Key evidence (provided by the candidate):

- A CV. Hyperlinks to online versions or dois for key publications are essential.
  - Most or all disseminated scholarship will go in the “service” category.
- Candidate statement.
  - Within this, the candidate should describe their area of service expertise referring both to accomplishments and to related disseminated scholarship.
  - Scholarship cannot be labelled as ‘research’ per IU rules.
- The rest of the dossier
  - Evidence of teaching activities and excellence: syllabi, assignments, student accomplishments, curricular projects. Make a mini-dossier of key material for external reviewers.
  - More details (where details would disrupt the flow of the candidate statement)
  - External confirmation of the candidate’s individual role in joint projects (grants, presentations, publications)
  - Explanations of any awards

Elements that are like any other clinical case:

- Independence and initiative. This is described in the candidate statement and should be confirmed, for at least the most important grants and dissemination, by co-worker statements.
- Peer-reviewed dissemination (presentations or publications), at the local/regional level for associate and national/international for full; may be academic or professionally peer-reviewed.
- Satisfactory service, internal, campus, or external as appropriate.

Distinctive elements:

- Within the context of the School of Medicine, “service” is generally oriented around patient care, either individually (e.g. the development of a new technique or therapy) or institutionally (e.g. the creation of a new service/specialty offering). It must be accompanied by dissemination, and, to constitute excellence, be clearly differentiated from routine and expected levels of patient care.
- For other schools, candidates should explain their use of the term “service,” which may include administrative, community, organizational, or governmental work. Clinical faculty must have peer-reviewed dissemination, but key indicators of value may also be found in reports, program outcomes, or influence on policy-making.

External reviewers:
External reviewers should assess evidence of the quality of the service activity as well as its associated disseminated scholarship. IU may classify some activity as “service” that reviewers...
may think of as “teaching” and vice versa; published scholarship may be considered “research” elsewhere. Please comment on overall quality and value, rather than categories. Explaining special disciplinary or professional importance is especially useful to IUPUI committees.

**Internal reviewers**

Internal reviewers should be able to determine quickly from the CV and statement that the candidate performs *at least satisfactorily* in their teaching responsibilities. IUPUI requires input about teaching from learners and from peer evaluators.

For service, clinical faculty must establish that their work is distinctly superior to that which is routine or required of all clinical faculty—in quality and not solely in quantity. There should be an element of leadership and innovation.

Where departments and schools have distinctive expectations of clinical faculty, they should take care to explain their assessments to future levels of review who will not be familiar with the context.