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# Introduction

The general criteria for the award of promotion and advancement in rank of faculty in the Paul H. O’Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs (O’Neill School) are set forth in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in the School’s Governance Document. This document, titled “Promotion and Tenure Standards for Non-tenure Track Faculty in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs,” builds on the criteria set out in the Governance Document, supersedes the “Lecturer and Clinical Appointments 2009” document, and is intended to be the operative statement of the standards for promotion of non-tenure track faculty in the School. The standards are intended to be interpreted in light of the evolving expectations of the Academy, the University, and the School. The standards were revised in 2019 to reflect the university’s creation of a third lecturer rank, “Teaching Professor”, effective Fall 2020. Lecturers, Clinical Assistant Professors, and Assistant Scientists being considered for promotion have the choice of whether to be evaluated using the standards in place at the current time or at the time of their original appointment. All other faculty being considered for promotion will be evaluated using the standards in place at the current time.

The O’Neill School is a professional school with a faculty drawn from a broad range of disciplines. It maintains a strong international reputation, and holds high expectations for those associated with it. Organized as a “core” school, the O’Neill School has faculty and programs on the Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses and affiliated faculty and degree programs on regional campuses, each of which has a distinctive operating context and mission.[1](#_bookmark0) Integral to the School’s mission is an emphasis on the creation and transmittal of knowledge -- as well as its application to the problems faced by society. These features, among others, engender some distinctive and important overarching dimensions to the promotion expectations within the School.

The expectations concerning teaching, research and service are sensitive to the diversity of the missions and contexts of the core campuses on which the faculty appointments are based.

The application of the standards should be consistent with the following four considerations. First, the O’Neill School respects and accommodates the diversity of disciplines represented in the School as well as the scholarly expectations and traditions of those disciplines. As such, the O’Neill School accepts and accommodates both disciplinary and interdisciplinary work. Second, the O’Neill School recognizes that publications are often the output of a collaborative process. As a result, where appropriate, candidates are expected to articulate their contributions to collaborative work being used to make the case for promotion or long- term contract. Third, the best new research/creative activity may not necessarily appear in the traditional disciplinary top journals or in books published by the historically most prestigious publishing houses, and work “on the edges” or straddling two fields may eventually transform research agendas in fundamental ways not always easily recognized by the home unit.

Research scientists are therefore expected to publish each piece of research in the outlet most appropriate for that work. Finally, the O’Neill School encourages faculty to do work that realizes synergies between their teaching, research, and service. The School values these synergies and recognizes the difficulty in some instances of separating the work neatly into three categories for purpose of evaluation. Some work, such as public scholarship,[2](#_bookmark1) may be

1 The relationship between the O’Neill School and each affiliated program is specified in a separate Memorandum of Understanding between the O’Neill School and the particular regional campus.

2 IUPUI defines public scholarship as an intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is

recognized as contributing to more than one category.

# 1 General Criteria

## Lecturer Faculty

Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Teaching Professors are to be evaluated annually, chiefly on the basis of their contributions to the School’s teaching mission. Reappointment of lecturers to long-term contract and promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer must be based on excellence in teaching, primarily based on performance in the classroom, and satisfactory service related to teaching, and shall only be granted to colleagues who have demonstrated a commitment to continued professional growth and currency with pedagogical developments in their fields. Promotion to Teaching Professor must be based on both sustained excellence in classroom teaching and pedagogical leadership.

## Clinical Faculty

Clinical appointees are to be evaluated annually, chiefly on the basis of their contributions to the School’s teaching and service missions. Reappointment of clinical faculty to long-term contract and promotion must be based on at least satisfactory performance in both teaching and service and excellent performance in teaching or service. While clinical faculty are encouraged to contribute to the conduct of research, research cannot be included as a basic category of evaluation for promotion or reappointment to long-term contract. In exceptional cases, a candidate may be promoted based on a presentation of balanced strengths across the two categories (teaching and service) that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the School and the University.

## Professor of Practice

Professors of Practice are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed to this rank shall be given long-term contracts after a probationary period of not more than three years. The criteria for granting long-term contracts shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that Professors of Practice shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts.

## Research/Scientist Faculty

Research/scientist faculty are to be evaluated annually, on the basis of their contributions to the School’s research mission. Reappointment of research faculty to long-term contract and promotion must be based on excellent performance in research productivity (this may include research-related service). Teaching or service cannot be included as a basic category of evaluation for promotion or reappointment to long-term contract.

# 2 Teaching (Lecturers and Clinical Faculty)

## Preamble

Teaching encompasses a wide range of activities related to the instructional mission of the

responsive to public audiences and non-academic peer review. It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing production of knowledge with community stakeholders.

University. There are at least three dimensions to teaching: (1) instruction in the classroom, laboratory, or field setting; (2) mentoring and advising; and (3) contributions to pedagogy.

## Evidence of Teaching Quality

### Instruction

Formal instruction takes place in a variety of settings, including classrooms, laboratories, and in the field and may be in the context of a class, workshop, or retreat. It also may involve management of multi- section courses or team-taught courses..

Where management of multi-sectioned courses or team-taught courses is involved, evaluations should differentiate between the quality of the course organization and the actual instruction provided by a specific faculty member. The relative contributions of the various instructors should be ascertained.

