

Definitions-Examples Related to Senior Lecturer and Teaching Professor Expectations

Source: These examples are taken **from experience and input** from attendees at a workshop on promotion in the lecturer ranks: invitees were department chairs, school and department P&T chairs, members of the Ad Hoc committee, and associate deans for faculty affairs. *These are NOT formal guidelines but advice about what reviewers may think about activities.*

For each term, examples are given, with some sketches as to what would qualify as “excellence.”

Indented items are new examples.

Includes some current campus PT language.

Schools and departments should consider these as starting points for their conversations, considering opportunities and possibilities that are specific to their disciplines and teaching context.

Contents

Peer-reviewed.....	1
Dissemination	2
2019-2020 PT Guideline language on “Dissemination”	3
Leadership (for ‘excellence’).....	5
Mentoring (for ‘excellence’)	5

Peer-reviewed

Commentary: Current PT language about “peer-review” places it in the context of “scholarship,” that true scholarship is peer-reviewed.

Another component of “peer-review” is to avoid self-publishing—ensuring that something has undergone at least some review by experts other than the author; also to avoid sham or predatory journals which will publish anything that pays a fee.

We already have definitions or usages of ‘peer-review’ that are not the classic, “double-blind referee” model.

- In law, law reviews are edited / reviewed by *students*, not technically peers, but that is the common method of scholarly communication.
- In physics, “pre-prints” are widely shared and commented on.
- Some conferences have competitive pre-conference review procedures; those reviews may look only at abstracts or might encompass the whole paper; or, a paper may be reviewed post-presentation for inclusion in published proceedings.

Not to mention notorious cases of items successfully getting through peer review and yet being, um, shoddy at best.

For lecturer-track faculty, consider which of these would qualify as ‘peer-reviewed’ accomplishments, if “peer reviewed” is required (only) for teaching professor?

Presentation at the Assessment Institute. Held in Indianapolis, has a national audience. Presentations are competitively reviewed, but only at the abstract level.

Presentation at the EC Moore Symposium (annual. Blind peer review by teaching experts).

Presentation at IU Online: IU-wide.

Teaching item in the Digital Teaching Repository. “The Digital Teaching Repository is a peer-reviewed, online archive of instructional materials created by educators at IUPUI, IUPUC, and IU Fort Wayne. The Repository will include syllabi, video tutorials, in-class activities, and other practical teaching artifacts. All entries are indexed by [ScholarWorks](#) which provides powerful data analytics and an international reach.”

News or report in the Quality Matters site <https://www.qualitymatters.org/index.php/qa-resources/resource-center/articles-resources> (Presume this is editorially reviewed)

Quality Matters review of course design (external, peer-reviewed).

Teaching-related article in a professional journal/newsletter of wide scope, e.g. Inside Higher Ed, Chronicle of Higher Education, (or similar disciplinary/profession item such as American Libraries)

Teaching-related **op ed / editorial** / opinion piece article in a professional journal/newsletter of wide scope, e.g. Inside Higher Ed, Chronicle of Higher Education, (or similar disciplinary/profession item such as American Libraries)

Article, or op-ed, in a professional state-wide electronic journal/newsletter/newsfeed; could be post-reviewed by experts for validity of content.

Presentation on a discipline/ profession-related topic at a state conference, e.g. “Indiana Court Records” at the Society of Indiana Archivists, or “Family Business Succession Planning” (by a Kelley lecturer) at the Chamber of Commerce; some review of proposals by experts.

Consider also cases of **invited** presentations, if the invitation is based on recognized expertise.

Dissemination

For several aspects of this question, see above section on *Peer review*.

Here, a question is, does the item need to be *retrievable?* (persistent)

An article in a peer-reviewed journal, with a “doi” [digital object identifier] and available in academic databases such as ProQuest (for-profit aggregator), Elsevier (for-profit publisher), or Project Muse (non-profit aggregator).

A conference *abstract* available online in an archive describing a conference.

A conference *paper* available in a published (online / print) conference proceedings

Conference slides/presentation, recorded and saved in IUPUI ScholarWorks repository

Conference slides/presentation, recorded and saved in a disciplinary repository (e.g. arXiv for physics)

A copy (pdf, picture) of a conference brochure, documenting that the event did take place, but no content provided.

