

PROMOTION AND TENURE STANDARDS FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

IN THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

[April 2019]

1 Introduction

The general criteria for the award of tenure and advancement in rank of faculty in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) are set forth in the Indiana University Academic Handbook and in the School's Governance Document. This document, titled "Promotion and Tenure Standards for Tenure Track Faculty in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs," builds on the criteria set out in the Governance Document, supersedes previous SPEA promotion and tenure documents, and is intended to be the operative statement of the standards for tenure and promotion of 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. These standards were originally approved by the SPEA Academic Council in 1999 and were effective immediately. The standards were revised minimally in 2008 (effective in June 2008), to account for changes in the School's structure mandated by the Board of Trustees of Indiana University. The standards were revised in 2018, effective Fall 2019. Any faculty member being evaluated for tenure may choose to be evaluated pursuant to the statement of standards in place when they were initially employed by SPEA. All promotion reviews will use the standards in place at that time.¹

The School of Public and Environmental Affairs 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, SPEA 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.² 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 and tenure 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 School's strong emphasis on instruction in a professional context means that in some instances faculty carry heavier instructional loads than their disciplinary counterparts elsewhere in the University and the Academy. Concomitantly, the School's emphasis on the application of knowledge in the context of public service creates an added dimension to the normal definition of service within the Academy and calls for a heavier commitment of time and effort to this end than is placed on most faculty elsewhere in the University and the Academy.

The application of the standards should be consistent with the following four considerations. First, SPEA respects and accommodates the diversity of disciplines represented in the School as well as the scholarly expectations and traditions of those disciplines. As such, SPEA accepts and accommodates both disciplinary

¹ In the case of faculty being evaluated for promotion and tenure, the candidate can choose to be evaluated for both decisions using the standards in place at that time, or the candidate may choose to be evaluated for tenure based on the standards in place at the time he/she was hired, while being evaluated for promotion based on the current standards in place at the time.

² The relationship between SPEA and each affiliated program is specified in a separate Memorandum of Understanding between SPEA and the particular regional campus.

and interdisciplinary work. Second, SPEA recognizes that publications are often the output of a collaborative process. As a result, candidates are expected to articulate their contributions to co-authored work being used to make the case for promotion or tenure. 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. Candidates are therefore expected to publish each piece of research in the outlet most appropriate for that work. Finally, SPEA 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,³ may be recognized as contributing to more than one category.

2 General Criteria

For both tenure and promotion to either associate or full professor, a candidate must demonstrate excellence in one of the assessment categories (teaching, research and service) and at least a satisfactory (or “effective”) record in the remaining categories. In exceptional cases, a candidate may be tenured or promoted based on a presentation of balanced strengths across the three categories that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the School and the University.

Tenure is based on the clear promise, evident in the record to date, that the faculty member has or will achieve a national or international reputation as a first-class productive scholar, or a record of excellence as a teacher, or excellence in service.

Promotion from assistant to associate professor is based on continued improvement in the quality of teaching, research, and service during the period as an assistant professor and evidence that the faculty member is achieving a national reputation as a first-class productive scholar, or developing a record of excellence as a teacher, or developing a record of excellence in service.

Promotion to full professor is based on a national or international reputation as an excellent productive scholar, or on a sustained record of excellence in teaching, or on a sustained record of excellence in service.

2.1 Research

2.1.1 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

³ IUPUI defines public scholarship as an intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is 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.

scholar. 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 generally substitute for a record of peer-reviewed scholarship.⁴

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.

2.1.2 Evidence of Research Quality

2.1.2.1 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.

2.1.2.2 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.

2.1.2.3 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

⁴ An important exception is research published in law journals. While not peer reviewed, articles published in law journals are valued equivalently to peer-reviewed publications.

the field, but in each case an assessment should be made of the faculty member's independent contribution to the published research.

2.1.2.4 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; or leadership positions in scholarly societies.

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.

2.1.3 Criteria for Assessment of Research

2.1.3.1 Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Note: as discussed in Section 2 above, tenure is based on the promise of future excellence, while promotion is based on work already completed in rank.

2.1.3.1.1 Excellence

The evidence establishes that the candidate is beginning to establish a national reputation as an original contributor through research. Research accomplishments to date forms the basis for promotion to Associate Professor; high promise of continued development as a research scholar forms the basis for tenure. 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.