Colleague and co-instructor evaluations can be particularly helpful for instructors in both multi- section and single section courses. There is also an expectation that faculty document learning outcomes on course syllabi.

Performance in the classroom requires mastery of course content and careful efforts to identify and measure student learning outcomes. Student learning depends on many factors, some beyond the control of instructors, and the expectation is that instructors strive to improve learning outcomes for their students, using tools and techniques grounded in the pedagogical literature.

Excellence in teaching will be established based upon criteria listed later in this document. While student evaluation data may be submitted, it is not the primary means of establishing excellence. It is particularly advisable that faculty obtain ongoing peer assessment or evaluations of their classroom instruction.

### Mentoring and Advising

This category includes: (1) academic advising and mentoring: supervision of internships, supervision of research and/or teaching assistants, laboratory work, and field work; (2) supervision of independent study; and (3) advising undergraduate, masters and doctoral students concerning their research and theses. The opportunities, as well as the demands, for faculty mentoring and advising vary substantially among academic fields, between different levels of students, and among campuses. While quantitative measures can be informative as to the time and effort the faculty member has invested in these activities, it is important, where possible, to develop an assessment of the quality of the advising and mentoring provided by the faculty member. Letters from students can be helpful. Where products, such as theses, papers, presentations, joint-publications, and reports, arise out of the interaction with the faculty member, they should be noted and assessed.

### Contributions to Pedagogy

This category includes: (1) course development; (2) curriculum development; and (3) the development of teaching materials and techniques. Assessment of the quality of these activities focuses primarily on those that go beyond the basic level of academic citizenship such as the development of syllabi and routine participation in faculty and committee meetings concerning teaching and curriculum issues. Peer assessment of the contributions to pedagogy

and their impact is particularly desirable and should be part of any asserted claims of excellence.

In assessing course development, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: the receipt of grants to develop new courses or revise old ones; teaching awards and other recognition attributable to the course preparation; articles in peer-reviewed journals about the new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them; and presentations at conferences about the new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them.

In assessing curriculum development, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: leadership or major contributions to the reviewing and revising of existing curriculum; leadership or major contributions to the development of new degrees, programs of study, certificates, and areas of study; articles in peer reviewed journals about the curricular development; and presentations at conferences about curricular development.

In assessing the development of teaching materials, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: the quality, innovative nature, and impact of textbooks, instructor’s manuals, student guides, web sites and other teaching media; and articles or conference presentations related to teaching. Having the benefit of peer evaluation (internal and external) of innovative materials and methods is especially desirable.

* + 1. Teaching-related Services (Lecturers)

For lecturers this category includes (1) school and university service, (2) engagement in relevant professional activities or associations in order to bring professional developments into the classroom and connect students to professionals in the field, and where relevant (3) community engagement to provide service-learning opportunities for students or in other ways provide opportunities for students to apply professional skills to community issues.

## Criteria for Assessment of Teaching

### Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor/Senior lecturer and/or Long-term Contract

* + - 1. Excellence

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a substantial amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). The candidate demonstrates mastery of their course content and a consistent effort to update course content as appropriate to the discipline and subject matter. Excellent teachers will document careful consideration of their approach to classroom teaching and a consistent effort to improve upon student learning.

The candidate should provide teaching statements that describe and document how course content and assessments reflect learning outcomes. Additionally, teaching statements should describe an evidence-based teaching philosophy and should provide rationale for the approach(es) selected, grounded in the literature on pedagogy. Supporting evidence should be used to demonstrate the value of the candidate’s teaching philosophy.

Examples of supporting evidence should also include (but not be limited to) each of the following:

1. Documentation showing how learning outcomes are connected to course materials, such as readings, classroom activities, and assessments;
2. Evidence of student learning including grading strategies that both challenge and effectively incentivize students to achieve learning outcomes, recognizing that the level of student preparedness and effort may impede complete achievement of the learning outcomes;
3. Documentation regarding peer assessment that includes classroom observations as well as evaluation of teaching materials and assessments. Candidates should provide appropriate reflections on the comments provided by peer faculty and discuss how peer assessment has contributed to the candidate’s classroom performance. Evidence that the candidate has actively sought advice or input from peers in order to improve student learning will be highly valued. Candidates should provide peer assessment for other faculty colleagues and reflect on how this has improved their own teaching;
4. The candidate’s reflections on grade distributions in their classes;
5. Summaries of qualitative comments in student evaluations with reflection from the candidate as to how these comments were used to improve student learning; and
6. Other appropriate evidence, which may include (but is not limited to): unsolicited letters from students and recognition of teaching excellence from organizations devoted to teaching quality. While quantitative data from student evaluations may be submitted, it will not be the primary consideration in establishing excellence in the classroom. Quantitative student evaluation data will be evaluated in consideration of the potential biases, limitations or weaknesses of such instruments.

