Key evidence (provided by the candidate):

- A CV. Hyperlinks to online versions or dois for key publications are essential.
  - Some disseminated scholarship is required in the “research” category.
  - Most disseminated scholarship will go in the “teaching” category.
- Candidate statement.
  - Within this, the candidate should describe their area of teaching expertise, including disseminated scholarship. Some description of a research agenda is required; it may be more or less connected to teaching scholarship but must be labelled independently.
- 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 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.
- Future plans. Tenure, especially, is based on confidence in future work.
- Satisfactory work in research and in service.

Distinctive elements:

- A teaching philosophy must be presented; reviewers do not judge the philosophy itself but on how it drives action and scholarship.
- The candidate should present evidence of an “emerging national reputation” for their area of teaching scholarship.
- Teaching excellence must be manifested both internally (being a good teacher/contributor to teaching) and externally (peer-reviewed dissemination, contributions to scholarship of teaching and learning.)

External reviewers:

External reviewers should assess evidence of the quality of both disseminated scholarship of teaching and learning, and, what evidence is presented of teaching activity (e.g. syllabi.). Personal experience of candidate’s teaching in conferences is relevant but not required. External reviewers may also comment on the research presented; IU rules require tenure track
faculty to have activity in BOTH teaching AND research, although the division of items between those areas is dependent on the candidate’s specific circumstances. Reviewers may assume that service is satisfactory, although they may remark on anything special. Explaining special disciplinary aspects 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:

- Research (requires peer-reviewed dissemination in venues appropriate to the topic)
- Service (both internal and off-campus (research or teaching)

Internal reviewers have access to the entire dossier contents and should review evidence of student learning, impact of teaching innovations, and contributions to the science of learning.

The division between scholarship that is “teaching” and that which is “research” is not something that external reviewers will be familiar with, so internal reviewers should overlook any confusion on their part. (At most universities, all peer-evaluated dissemination is considered research, with the rare exception of textbooks.)

It is especially important for the chair and the department committee to place the candidate’s teaching-excellence achievements in the context of expected faculty responsibilities in research and service in the particular unit, as well as anything distinctive about particular teaching missions or initiatives of the school or department (e.g. new programs.)

For candidates for full rank, excellence in teaching should reach a high/national level, and should be sustained for some time although not necessarily perfectly consistently. It is not unusual for faculty to switch areas of excellence between associate-rank and full-rank promotions.