2.1.3.1.2 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 criteria for excellence.

2.1.3.1.3 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.

2.1.3.1.4 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.'

2.1.3.2 *Promotion to Full Professor*

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

2.1.3.2.1 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.

2.1.3.2.2 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.

2.1.3.2.3 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.

2.1.3.2.4 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.

2.2 Teaching

2.2.1 Preamble

Teaching encompasses a wide range of activities related to the instructional mission of the University. There are at least three dimensions to teaching: instruction in the classroom, laboratory, or field setting; mentoring and advising; and contributions to pedagogy.

2.2.2 Evidence of Teaching Quality

2.2.2.1 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. The evaluations -- and the evaluation instruments -- should be sensitive to the context of the instruction and to what is being assessed -- for example, quality of the instruction provided by the faculty member versus quality of the course organization or management. The size and the nature of the audience -- for example, undergraduates, graduate students, professionals, colleagues, or lay - as well as the subject matter--are also relevant factors in interpreting the evaluations. See appendix B for a list of items that commonly serve as the primary evidence of instructional quality.

Where management of multi-sectioned courses or team-taught courses is involved, the student 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.

In considering student evaluations of teaching, particularly the standard course evaluative instruments, the nature of the instruments and their potential biases, limitations or weaknesses should be kept in mind and fully considered. Among other things, it will commonly be the case that even the best instructors may receive unfavorable commentary or evaluations from some students and that instructors performing at an unsatisfactory level may be able to point to positive commentary or evaluation from some students. Because of these limitations, it is particularly advisable that faculty obtain ongoing peer observations or evaluations of their classroom instruction.

2.2.2.2 *Mentoring and Advising*

This category includes: academic advising and mentoring: supervision of internships, supervision of research and/or teaching assistants, laboratory work, and field work; supervision of independent study; and 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.

2.2.2.3 *Contributions to Pedagogy*

This category includes: course development; curriculum development; and 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; articles in peer-reviewed journals about innovative teaching methods or materials; and presentations at conferences about innovative teaching methods and materials. Having the benefit of peer evaluation (internal and external) of innovative materials and methods is especially desirable.

2.2.3 *Criteria for Assessment of Teaching*

2.2.3.1 *Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor*

2.2.3.1.1 *Excellence*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a substantial amount of teaching (considering

the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) and has established strong performance across each of the three dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. The strong performance at instruction is confirmed in student evaluations (for example, high average numerical ratings on key questions, depending on the size and nature of the courses and with full consideration for the potential biases, limitations or weaknesses of such instruments, coupled with indications of excellence in the open-ended comments from students), in unsolicited letters from students, and in peer observations). Excellence in teaching accomplishments to date forms the basis for promotion to Associate Professor; high promise of continued development in teaching forms the basis for tenure.

The evidence indicates strong, consistent contributions to student advising and mentoring of students at different levels; co-authored publications with students are especially valuable. The candidate has made exceptional contributions to course or curriculum development and to innovation in pedagogy recognized beyond the campus. In the case of pedagogical contributions, peer review confirms the excellence of the contributions. The faculty member must demonstrate a record of high quality publicly disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching.

2.2.3.1.2 Very Good/highly satisfactory

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a significant amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). The candidate has made significant contributions to course or curriculum development. The candidate has made significant use of innovative or high-impact teaching practices and obtained peer observation of such practices. Evidence from peer observation, student evaluations (with full consideration for the potential biases, limitations or weaknesses of such instruments), unsolicited letters from students, and other sources reflects a high degree of success in motivating and achieving student learning. Evidence from peer assessment and student evaluations indicates the candidate's consistent use of feedback to improve instruction.

The evidence indicates significant contributions to student advising and mentoring of students at different levels, including supervising numerous student projects and mentoring students toward publication of academic work and receipt of academic awards, as well as a record of significant contributions to curriculum development, peer-reviewed scholarship in teaching, and/or other contributions to pedagogy.

2.2.3.1.3 Effective/Satisfactory

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a reasonable amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations). Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, 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. As noted above, the inherent limitations of student course evaluations should fully recognized when used as an assessment tool. 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 observations 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.

2.2.3.1.4 *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 fully recognized when used as an assessment tool.] Peer observations 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 the faculty member 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.