Performance in the classroom forms the primary basis for promotion, however, candidates should also demonstrate strong, consistent contributions to advising and mentoring of students. Advising and mentoring should be broadly defined, and may include co-authored publications with students, working with students on Honors theses or other research projects, advising a student group, or providing help sessions for difficult course material. Evidence that a candidate has provided extensive support for students in defining career options and seeking employment should also be considered. In addition to advising and mentoring, the candidate should also have made strong contributions to course or curriculum development, which may include the development of new curriculum, revision of existing curriculum, or pedagogical innovation. Candidate materials should document the rationale for new or revised approaches and a consistent effort to evaluate the outcomes.

On the IUPUI campus, the candidate must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer- reviewed scholarship in teaching and must have made contributions to innovation in pedagogy recognized beyond the campus, with peer review confirming the excellence of the contributions.

On the Bloomington campus, peer-reviewed contributions to pedagogy are highly valued, but

not required for promotion and/or long-term contract.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a significant amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). The candidate may have made some use of innovative or high-impact teaching practices and obtained peer assessment of such practices. Evidence from peer assessment, student evaluations, unsolicited letters from students, and other sources may reflect some success in motivating and achieving student learning. Evidence from peer assessment and student evaluations indicates the candidate’s attempt to use feedback to improve instruction.

The evidence indicates some contributions to student advising and mentoring of students at different levels, including supervising student projects., The candidate may have made some contributions to course or curriculum development, including the development of new courses or the significant revision of existing courses.

* + - 1. *Effective/Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a reasonable amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). Summaries of qualitative comments in student evaluations confirm that the faculty member is performing the instructional responsibilities at an acceptable level. Students generally are comfortable with the organization of courses and with the effectiveness of the teaching. The inherent limitations of student course evaluations should be fully recognized when used as an assessment. Teaching effectiveness has generally improved over time and, where particular problems have been identified, the faculty member has taken steps to address them and assess the effectiveness of the changes. Peer assessment also support a conclusion that the instructional effectiveness is at a clearly acceptable level.

The faculty member has demonstrated the ability to take on the development of new course preparations and to craft and deliver reasonably acceptable courses. The faculty member willingly contributes his or her share of the advising and makes the normally expected contributions to student mentoring, curriculum and course development, and pedagogy.

* + - 1. *Ineffective/Unsatisfactory*

The evidence does not demonstrate that the contributions to the instructional mission are at the acceptable level. A record of ineffective performance typically would be characterized by at least one of the following:

The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher or there are significant student complaints about course organization or delivery or teaching effectiveness. [As noted above, the inherent limitations of student course evaluations should be fully recognized when used as an assessment tool.] Peer assessment or evaluations suggest that there are significant problems in classroom instruction. When problems have been identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft responses to address the problems, and there is a discernible lack of improvement over time or an inability to bring the teaching up to a clearly acceptable level on a regular basis. Overall, the evidence does not show that is teaching at a clearly acceptable level. The faculty member does not

make the normally expected contributions to student advising, has not demonstrated the ability to be an effective mentor, or does not make effective contributions to course or curriculum development or pedagogy.

### Promotion to Clinical Professor

Promotion to this rank carries higher expectations and is based on performance in rank as Associate Clinical Professor.

* + - 1. *Excellence*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has achieved sustained excellence in teaching at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor. The candidate will have executed a substantial and sustained amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). Further, the candidate demonstrates sustained mastery of their course content and a consistent effort to update course content as appropriate to the discipline and subject matter. Further, the candidate has undertaken careful consideration of their approach to classroom teaching and a consistent effort to improve upon student learning*.*

The candidate should provide teaching statements that describe and document how course content and assessments reflect learning outcomes. Additionally, teaching statements should describe an evidence-based teaching philosophy and should provide rationale for the approach(es) selected, grounded in the literature on pedagogy. Supporting evidence should be used to demonstrate the value of the candidate’s teaching philosophy.

Examples of supporting evidence should also include (but not limited to) each of the following:

1. Documentation showing how learning outcomes are connected to course materials such as readings, classroom activities, assessments;
2. Evidence of student learning including grading strategies that both challenge and effectively incentivize students to achieve learning outcomes, recognizing that the level of student preparedness and effort may impede complete achievement of the learning outcomes;
3. Documentation regarding peer assessment that includes classroom observations as well as evaluation of teaching materials and assessments. Candidates should provide appropriate reflections on the comments provided by peer faculty and discuss how peer assessment has contributed to the candidate’s classroom performance. Evidence that the candidate has actively sought advice or input from peers in order to improve student learning will be highly valued. Candidates should provide peer assessment for other faculty colleagues, and to reflect on how this has improved their own teaching;
4. The candidate’s reflections on grade distributions in their classes;
5. Summaries of qualitative comments in student evaluations with reflection from the candidate as to how these comments were used to improve student learning; and
6. Other appropriate evidence, which may include (but is not limited to): unsolicited letters from students and, recognition of teaching excellence from organizations devoted to teaching quality. While quantitative data from student evaluations may be submitted, it will not be the primary consideration in establishing excellence in the classroom. Quantitative student evaluation data will be evaluated in consideration of the potential biases, limitations or weaknesses of such instruments.

