition is also documented through reference letters and independent external reviewers who can attest to the importance of the candidate's accomplishments and the national prominence that is required for promotion.

DETAILED CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE EVALUATIONS OF SERVICE

It is critical that clearly defined unique characteristics of the service contribution be presented as the basis for promotion and/or the granting of tenure. The documentation of the type, value, and impact of the service contribution is the responsibility of the candidate and department. When excellence in service is declared, it is essential that the identification of the unique service contribution, its impact, growth and development in rank, and the plans and expectations for continued contributions are clearly presented in the personal statement, CV, and service sections of the dossier.

Service to Patients

Service to patients involves the provision of clinical care. When a faculty member is seeking promotion and/or tenure on the basis of excellence in service activities related to patient care, the clinical care must be exceptional and go beyond the normally expected provision of services. Such exceptional care should result in the faculty member developing a distinct "niche" area and being recognized as an expert in their field (either as a teacher of clinical skills or as a healthcare provider) and bring prestige to the candidate, the department, service line, and/or the school. Examples of service to patients may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

- Establishment of new clinical programs, including local, regional, national or international clinical programs
- Significant contributions to the growth of existing clinical programs
- Significant contributions to new, expanding or complex patient care systems
- Provision of an essential element of clinical care
- External replication of innovative practices and or procedures

Service to Learners

Candidates must document their service to learners (which includes medical students, graduate students, health professions trainees, residents, and fellows). For satisfactory service, these activities may include the normal responsibilities of most faculty members such as advising and mentoring individual learners or groups of learners. For those declaring excellence in service, such service to learners would involve activities that promote the educational mission of the

school well beyond the normal responsibilities of every faculty member.

Examples of this type of service include but are not limited to:

- Participation in, and documented impact from, specific committees or programs focused on education
- Administration of educational programs or courses
- Development and presentation of seminars addressing issues important to learners

Service to the Discipline/Profession

Service to the discipline or profession involves activities that advance knowledge and understanding through the scholarship of integration and application.

Examples of this type of service include:

- Serving as an officer of a medical or professional society
- Serving as an editor or reviewer for a journal or other publications in a field or discipline
- Hospital, local, regional, or national committee work
- Serving on advisory or review boards of study sections, societies, or professional organizations
- Participation in clinical or basic research efforts in the department or school, including the referral of patients into research studies
- Publications
- Participation in research

Service to the Community

Service to the community involves activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the university community and call upon the faculty member's expertise as scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. This service must be related to the faculty member's work and expertise. Examples of this type of service include but are not limited to:

- Communicating in popular media
- Giving presentations for the public
- Consulting activities
- Serving on community boards

Administrative Service

Administrative service involves organizational, leadership, and management activities that help fulfill the mission of the department, school, university, and/or health system. Examples of this type of service include but are not limited to:

- Program and faculty leadership positions
- Engagement in quality, safety and/or improvement projects within a clinical environment
- Creating and implementing strategic initiatives and partnerships, and program or institutional management responsibilities
- Volunteer work related to your area of excellence

University Service

Academic programs, departments, schools, the campus and the university are communities that rely on their members for the necessary energy, time, and leadership to sustain, develop and execute their missions. This contribution to the greater collective good of the university community is a critical component of being an academic faculty member. A faculty member should not expect to achieve tenure or advancement while ignoring the responsibilities of being a contributing member of the university community. Examples of university citizenship include but are not limited to:

- Department, school, campus, university, or hospital committee work, projects, or task forces
- Participation in faculty governance

SCHOLARSHIP

Scholarship is the act of seeking, attaining, analyzing, formulating and communicating knowledge or expertise in an area or discipline. Examples of scholarship include traditional publications such as peer-reviewed articles in scientific journals, book chapters, invited reviews, editorials, audio or audio-visual productions, educational materials, or web based documents. These works should be accessible to the academic community and advance the state of knowledge in the area or discipline of the candidates declared area of expertise.