2.2.3.2 *Promotion to Professor*

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

2.2.3.2.1 *Excellence*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a substantial amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the courses, and the number of different preparations) and has established strong performance across each of the three dimensions of teaching during time in rank: instruction, mentoring and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. The strong performance at instruction is confirmed in student evaluations (for example, very high average numerical ratings on key questions, depending on the size and nature of the courses and with full consideration for the potential biases, limitations or weaknesses of such instruments, coupled with indications of excellence in the open-ended comments from students), in unsolicited letters from students, and in peer observation.

The evidence indicates strong, consistent contributions to student advising as well as exceptional mentoring of students at different levels and the candidate has made exceptional contributions to course or curriculum development and to innovation in pedagogy recognized beyond the campus. The faculty member has established a national or international reputation for pedagogical contributions, and peer observation and review confirms the excellence of those contributions.

2.2.3.2.2 *Very Good/highly satisfactory*

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a significant amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the size and 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.

2.2.3.2.3 Effective/Satisfactory

The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has executed a reasonable amount of teaching (considering the number of courses taught, the size and 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.

2.2.3.2.4 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.

2.3 Service

2.3.1 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, although candidates need not contribute equally to each type of service.

2.3.2 Evidence of Service Quality

2.3.2.1 School and University Service

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:

2.3.2.1.1 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.

2.3.2.1.2 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.

2.3.2.2 Service to the Profession

Service to the profession involves activities that enhance the quality of disciplinary or professional organizations or activities. This includes the following categories:

2.3.2.2.1 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.

2.3.2.2.2 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.

Many of these services activities can also contribute to the faculty member's reputation as a scholar or are indicators of the extent to which the faculty member is gaining--or has--established a national reputation as a scholar. Thus, there can be a clear relationship to the assessment of the research area as well.

2.3.2.3 Public Service

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, non-profit, 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 service activity within their areas of expertise as the occasion permits.

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 non-profit 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 or 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.

2.3.2.4 Evaluation of Service Activities

2.3.2.4.1 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.

2.3.2.4.2 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.

2.3.2.4.3 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.

2.3.2.4.4 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.

2.3.3 Criteria for Assessment of Service

2.3.3.1 Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

2.3.3.1.1 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. Excellent service accomplishments to date forms the basis for promotion to Associate Professor; high promise of continued quality development in service forms the basis for tenure.

2.3.3.1.2 *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.

2.3.3.1.3 *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.

2.3.3.1.4 *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.

2.3.3.2 *Promotion to Professor*

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

2.3.3.2.1 *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.

2.3.3.2.2 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.

2.3.3.2.3 Satisfactory

The evidence establishes that the faculty member contributes effectively and at a level beyond that 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.

2.3.3.2.4 Unsatisfactory

The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member contributes 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.

2.4 Appendix A.

Table 1: Who votes on promotion/tenure to which rank?

CANDIDATES		VOTING-ELIGIBLE FACULTY							
		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.	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	Senior Lecturer	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Scientist /Scholar	Senior Scientist/Scholar	x	x					x	
	Assoc. Scientist/Scholar	x	x					x	x

2.5 Appendix B.

Primary evidence of instructional quality

- a) A faculty member's articulation of a conscious and reflective teaching strategy, teaching goals, and efforts to develop pedagogical skills
- b) 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.
- c) Grants and awards for course development and evidence of implementation in courses.
- d) Participation in campus instructional training/orientation. For example, attendance at IU Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning workshops and evidence of implementation in courses
- e) Student, peer, and external recognition of teaching excellence, when holistically assessed and not based entirely on numerical course evaluations
- f) Publications related to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL)
- g) Conference/workshop/meeting presentations related to SOTL
- h) Evidence of grading strategies that effectively challenge students
- i) 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.
- j) 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
- k) Evidence of student mentoring, recommendation/reference/award nomination letters, etc.
- l) Numerical portions of student course evaluations (again, with appropriate rate of response)
- m) Participation in SPEA's peer assessment of teaching activities, including evidence of a conscious effort to incorporate the feedback received
- n) evidence of peer mentoring, leadership, and other teaching-related service to faculty development
- o) Other formal outside training or professional development (e.g., FACET) in teaching and student learning and evidence of implementation in courses
- p) Number of students taught and sizes of course sections
- q) Range and variety of courses taught; range and variety of student cohorts taught
- r) Evidence that all courses have articulated the expected student learning outcomes