Performance in the classroom forms the primary basis for promotion, however, candidates should also demonstrate strong, consistent contributions to advising and mentoring of students; Advising and mentoring should be broadly defined, and may include co-authored publications with students, working with students on Honors theses or other research projects, advising a student group, or providing help sessions for difficult course material. Evidence that a candidate has provided extensive support for students in defining career options and seeking employment should also be considered. In addition to advising and mentoring, the candidate should also have made strong contributions to course or curriculum development, which may include the development of new curriculum, revision of existing curriculum, or pedagogical innovation. Candidate materials should document the rationale for new or revised approaches and a consistent effort to evaluate the outcomes.

On the IUPUI campus, the candidate must demonstrate a record of sustained nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in area of excellence.

On the Bloomington campus, peer-reviewed contributions to pedagogy are highly valued, but not required for promotion and/or long-term contract.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a significant amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) during time in rank. Performance in advising and mentoring is also consistently strong during time in rank. While the evidence demonstrates strong performance on all three dimensions of teaching, the candidate has not yet established a national or international reputation for contributions to pedagogy.

* + - 1. *Effective/Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a reasonable amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) as well as advising or mentoring and contribution to pedagogy during time in rank. While the evidence indicates that the performance is at an acceptable level of quality there are insufficient indications of strong performance in the three dimensions of teaching to be considered for excellence or characterization as very good.

* + - 1. *Ineffective/Unsatisfactory*

The evidence does not demonstrate that the candidate’s contributions to teaching are of acceptable quality in the three required dimensions. An ineffective record of teaching would typically be characterized by one or more of the following: The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher. There are significant student

complaints about course organization, delivery or teaching effectiveness. When problems with teaching are identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft effective responses to these problems. Peer evaluations raise questions as to whether the faculty member is teaching at an acceptable level of quality. The faculty member does not deliver the expected quantity or quality of advising services, does not perform as an effective mentor or does not make effective contributions to innovation in course or curriculum development or pedagogy.

### Promotion to Teaching Professor

Promotion to this rank carries higher expectations and is based on the candidate’s performance in the rank of Senior Lecturer. Candidates for Teaching Professor must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching and leadership in pedagogy.

* + - 1. *Excellence*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has achieved sustained excellence in teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer. The candidate has executed a substantial and sustained amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). The candidate demonstrates sustained mastery of their course content and a consistent effort to update course content as appropriate to the discipline and subject matter. Further, the candidate has undertaken careful consideration of their approach to classroom teaching and a consistent effort to improve upon student learning.

The candidate should provide teaching statements that describe and document how course content and assessments reflect learning outcomes. Additionally, teaching statements should describe an evidence-based teaching philosophy and should provide rationale for the approach(es) selected, grounded in the literature on pedagogy. Supporting evidence should be used to demonstrate the value of the candidate’s teaching philosophy.

Examples of supporting evidence should also include (but not limited to) each of the following:

1. Documentation showing how learning outcomes are connected to course materials such as readings, classroom activities, and assessments;
2. Evidence of student learning including grading strategies that both challenge and effectively incentivize students to achieve learning outcomes, recognizing that the level of student preparedness and effort may impede complete achievement of the learning outcomes;
3. Documentation regarding peer assessment that includes classroom observations as well as evaluation of teaching materials and assessments. Candidates should provide appropriate reflections on the comments provided by peer faculty and discuss how peer assessment has contributed to the candidate’s classroom performance. Evidence that the candidate has

actively sought advice or input from peers in order to improve student learning will be highly valued. Candidates should provide peer assessment for other faculty colleagues, and to reflect on how this has improved their own teaching;

1. The candidate’s reflections on grade distributions in their classes;
2. Summaries of qualitative comments in student evaluations with reflection from the candidate as to how these comments were used to improve student learning; and
3. Other appropriate evidence, which may include (but is not limited to): unsolicited letters from students and, recognition of teaching excellence from organizations devoted to teaching quality. While quantitative data from student evaluations may be submitted, it will not be the primary consideration in establishing excellence in the classroom. Quantitative student evaluation data will be evaluated in consideration of the potential biases, limitations or weaknesses of such instruments.

The candidate must also demonstrate leadership in pedagogy by making contributions beyond classroom instruction and student mentoring. The candidate must show how these contributions engage with and enhance the goals of the teaching and learning community within and beyond the O’Neill School. The candidate must further demonstrate a recognized campus, university, regional, national, or international reputation for pedagogical leadership.

Evidence for such pedagogical leadership contributions could include, but are not limited to:

1. Active involvement in school-, campus- or university-level teaching (curricular or co- curricular) initiatives with explanation of impact and contribution;
2. Sustained leadership and demonstrated impact in relevant pedagogical organizations, with explanation of impact and contributions;
3. Significant contributions to textbooks (e.g. author, editor, preparer of test banks or other instructor resources), authorship of case studies, or development of other disseminated teaching materials.
4. Peer-reviewed publications in relevant professional or pedagogical journals, books, newsletters, blogs, or magazines on topics related to the candidate’s professional or academic expertise;
5. Workshop or conference presentations on curriculum, teaching approaches, or content related to the candidate’s field;
6. Collaborative and innovative activities related to pedagogical improvement in the candidate’s field of expertise;
7. Creative activities related to curriculum, pedagogical improvement, or the candidate’s field of expertise; or
8. Retention of extramural grant awards to improve teaching and related programming.