For the purpose of promotion or tenure, the candidate should demonstrate that peers have assessed his or her work products. This may need to be arranged for less traditional work that does not automatically receive a peer review as part of the publication or dissemination process. That is, an independent expert in the specific discipline may need to be asked to conduct a review by the candidate's chair or other appropriate institutional authority, and that review should be included in the dossier (along with the chair's letter requesting the review). Independent peer reviews of scholarship should address the significance of the academic contribution to the overall advancement of knowledge in the area or discipline. A clear description of the candidate's relationship with the peer-reviewer and the expertise of the reviewer should be included. The stature within the discipline or field of the peer reviewer contributes to the weight accorded the review.

For the purpose of promotion and tenure, scholarly activity is considered to be the body of work that is related directly to the candidate's declared area of excellence. Within the entire body of work in rank, the candidate will be expected to have publications, audio or audio-visual productions, educational materials, or other materials as described above that represent and demonstrate their scholarly contributions. Again, work that is peer-reviewed carries more weight. The quality of the scholarship is more important than any specific number of works. Further, evidence of a substantial and growing body of scholarship is expected. In the case of multiple or group authorship, the candidate must indicate the type and degree of his or her contribution to the work, if it is not already acknowledged in the work itself. For work products in the electronic media, the curriculum vitae or the dossier should include web addresses or other instructions for accessing those works. Further, when available the candidate should supply usage data (e.g, number of hits, number of shares/retweets). The candidate is encouraged to identify the best specific scholarly works that support the application for promotion and/or tenure either in the personal statement or as an appendix to the dossier. The rubric on the

following pages outlines examples of service contributions one might make as well as details how your dossier will be assessed.

Forms

[IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Service Performance](#)

Definitions

FSC – Faculty Steering Committee

SEC – School Executive Committee

Related Information

[Promotion and Tenure @ IUSM Website](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Research for Promotion and Tenure](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion and Tenure](#)

[IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

History

Reviewed	Approved
5/2006	5/10/2007 FSC; 5/21/2007 SEC; 5/2007 IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties
1/2017	2/21/2017 FSC; 5/1/2017 SEC

The initiative to develop School of Medicine-specific standards of excellence first began in 2003. A task force was appointed with Dr. Ások Antony (then Chair of the School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure and Contract Committees) appointed as Chair of the task force. Three subcommittees were appointed, one for each mission area: Research, chaired by Peter J. Roach; Service, chaired by Thomas G. Luerssen from 2003-2006 and Sharon P. Andreoli from 2006-2007; and Teaching, chaired by Debra K. Litzelman. Dr. Antony and Deborah Cowley, Director of Academic Administration, were members of all three subcommittees. A preliminary version of the standards of excellence were disseminated for review in May 2006. The final document was approved on May 10, 2007 by the IUSM Faculty Steering Committee and May 21, 2007 by the IUSM Executive Committee, and was then subsequently approved by then IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties, Dr. Uday Sukhatme.

In fall 2012, the IUSM received a national award from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and American Council on Education to accelerate faculty career flexibility. As part of the award, a committee was appointed to review IUSM faculty appointment types and promotion and tenure criteria. This committee identified the need to update the standards of excellence in research to better reflect current criteria used by the school committee and to articulate how collaborative research or “team science” would be evaluated. The revised standards were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 20, 2014, presented at the School Executive Committee on April 7, 2014, and approved on May 12, 2014. Similarly, subcommittees were appointed to revise the standards of excellence in teaching and service, which were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 16, 2017 and by the School Executive Committee on May 1, 2017.

IUSM Rubric For Evaluating Professional Service

Please note that one does NOT need to engage in all of the listed contributions or have all of the evidence for excellence listed within each category.