A blog posting—self-hosted? Hosted by an organization?

2019-2020 PT Guideline language on “Dissemination”

Assessment of dissemination outlets:

[The Guidelines assume that the following constitute types of dissemination outlets (in Chair responsibilities section):]

- Journals
 - Presses
 - Editions
 - Galleries
 - Presentations
 - “IUPUI encourages dissemination of results in appropriate media of high quality even when these outlets are unusual for the discipline.”
- **Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media, is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence.**
[same language for all ranks and types]
 - Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
 - In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate’s work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination. Candidates and department chairs (or deans) may wish to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may better fit with standards in the field.

Area of Excellence

“Lecturers are required to be excellent in teaching and satisfactory in service. They have no formal research requirements for promotion although scholarship is required in their area of excellence.”

Standard for Excellence

“Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching.”

Documenting Teaching Performance

(from appendix)

Scholarship of teaching and national leadership:

- CV: Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline
- Candidate statement: Descriptions of scholarly approach

Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance

Instruction:

Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes

The case for teaching excellence is grounded in a sophisticated teaching philosophy

Evidence of innovative and reflective teaching practice.

Course or curricular development:

In addition to producing effective course and curricular products, shows evidence of having disseminated ideas within the profession or generally through publication, presentation or other means. Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally and nationally) indicates excellence.

Mentoring and advising:

Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach

High accomplishments of students mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor

Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising documented

Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students

External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work

Scholarly activities, including awards:

Documentation of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others through appropriate dissemination channels

Positive departmental evaluations of the stature of the published work (e.g., journals)

Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations or other dissemination methods

National or international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects

Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required to document excellence for clinical and tenure-track faculty

Professional Development Efforts in Teaching

Extensive record of participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning

Membership in communities of practice on the campus, national, or international level

Participation in dissemination of good practice

Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area

Leadership (for 'excellence')

In this section, I give some examples of 'leaders' and indications of *excellence*. (Someone could formally 'lead' a project or area without necessarily being excellent at it.)

Course coordinator: Course SSSS 101 has 10 sections per semester. Person institutes a new orientation for adjunct faculty; sets up a pairing between experienced and new adjuncts; performs evaluations for every adjunct. The indications of *excellence* could lie in the innovation of a NEW orientation; in high satisfaction by adjuncts (surveyed by department chair?); in lower complaints from students; in lower DFW rates; in higher transition-to-major status.

Program administrator: Person leads initial accreditation efforts: coordinates all efforts, prepares majority of the report, corresponds with accreditors. "regular" performance might be running an accredited program, "excellent" performance might be achieving new levels or areas of accreditation.

Curricular innovator: person is the CTL liaison faculty member; disseminates new technologies, evaluates, adjusts to particular program/department needs. Markers of excellence might be systematic and enhanced usage of technology tools; appreciation of role by department faculty (full time and adjunct).

Program assessment: initially serves as school member of curriculum committee, then as member of campus PRAC committee; excellent level might be heading a subcommittee of PRAC or chairing PRAC; acting as a consultant on assessment for other programs.

Mentoring (for 'excellence')

Mentoring-of-faculty (improving THEIR instruction)

Is designated mentor for all new faculty with regard to teaching. Mentees highly satisfied, report concrete improvements / assistance.

Is designated mentor for all new adjuncts. Or all new NTT faculty.

Develops mentoring manual.

Develops and administers mentor-matching system.

Depending on area, mentoring of high school level teachers in coordinated programs.

Mentoring-of-students is what is referred to in current guidelines

Consistently receives student-research awards; consistently advises students who win grants or awards.

Mentees consistently win prizes for work.

Supervises students doing independent study or masters theses

From current guidelines:

Suggestions for Evaluating Teaching [*not separated by type of faculty or rank.*]

Mentoring and Advising

Mentoring and advising characterized by scholarly approach High accomplishments of students consistently linked to influence of mentor.

Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising not evidence mentoring and advising documented

Demonstrated impact on accomplishments of mentored and advised students

External peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work