In addition to sustained excellence in classroom teaching and pedagogical leadership, the candidate should provide evidence of strong, consistent contributions to student advising as well as outstanding mentoring of students. Mentoring may include a variety of activities, including but not limited to advising Honors projects or other student research, advising student organizations, and supporting students in defining and pursuing career goals.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has continued to perform well in classroom teaching. The most important evidence will be demonstration from the candidate of significant effort to innovate and improve course content and classroom performance over time, and specifically in the period since promotion to Senior Lecturer. The candidate will have continued to execute a significant amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) and will have demonstrated established good performance in both classroom instruction and pedagogical leadership. The candidate has made some use of innovative or high-impact teaching practices and obtained peer assessment of such practices. Evidence from peer assessment, student evaluations, unsolicited letters from students, and other sources reflects a degree of success in motivating and achieving student learning. Evidence from peer assessment and student evaluations indicates the candidate’s attempt to use feedback to improve instruction.

The candidate may also demonstrate some leadership in pedagogy, including some contributions to course or curriculum development and to innovation in pedagogy. The candidate’s pedagogical leadership has begun to receive recognition both within and beyond the O’Neill School, including at the campus, national or international level.

In addition to continuing to perform well in classroom teaching and pedagogical leadership, the candidate will have provided evidence of some contributions to student advising as well as mentoring of students.

Overall, the candidate has made progress toward the level of excellence required for the Teaching Professor rank, but additional evidence will be required in one or more categories: sustained excellence in classroom teaching and mentoring and/or pedagogical leadership.

* + - 1. *Effective/Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a reasonable amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) as well as advising or mentoring and contribution to pedagogy during time in rank. While the evidence indicates that the performance is at an acceptable level of quality there are insufficient indications of sustained excellence in the classroom and pedagogical leadership.

* + - 1. *Ineffective/Unsatisfactory*

The evidence does not demonstrate that the candidate has achieved sustained excellence in classroom teaching or made substantial pedagogical contributions. An ineffective record of teaching would typically be characterized by one or more of the following: The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher. There are significant student complaints about course organization, delivery or teaching effectiveness. When problems with teaching are identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft effective responses to these problems. Peer evaluations raise questions as to whether the faculty member is teaching at an acceptable level of quality. The faculty member does not deliver the expected quantity or quality of advising services, does not perform as an effective mentor or does not make effective contributions to innovation in course or curriculum development or pedagogy. The candidate has not demonstrated a record of pedagogical leadership at the school, campus, or national level. While some contributions to pedagogy have been made, they are not of sufficient quality or impact.

# Service (Clinical Faculty and Lecturers)

### 4.1.1 Preamble

Service is the effective application by faculty members of knowledge, skills, or expertise developed within their discipline or profession as a scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. A distinction is made between general civic or family responsibilities and the application of one’s professional skills. It is the latter that delineates contributions in the area of service. Candidates are expected to apply their professional skills in service to the School, the University, the candidate’s profession, and the public. Clinical faculty are expected to make specific contributions to public and professional service. Lecturers are expected to make specific contributions to teaching-related services which will likely include public and professional service.

Research in the sense of performance in the area of research and creative activity is not required when awarding long-term contracts and promotion. However, what can be considered as service activity is very broad and can encompass a wide range of activities that in other instances might be included as research. Publications, including refereed journal articles, can be considered as contributions in service as long as the publication is applied. For example, clinical faculty participating in clinical trials and having publications relating to such work should report those efforts as service. Similarly, contracts and grants, such as the grants for clinical trials, with an applied or service-oriented connection are included as performance in the area of service.

## Evidence of Service Quality

### Service to the School and University

The overall functioning and self-governance of the university is dependent upon the academic citizenship of its faculty, and institutional service involves activities that help sustain or lead academic endeavors. Every faculty member is expected to contribute a certain amount of service to the School such as regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in committee assignments. The nature and level of service may vary according to the particular needs and missions of the campus where the faculty member is resident as well as on the interests and special contributions the faculty member may be able to make.

Institutional service includes the following categories:

* + - * 1. Committee Service

Serving on committees is essential for the management or functioning of the School or University. A non- exhaustive list of such committees includes those involved with curricular policy, student recruitment, admission and placement, accreditation, teaching or learning evaluation, search and screen, promotion and tenure, and task forces dealing with important issues.

* + - * 1. Administrative Service

Taking a leadership role in the management of the school or university includes such activities such as directing programs, directing faculties or committees, directing institutes or centers, or serving as an elected representative in faculty governance.

### Service to the Profession

Service to the profession involves activities that enhance the quality of disciplinary or professional organizations or activities. Clinical faculty and lecturers are encouraged, but not required, to contribute to the following types of categories:

* + - 1. *Professional Development*

This includes service that is essential for development of one’s profession such as making privately- produced data available to other researchers, reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or proposals for funding agencies, moderating sessions or serving as a discussant at professional conferences, serving on committees, or participating in professional societies or organizations and participation in accreditation or establishing professional or academic standards.

* + - 1. *Professional Leadership*

This includes assuming a leadership role in advancement of one’s profession through activities such as editing a journal, serving on an editorial board, organizing symposia, conferences or workshops, editing proceedings, or serving as an officer of a professional society.