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovations in diagnosis, treatment, safety, or prevention • Innovations in education • New or improved application of technologies • New or improved applications of models of care delivery, patient safety, research methods • Development of a new, or improvement of an existing clinical program • Development of continuing medical education activities • Extension of practice, methods, and/or curriculum to new population/program • Patient, learner, employee, and/or faculty satisfaction • Participating in CQI practice improvement and/or patient safety projects • Participating in curriculum development and other education projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No documentation of attempts to improve practice quality, patient safety and/or education innovations • No record of performance in pursuing growth and development in clinical practice, patient safety and/or education innovations • Poor reviews from patients, employees, learners, and/or faculty peers • Only routine, required, or expected contributions are made 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some documentation and outcomes related to attempts to improve patient care, practice quality, patient safety, and/or education practices • Some record of pursuing growth and development in clinical practice, patient safety, or education innovations (e.g., engagement in CME/faculty development) • Adequate reviews from patients, employees, learners, and/or faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and strong evidence documenting improvement of practice, patient safety, and/or educational outcomes (e.g., data that shows significant improvement in patient or learner outcomes) • Record of contributing to the growth and development of others in clinical practice, patient safety, and/or educational innovation • Replication of your innovative practices at other institutions • Documented changes in outcomes as a result of your continuous quality improvement programs • Implementation and assessment of your curricular innovations • High quality reviews from patients, employees, learners, and/or faculty peers • Awards recognizing your innovative activities • Grant funding that supports your innovative activities

- Support of the research mission (e.g., statistical analysis, patient recruitment)

--	--	--	--

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Leadership & Citizenship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership role in education programs • Department, school or university leadership position including serving as a committee chair • Leadership in clinical service (e.g., service line chief, committee chair, improvement project lead) • Involvement in academic administration activities (e.g., section director, promotion and tenure committee, IRB) • Leadership roles in professional organizations • Key role in public events, support groups, community based projects, and/or advocacy campaigns • Key role in committees and/or programs • Significant philanthropic efforts • Service on boards in related fields • Participation in department, school, campus, hospital/clinic, and/or university committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of history and evidence of community engagement • Lack of leadership roles • No evidence of service contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some history and evidence of leading with the community or education committees and initiatives • Some evidence of having a key role or serving as a leader in education programs, patient care, administrative work, and/or service activity • Chair's determination that service is more than mere participation • Provision of peer review of scholarship • Ad hoc grant reviewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent history and evidence of having a key role or serving as a leader in education programs, patient care, administrative work, and/or service activity • Increasing levels of leadership within organization • Data showing positive gains/outcomes as a result of your leadership (e.g., patient outcomes, increased efficiency in clinical setting, adoption of policy or procedure) • Leading a new initiative • Awards and recognition that reflect contributions to the department, school, campus, hospital, clinic, or community • Independent testimony of value/ outcomes of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair, acceptance of a policy/program) • Playing a major role over a period of time that contributed to school, campus or unit goals, with evidence of significance, role, and impact (e.g., letters from colleagues, organizational leaders, agencies)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in faculty governance • Participation in projects or task forces • Community engagement • Participation in local, regional, national and/or international professional organizations 			
---	--	--	--

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Dissemination and Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational materials • Guidelines/protocols • Brochures • MedEdPortal contributions • Popular media presence (e.g., op eds, news stories, blogs) • Presentations • Publications • Recruitment of patients for clinical trials • Participation in team science or team delivery of clinical care • Participation in student, resident, and fellowship education programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence of dissemination of clinical/educational activity, advances, or gains in knowledge • No review by others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence of dissemination • Some involvement in collaborative efforts (e.g., support of clinical trials, practice improvement, team science/practice, participation in education/curriculum) • Routine, required, or expected contributions are made to the discipline, department, school, university, health system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer reviewed publications • Peer refereed presentations • Regional or national recognition (e.g., awards, invited talks, moderator at national meeting, journal reviewer/editor) • Publication in popular press, • Publication of education materials • Serving as source for media in coverage of specific health related story or program • Grant funding that supports your work • Newsletters, non-peer reviewed publications, awards that recognize your scholarship



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Standards of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion and Tenure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Scope
Overview
Guidelines
Forms
Definitions
Related Information
History

Effective: 03/01/2007

Last Updated: 5/31/2017

Responsible University Office:

Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Responsible University Administrator

Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Policy Contact:

Director, Faculty Affairs

Scope

IU School of Medicine:

Faculty members

Department chairs

School and Department Promotion and Tenure Committees

Dean

Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (EAD)

Director, Faculty Affairs

Assistant Director, Faculty Systems

Overview

The standards of excellence in teaching provide guidelines for the evaluation of direct teaching activity as well as broader education activities such as curriculum development, mentoring and advising, and professional development efforts in education. Criteria for satisfactory contributions in teaching are also presented. For those faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure with research or service as the area of excellence, teaching

performance must be satisfactory in both quantity and quality, and candidates must address teaching in their personal statements. Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure with teaching as the area of excellence also must have a record of high quality and quantity of teaching performance that is supported by appropriate learner and peer evaluation in addition to accepted forms of dissemination of one's contributions to the teaching mission of IUSM.