### Service to the Public

Service to the community involves activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the academic community and call upon the faculty member’s expertise as a scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. Consistent with the School’s public affairs orientation, service activities may be in the public, nonprofit, or private sectors and may either be paid or unpaid. The professional nature of the activity is the critical aspect. It is expected that all faculty members will engage in some public and professional service activity within their areas of expertise.

The professional engagement involved in public service involves application of specialized professional knowledge or skills in a variety of forums and includes advising or consulting with private, public, and nonprofit organizations; providing public policy analysis or technical expertise for local, state, regional, national, or international agencies or entities; writing technical reports or other materials prepared specifically in conjunction with service activities; serving as an expert witness or providing legislative testimony; serving on boards, commissions, or review panels; evaluating policies, programs, or personnel for agencies; assisting agencies with development activities; and communicating in popular, non-academic publications and other media such as television or radio. These and other forms of applied research that help address challenges confronting the School, the University, external parties, and the public, provide substantial value and should be given commensurate weight

in promotion and tenure evaluation.

## Evaluation of Service Activities

### Quantity of Service

Considerations include: the number and range of the activities; the nature of the faculty member’s involvement in each activity; the commitment of time required; and, whether the faculty member participated regularly. Documentation of the involvement in minutes and reports sometimes can be useful.

### Quality of Service

As with research, it is particularly important to ascertain the quality and impact of the service. Considerations include: the evaluations of colleagues, committee chairs and other administrators as to the quality of institutional service; evaluations by professional colleagues as to the quality of professional service; and evaluations by colleagues, clients, stakeholders and peer reviewers (internal and external) as to the quality of public service; indications that the faculty member has been asked to continue the service or has been sought out by others as a result of the service; and receipt of competitive grants, awards, honors or other recognition for the service activity.

### Outcomes and Impacts of Service

Another important indicator in assessing service activities is tangible evidence of the significance of the service and its effectiveness or impact, including evidence of outcomes such as letters of accreditation, reports, and technical documents, changes in policies, implementation of new programs or measures, and statements from stakeholders.

### Leadership

Demonstration of leadership is particularly important to an assertion of excellence in service. The evidence includes appointments, nominations, or elections to leadership positions as well as an evaluation of the leadership by colleagues, peers or, as appropriate, clients, and stakeholders.

## Criteria for Assessment of Service Quality

### Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor

* + - 1. *Excellence*

The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through service activities (especially public or professional service), provides effective leadership on significant activities and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers or evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its beneficial and significant impact. The faculty member has received external awards, honors, or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate, the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to obtain grant or contract support or to develop other support for service activities. The faculty member’s activities contribute beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Typically, service excellence must be premised on more than outstanding service to the School and University, and must include significant public or professional service. The faculty member must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated works in one or more areas of service.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions.

The faculty member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the school through his or her persistent service commitments to the community broadly defined to include international, federal, state and local governments, and non-profit and private organizations. The faculty member has a track record of service to the academy including review of journal articles and grant applications; serving on journal editorial boards and academic association board of directors; organizing and participation in conferences, workshops and symposiums.

* + - 1. *Satisfactory*

The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities in one or more areas of service (school and university OR profession OR public). A satisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: provides a reasonable amount of service to the School or University; demonstrates more than minimal contributions to the public or professional service mission of the School; responsible service, including the completion of assignments or attendance of meetings; participation in disciplinary conferences or meetings.

* + - 1. *Unsatisfactory*

The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University; failure to demonstrate more than minimal contributions to the public or professional service mission of the School; irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings; failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings; or generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions.

### Promotion to Clinical Professor

Promotion to this rank carries higher expectations and is based on performance in rank as Clinical Associate Professor.

* + - 1. *Excellence*

The evidence demonstrates that, during time in rank, the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through his or her service activities (including particularly his or her public or professional service), provides effective leadership on significant activities, and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers or evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and corroborate its beneficial impact and significance.

The faculty member has received external awards, honors or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to obtain grant or contract support – or to develop other support for service activities. The faculty member’s service activities contribute well beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Typically, service excellence must be premised on more than outstanding

service to the School and University and must include significant public or professional service. The faculty member must demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated works in one or more areas of service.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities during time in rank. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions. The faculty member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the school through his or her persistent service commitments to the community broadly defined to include international, federal, state and local governments, and non-profit and private organizations. The faculty member has a track record of service to the academy including review of journal articles and grant applications; serving on journal editorial boards and academic association board of directors; organizing and participation in conferences, workshops and symposiums.

* + - 1. *Satisfactory*

The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes effectively and at a level beyond that the minimum expected for an associate professor to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities. A satisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following during time in rank: provides a reasonable amount of service to the School or University; demonstrates more than minimal contributions to the public or professional service mission of the School; responsible service, including the completion of assignments or attendance of meetings; participation in disciplinary conferences or meetings; or generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions.

* + - 1. *Unsatisfactory*

The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member contributes well beyond the minimum and effectively to the mission of the School and University through his or her service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following: Failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University; failure to demonstrate the willingness or ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School; irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings; failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings; or generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his or her contributions.