Guidelines

CRITERIA FOR SATISFACTORY CONTRIBUTIONS IN TEACHING

For those faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure with research or service as the area of excellence, satisfactory teaching performance must be documented for both quantity and quality. Candidates will need to submit compiled, comparative data for both quantity and quality of teaching (see sections 1 and 3 below for details). The department chair, IUSM regional campus director or his/her designated education leader from within the department/campus should include a summary statement about the candidate's contributions to the teaching mission relative to other departmental/regional campus members. Learner ratings of the quality of teaching must be satisfactory with a stable or improved trend in scores across time. The department chair/IUSM regional campus director should include a summary statement about the candidate's teaching responsibilities in his/her dossier review letter. Additionally, the personal statement should include a description of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and learning (see section 1 below for more detail). In addition, a peer review or observation of one's teaching is a campus expectation for satisfactory performance in teaching.

OVERVIEW OF CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

In general, candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure with teaching as the area of excellence must have

1. A record of high quality and quantity of teaching performance that is supported by appropriate learner and peer evaluation;
2. Quality measures (evaluations by learners, peers, and learner outcomes) that have remained stable or improved over time;
3. A record of significant peer-reviewed contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning;
4. Increased levels of responsibility and visibility as an education leader in major education committees, meetings, and societies (generally progressing from local to regional to national or international roles); and
5. Awards or other types of recognition for teaching and/or educational leadership. Candidates are encouraged to include samples of their educational scholarship or clear instructions regarding how the scholarly products can be retrieved.

DETAILED CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

1. Philosophy of Teaching and Learning

The personal statement should include a description of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and learning generally including comments about his/her teaching strengths and style that contribute to trainees' learning. More specifically, the elements in these statements can include: the candidate's personal goals and approach to teaching and learning; a description of the theory(ies) and/or framework(s) that inform the candidate's teaching style/methods; self-assessment of his/her most significant contributions to teaching and learning; educational methodologies employed and why; comment on most significant impact on learners, mentees, or fellow educators; reflective critique of role as medical educator; and long-term goals as an educator. The [IUSM Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development website](#) has more information about and examples of teaching philosophy statements.

2. Quantity of Instruction with Comparative Information

All Indiana University School of Medicine (IUSM) faculty are expected to teach to achieve promotion and tenure. IUSM trainees include medical students, graduate students (including Master of Science in Medical Science (MS MS) students), health professions trainees, residents, fellows, and post-doctoral trainees (PhD and MD). In addition to teaching IUSM trainees, IUSM faculty may teach learners in other schools within or outside the IU system. Faculty teaching assignments must be explained by the department chair/IUSM regional campus director, noting if a faculty member has few opportunities to teach and thus must demonstrate alternative contributions to the teaching mission.

IUSM faculty may teach IUSM trainees in any of a variety of venues. Typical teaching venues include: classroom, small group sessions, laboratories, simulation center, clinics and other outpatient settings, inpatient settings, operating rooms, emergency department, procedure suites, and one-on-one or small group tutoring.

All IUSM faculty will be expected to submit summary reports of the quantity of their teaching. Comparative data for each teaching venue and each type of learner will help support the candidate's contribution to the education mission. The department chair/IUSM regional campus director, or his/her designee, will be responsible for providing a clear and detailed summary of the candidate's teaching load relative to colleagues within the section, division, department, and/or campus.

3. Quality of Instruction with Comparative Measures

a. Learner Ratings of Teaching Quality

Ratings of teaching completed anonymously by learners using the highest quality instruments relevant for the teaching venue will provide the strongest data. Open-ended comments are important to include to help in the interpretation of learners' ratings of teaching effectiveness.

The candidate and/or department chair or campus director (or designee) should address negative comments about teaching performance or poor learner ratings by explaining any relevant context regarding the teaching issue and how improvements were made.

The Office of Medical Student Education (MSE) uses internally developed and validated teaching effectiveness assessment instruments for instructor evaluations by medical students. Instructor evaluations are distributed and collected electronically across the state. Response rates are included to assure adequate sampling. Reports can be viewed on the web real-time and summary reports include individual teaching scores for the current year, past year, and cumulative scores with standard deviations. These reports also include comparative data for individuals within a department as well as across IUSM regional campuses and departments for broader comparison. If the reports are not available to the candidates, they should contact their chair/regional campus director, or clerkship coordinator to obtain medical student teaching evaluation summaries.

The national residency review committees (RRC) require residency and fellowship programs to collect data on GME faculty teaching quality. The candidate should include summarized data from resident and/or fellow teaching evaluations in the dossier if involved in teaching at the GME level. Inclusion of raw data or teaching evaluation forms in the dossier will not be considered adequate documentation of teaching quality. Candidates should contact their program director and/or vice chair of education to obtain GME teaching evaluation summaries.

For teachers of graduate students, graduate program directors will be expected to systematically collect teaching effectiveness evaluations for classroom and/or small group teaching sessions employing similar methods of collecting and reporting information as outlined above for medical student and resident teaching. Candidates should contact the appropriate graduate program director for teaching evaluation summaries.

For teachers of Health Professions students, the health professions program directors will be expected to systematically collect teaching effectiveness evaluations employing the same rigorous methods of collecting and reporting information as outlined above for medical student and resident teaching.

For faculty engaged in CME, quality data regarding teaching effectiveness for CME-level teaching and for non-IUSM trainees should be included in the dossier.

b. Learner Outcomes

When possible candidates should supply data that demonstrate the association between effective teaching and learner outcomes. The IUSM P&T committee does recognize that multi- instructor courses and complex integrated training programs can make the direct linkage of a learner's outcome with one teacher difficult at best.

c. Peer Evaluation of Teaching Quality

The IUPUI Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the IUSM Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (OFAPD), and some departments in IUSM provide peer review and observation of teaching upon request. Inclusion of peer assessment of teaching in any education venue and/or of education products provides strong supporting evidence of teaching quality. Candidates should consider including reviews of written curriculum, education modules, educational websites, or other innovative education materials conducted by peers trained to provide such reviews. Inclusion of repeat, follow-up peer assessments with clear documentation of how the faculty member modified or improved their teaching or curricular products based on peer assessment provides substantially stronger evidence of teaching quality than inclusion of one-time peer assessment.

Peer reviews are especially important in documenting emerging or established recognition at the national or international level. They should address the quality of the candidate's teaching and related scholarship as well as the impact of the candidate's work. Independent peer reviews of scholarship should address the significance of the academic contribution to the overall advancement of knowledge in the area or discipline. Whether a peer reviewer is from within or outside the candidate's institution or department, the candidate must include a clear description of his/her relationship with the peer reviewer and why this person was chosen (e.g. content or process expert). The stature within the discipline or field of the peer reviewer contributes to the weight accorded the review. Reviews from colleagues, collaborators or individuals in some way connected to the candidate and thus may be less objective, are not appropriate.

4. Course/Curriculum Development/Retrievable Education Products

Descriptive summaries of any course or curriculum development can be included in the dossier. Such summaries can include: a clear statement about the faculty member's role in the development of the product; the purpose, rationale, or needs assessment leading to the development of the product; the targeted audience(s); how/where/when the curriculum has been implemented; an evaluation of the curriculum (by students or other targeted audience(s) and

peers); and any linked learner outcomes attributable to the new curriculum. Highlighted elements of a written curriculum, curriculum module, or web-product can be included as an appendix in the dossier as supplemental to the descriptive summary.

It is expected that the highest quality education products will be retrievable from national education repositories employing rigorous peer review (e.g., AAMC MedEdPORTAL, Society of Teachers of Family Medicine Family Medicine Digital Resource Library, End of Life/Palliative Education Resource Center, Association of Pediatric Program Directors, Alliance for Academic Internal Medicine e-learning resources). For purposes of promotion with teaching as the area of excellence, the candidate must include peer assessment of the education products ideally posted on any of the above mentioned or other similar repositories as evidence of the quality of the product.