# Research (Scientist/Scholar) Faculty

## Preamble

The primary evidence of the research record is the faculty member’s published work and the peer assessment of that work. Research published in journal articles and books generally are the most appropriate vehicles for the presentation of a faculty member’s work. Other outlets appropriate for research include chapters in books, papers in conference proceedings, reports, abstracts, and digital or electronic media where a peer-review process or other quality assessment similar to that used in the publication of journal articles or books is part of the decision to publish work in one of these media. As described below, other evidence may also be used to assess the faculty member’s standing in the profession and reputation as a

scholar (this may include research-related service). In keeping with the school’s mission, public service scholarship such as panel, commission, and other technical reports; policy white papers; and strategic plans developed for community or civic groups may also be produced. As noted in the Introduction, some work may be recognized as contributing to more than one category, and reviewers should be guided by conventions in the faculty member’s discipline. Non-peer reviewed public scholarship has value but does not substitute for a record of peer-reviewed scholarship.

In general, the candidate’s work should suggest that there is a well-defined domain of inquiry being established with continuity and connection between individual projects. There should be evidence that the candidate is contributing to an area in at least one of the following ways:

Methodological originality includes developing research methods that break new ground or offer new solutions to problems encountered in the field.

Substantive illumination includes adding new critical insights to a subject so that others working in the field now view the subject with greater clarity or with new perspectives.

Integration and synthesis includes placing large amounts of information or empirical data or technique in a new, usually more comprehensive, framework so as to clarify how pieces of knowledge may relate.

Conceptual and theoretical innovation includes generating new ways of thinking about existing topics or problems through new concepts, uses of logic or schemata.

## Evidence of Research Quality

### Quality of the Published work

Considerations include the appropriateness and status or reputation of the journal or publisher; the commentary from outside reviewers on the importance and impact of the published work; the reputation of those outside reviewers; and indications that the work is cited by others or has had an impact on the field.

### Quantity of the Published Research

Considerations include whether the number of publications -- considering the discipline, the campus and the nature of the work -- is appropriate to the rank; and whether the record demonstrates a generally sustained flow of work (after due consideration for the nature of the work and review or publication timetables). The quality of the work is more important than quantity, but the amount of the research produced is to be considered in context with the quality or value of the work.

### Independence of Research Output

Considerations include whether the faculty member has established an independent research agenda and whether the faculty member has authored publications without his or her thesis or post-doctoral advisor, or a single senior colleague, as a co-author. Co- authorship with collaborators should follow the norms of the field, but in each case an assessment should be made of the faculty member’s independent contribution to the published research.

### Professional Reputation of the Faculty Member

Among the indicators of the standing of the faculty member and the extent to which the

individual has obtained a regional, national or international reputation are: presentations at regional, national, and international meetings; invitations to lecture at other universities and at regional, national, or international meetings; invitations to organize symposia or panels at meetings; grants or contracts (the expectations vary, depending on the norms of the discipline or the campus); awards by regional, national, or international organizations; memberships on journal editorial boards; editorships of journals or books; leadership positions in scholarly societies or other indicators of research-related service.

In assessing these indicators, the reputation of the organizations, journals, scholarly societies, and grant making or contracting agencies, as well as the nature or rigor of any peer review process involved, are relevant considerations.

It should be noted that some of these indicators of reputation also constitute service activities that are considered in evaluating the faculty member’s service.

## Criteria for Assessment of Research

### Promotion to Associate Scientist/Scholar

* + - 1. *Excellence*

The evidence establishes that the candidate is beginning to establish a national reputation as an original contributor through research and shows high promise of continued development as a research scholar. The candidate’s work should suggest that there is a well-defined domain of inquiry being established with continuity and connection between individual projects. The candidate has established a record of high quality work, with a number of published works (appropriate to the campus and discipline) in high quality outlets appropriate for his/her work. Where appropriate to the discipline, the candidate has demonstrated the ability to compete favorably for grant or contract support for the research. Outside reviewers are generally very positive about the quality of the research.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The faculty member has established a record of high quality work, with a number of published works (appropriate to the discipline and the campus) in outlets of varying quality appropriate for his/her work. Importantly, the evidence demonstrates that the candidate is advancing at least one program of research and is contributing either some original inquiry or unique interpretations that are furthering the dissemination of new knowledge. The faculty member shows considerable promise of continued development as a scholar. Where appropriate to the discipline, the ability to compete for grant or contract support for research has been demonstrated. While the evidence demonstrates strong performance on at least some of the dimensions of research, overall, the performance does not meet the criteria for excellence.

* + - 1. *Satisfactory*

The evidence establishes that the candidate is developing a record of quality work, with some published works in outlets of varying or modest quality. The faculty member demonstrates independence from former dissertation advisors and shows promise of continued development as a scholar. Where appropriate to the discipline, the faculty member shows the potential to compete for grant or contract support for research.

* + - 1. *Unsatisfactory*

The evidence fails to establish that the candidate, through the publication of good quality work (in amounts appropriate to the discipline and campus and in appropriate outlets), shows promise of continued development as a scholar. An unsatisfactory research record typically would be characterized by little or no indication of a sustained research agenda; research work that in the judgment of reviewers is of low quality; research work that is published in poor quality journals or by poor quality book publishers; too little (as appropriate to the discipline and campus) work of quality in appropriate outlets; failure to demonstrate promise (where appropriate to the discipline) of the potential to compete for grant or contract support for research; or failure to demonstrate promise of continued development as a research scholar.’

### Promotion to Senior Scientist/Scholar

Promotion to this rank carries higher expectations and is based on performance in rank as Associate Scientist/Scholar

* + - 1. *Excellence*

The evidence clearly demonstrates that the faculty member has established a national or international reputation as a first-class scientist or scholar and can be expected to maintain that reputation. The faculty member has established and sustained a well-developed research agenda and has published a significant amount of high quality research in high quality journals or with high quality publishers during time in rank. Where appropriate to the campus and the discipline, the faculty member has shown the sustained ability to compete for grant and contract support for his or her research program. Outside reviewers

generally are very positive about the quality of the research and the impact it has had on the field, and they confirm the national or international reputation of the faculty member.

* + - 1. *Very Good/Highly Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to Associate Professor and has continued to make sound research contributions through the publication, on a sustained basis, of high quality research in amounts appropriate to the campus and the discipline and in good quality journals or with good quality publishers. Where appropriate to the discipline, the faculty member has shown the ability to compete for grant and contract support for his or her research programs. Outside reviewers are generally positive about the quality of the research.

* + - 1. *Satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate continues to publish good quality research in good quality outlets appropriate for his or her work during time in rank. Where appropriate to the discipline, the faculty member has shown the ability to compete for grant and contract support for his or her research programs.

* + - 1. *Unsatisfactory*

The evidence is insufficient to establish that the faculty member has grown as a scholar since the promotion to Associate Professor or that the faculty member has established a national reputation for making sound research contributions through the publication of good quality research in amounts appropriate to the campus and the discipline and in good quality outlets. An unsatisfactory research record since promotion to Associate Professor typically would be characterized by little indication of an independent research agenda; little indication of growth as a scholar; work that in the judgment of reviewers is of poor quality; too little work (as

appropriate to the discipline and campus) in good outlets; or where appropriate, insufficient demonstrated ability to compete for grants or contracts to support research.

# Appendices

## Appendix A.

Table 1: Who votes on promotion and/or tenure (or long-term contract) to which rank?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **VOTING-ELIGIBLE FACULTY** | | | | | | | | |
| **CANDIDATES** | | **Tenured Faculty** | | **Non-tenure Track Faculty with Long-Term Contracts** | | | | | **Scientists/ Scholars** | |
| **Candidate’s current type of appointment** | **Candidate being considered for tenure and/or promotion to…** | **Full prof. w/ tenure** | **Assoc. prof. w/ tenure** | **Prof. of Practice** | **Clinical full prof.** | **Clinical assoc. prof.** | **Teaching Prof.** | **Senior lecturer** | **Senior Scientist**  **/Scholar** | **Assoc. Scientist**  **/Scholar** |
| Tenured or Tenure- track Faculty | Full Prof. w. tenure | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assoc. Prof. w/ tenure | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assoc. Prof. w/o tenure | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clinical Faculty | Clinical Full Prof | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clinical Assoc. Prof | x | x | x | x | x |  |  |  |  |
| Lecturer | Teaching Professor | x | x | x | x |  | x |  |  |  |
| Senior Lecturer | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |  |  |
| Scientist  /Scholar | Senior Scientist/Scholar | x | x |  |  |  |  |  | x |  |
| Assoc. Scientist/Scholar | x | x |  |  |  |  |  | x | x |

## Appendix B.

List of items that commonly serve as the primary evidence of instructional quality.

1. A faculty member’s articulation of a conscious and reflective teaching strategy, teaching goals, and efforts to develop pedagogical skills
2. Development of effective teaching materials and techniques, including course development, improvement, or course innovation efforts. Note that a faculty member may also wish to account for its impact on students; experimentation should be rewarded even if it temporarily lowers student course evaluation numbers.
3. Grants and awards for course development and evidence of implementation in courses.
4. Participation in campus instructional training/orientation. For example, attendance at IU Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning workshops and evidence of implementation in courses
5. Student, peer, and external recognition of teaching excellence, when holistically assessed and not based entirely on numerical course evaluations
6. Publications related to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL)
7. Conference/workshop/meeting presentations related to SOTL
8. Evidence of grading strategies that effectively challenge students
9. The quality of the written portions of student course evaluations, and evidence of a conscious effort to use feedback received. These evaluations will be given greater weight when accompanied by a high response rate.
10. Achieving and/or maintaining relevant professional certifications and/or licensure, which require demonstration of ongoing professional development and currency in the subject areas being taught
11. Evidence of student mentoring, recommendation/reference/award nomination letters, etc.
12. Numerical portions of student course evaluations (again, with appropriate rate of response)
13. Participation in the O’Neill School peer observation of teaching activities, including evidence of a conscious effort to incorporate the feedback received
14. Evidence of peer mentoring, leadership, and other teaching-related service to faculty development
15. Other formal outside training or professional development (e.g., FACET) in teaching and student learning and evidence of implementation in courses
16. Number of students taught and sizes of course sections
17. Range and variety of courses taught; range and variety of student cohorts taught
18. Evidence that all courses have articulated the expected student learning outcomes.