5. Mentoring and Advising

Candidates must document their mentoring and advising roles. Faculty who declare teaching as their area of excellence tend to mentor/advise a load of students larger than many others in their department. Further, faculty will want to document the impact of their mentoring/advising on learner outcomes. For example, a faculty member has close one-on-one mentoring relationships whereby student's test scores, presentations, publications, grants, or creative products such as video, art, or creative writing, etc. can be clearly linked to the guidance or mentoring provided by a candidate. A candidate can include a list of learner outcomes with a clear description of their contribution to the learner's achievements in their dossier. Advising a group of learners should also be documented (e.g., UME special interest groups - SIG, women in emergency medicine).

For those seeking promotion with teaching as the area of excellence, letters from former medical students, residents, fellows, graduate students, or post-doctoral trainees clearly describing how the candidate contributed to their personal development also could be included in the dossier. The candidate can include unsolicited letters and/or the candidate's department chair/regional center director can solicit and collate letters from learners for inclusion in the dossier. Finally, the chair/regional center director will provide a written appraisal addressing a faculty members mentoring and advising contributions.

6. Scholarly Activities

Scholarship in education is necessary in order to meet the criteria for excellence. Educational scholarship can include educational textbooks, book chapters, and products included in education clearing houses, MedEd Portal, web modules, stand-alone electronic education modules, videos, national web postings of clinical cases and associated education materials (e.g., readiness assurance tests, self-study materials, application exercises, assessment checklists, standardized patient scenarios) for problem based learning, team

based learning, and/or objective structured clinical examinations for shared use. In addition, more traditional venues such as journal articles, conference presentations, abstracts, and posters are also examples of educational scholarship.

The scholarship of teaching can be defined by meeting the following criteria: the work is public; must be peer reviewed and critiqued according to accepted standards; and must be reproducible and/or built upon by other scholars.

In the vast majority of cases, the education material/scholarship will be retrievable (publications, web products, written curriculum, new assessment instruments, syllabi and hand outs from local/national presentations).

7. Teaching and Education Grants

All local, regional, or national teaching, curriculum, training, mentoring, education- related faculty development grants should be listed and described. The description must include: a clear statement about the faculty member's role in securing the grant; the funding amount (including direct and indirect amounts, when appropriate); the purpose, rationale, or needs assessment leading to the development of the grant; the targeted audience(s) for grant implementation; how/where/when the grant was implemented; an evaluation of the grant outcomes as assessed by learners, other target audience(s) and peers.

8. Teaching Awards

All local, regional, or national teaching, advising or mentoring awards should be listed and described (e.g., SGIM Clinician Educator of the Year, ACGME Parker Palmer Courage to Teach Award, "IU Trustee Teaching Award," IUSM Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award). The description must include the nature and significance of the award. Awards for teaching and/or educational leadership are an important component for demonstrating excellence in teaching.

9. Service to Education Mission

Candidates should list and describe all educational administrative and leadership roles held locally, regionally, nationally, and/or internationally. Roles might include education leadership positions within IUSM (e.g. clerkship or course director; residency/fellowship program director), at the national level (e.g. peer reviewer for the MedEdPORTAL education repository, reviewer for education themed journals such as Academic Medicine), education committees (e.g. chair of IUSM Curriculum Council; secretary of a regional society such as the Central Group on Educational Affairs), or serving as a CME course director or instructor. Descriptions should describe the candidate's role, accomplishments attained, and overall impact while holding each post. Letters of support from supervisors or peers further describing the candidate's role, accomplishments, and impact can be included

in the dossier.

10. Evidence of Participation in Professional Development Focused on Teaching

Candidate should list and briefly describe the professional development events in which they have participated (e.g., Michigan State Primary Care Faculty Development Fellowship, McMaster Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Workshops, IUSM Academy of Teaching Scholars) in order to improve their teaching and education excellence. The description can include programs attended and examples of applications of new educational methodologies, uses of technology, or approaches to the learner that were tried as a result of participation in the faculty development program, along with any outcomes.

Forms

[IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Performance](#)

Definitions

FSC – Faculty Steering Committee

SEC – School Executive Committee

Related Information

[Promotion and Tenure @ IUSM Website](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Research for Promotion and Tenure](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Service for Promotion and Tenure](#)

[IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

History

Reviewed	Approved
5/2006	5/10/2007 FSC; 5/21/2007 SEC; 5/2007 IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties
1/2017	2/21/2017 FSC; 5/1/2017 SEC

The initiative to develop School of Medicine-specific standards of excellence first began in 2003. A task force was appointed with Dr. Aśok Antony (then Chair of the School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure and Contract Committees) appointed as Chair of the task

force. Three subcommittees were appointed, one for each mission area: Research, chaired by Peter J. Roach; Service, chaired by Thomas G. Luerssen from 2003-2006 and Sharon P. Andreoli from 2006-2007; and Teaching, chaired by Debra K. Litzelman. Dr. Antony and Deborah Cowley, Director of Academic Administration, were members of all three subcommittees. A preliminary version of the standards of excellence were disseminated for review in May 2006. The final document was approved on May 10, 2007 by the IUSM Faculty Steering Committee and May 21, 2007 by the IUSM Executive Committee, and was then subsequently approved by then IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties, Dr. Uday Sukhatme.

In fall 2012, the IUSM received a national award from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and American Council on Education to accelerate faculty career flexibility. As part of the award, a committee was appointed to review IUSM faculty appointment types and promotion and tenure criteria. This committee identified the need to update the standards of excellence in research to better reflect current criteria used by the school committee and to articulate how collaborative research or “team science” would be evaluated. The revised standards were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 20, 2014, presented at the School Executive Committee on April 7, 2014, and approved on May 12, 2014. Similarly, subcommittees were appointed to revise the standards of excellence in teaching and service, which were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 16, 2017 and by the School Executive Committee on May 1, 2017.

IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Performance

Please note that one does NOT need to engage in all of the listed contributions or have all of the evidence listed within each category.

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching students, residents, and/or fellows (e.g., workshops, small groups, simulations, lectures, tutoring, clinical teaching) • Invited presentations, visiting professor • Peer reviewed workshops • Peer reviewed publications related to education (e.g., journal articles, MedEd Portal) • Book, book chapters • Other publications (e.g., blog, podcast, newsletter, perspective pieces) • Development or improvements of learning sessions (e.g., lecture, workshop, team based learning, simulation) • Participation in curricular development or education program development team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete lists of formal instruction • Incomplete information about roles in and goals of instruction • Incomplete or only raw learner data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, learners, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes • Unsolicited letters from learners • List of formal instruction (including role and goals) • Peer review of teaching • Satisfactory internal and external letters • Evidence of new or revised approach to teaching a particular topic (e.g., use of technology, new case based approach, team based learning) • Clear identification of contributions to curriculum development • Teaching philosophy statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective, innovative, and reflective instruction • Peer review of teaching • Outstanding internal and external letters • Well developed and evidenced based teaching philosophy statement • Effective service as an education leader (e.g., clerkship director, course director, committee chair, fellowship director) • Evidence of regular and significant local/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice • Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations, or other dissemination methods • Effective course and curricular products with notable outcomes/impact • Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally, regionally, and/or nationally) indicates excellence • Grant funding to support curriculum development

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Mentoring and Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring and/or advising students, residents, fellows, post-docs, research associates, and/or faculty • Advising student, resident or other learner groups • Serving on mentoring committee or panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of learners mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided • Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized • Impact on learner achievement is clear (e.g., advisee success in match; mentees successfully reach professional goals; publish abstract, publication or grant) • Unsolicited learner letters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplishments of learners mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor • Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented in teaching philosophy • Scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising including presentations and publications • Recognition of the quality of mentoring/advising work • Achievements of mentees such as publications, presentations, and awards
Professional Development Efforts in Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at professional development activities related to teaching and learning • Faculty development presentations and workshops related to teaching and learning • Evidence of mentoring of others in education projects • Engagement in faculty learning communities or committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information about teaching development efforts given • Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise • No mentoring of colleagues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance or personal experimentation • Reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching within teaching philosophy statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of mentoring other educators • High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers • Membership in education related committees (department, campus, local, regional, national) • Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area