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Agenda

Welcome

- Concepts and Evidence for Demonstrating **Excellence** in Teaching
  - But first: “Satisfactory”
- Quick: Developing teaching excellence—resources
- Defining excellence/criteria
- Documenting excellence/dossier
- Satisfactory in research (and service)
- Panel discussion with Q & A
Out of All 2018-2019 Tenure Track Cases (93)

All faculty:
59 research cases (32 to associate, 17 to full, 6 tenure-only)
18 service cases (10 to associate, 8 to full)
8 teaching cases (5 to associate, 3 to full)
6 balanced cases (1 to associate, 5 to full)

Non-School of Medicine:
36 research cases (23 to associate, 8 to full; 5 tenure-only)
All teaching and all balanced cases

School of Medicine:
23 research cases (9 to associate, 13 to full, 1 tenure only)
All service cases

2 librarian cases (performance)

Most reviewers are tenure-track and research-area
We take teaching seriously

“there are specific responsibilities that devolve upon the academic appointee who accepts a position at Indiana University.
“A teacher will maintain a clear connection between the advance description and the conduct and content of each course presented to ensure efficient subject selection by students.

A teacher will clearly state the course goals and will inform students of testing and grading systems; moreover, these systems should be intellectually justifiable and consistent with the rules and regulations of the academic division.

A teacher will plan and regulate class time with an awareness of its value for every student and will meet classes regularly.

A teacher will remain available to students and will announce and keep liberal office hours at hours convenient to students.

A teacher will strive to develop among students respect for others and their opinions by demonstrating his or her own respect for each student as an individual, regardless of age, color, disability, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status.

A teacher will strive to generate a proper respect for an understanding of academic freedom by students. At the same time, a teacher will emphasize high standards and strive to protect students from irrelevant and trivial interruptions or diversions.”
Satisfactory: All Faculty
(Except research scientists)

- Compliance with program, campus, and university policies (e.g. at least minimal use of Canvas, grading rosters, office hours, and responsiveness to questions)
- Participation in program learning infrastructure (assessment of student learning, FLAGS, etc.)
- Student input about teaching (course evaluations)
- Peer reviews of teaching
  - Peer=other teaching faculty in your unit

Faculty asserting excellence in teaching MUST go well beyond satisfactory
Excellence:

In teaching:

• Reflection on and improvement of own teaching
• Evidence of student learning
• External peer evaluation of course development

Tenure track faculty must also have:

Scholarship of teaching:

• Associate: Emerging national reputation
• Full: National reputation
How do you develop excellence?
Center for Teaching and Learning

Events/workshops/resources

- https://ctl.iupui.edu
- https://ctl.iupui.edu/Workshops-Events/Events/EventListing
- Documenting your teaching

Teaching philosophy

Scholarly teaching taxonomy

General IU resources:

- Teaching.iu.edu
- Teachingonline.iu.edu
More resources: **The Forum**

The Forum Network supports faculty collaboration and creativity by providing resources to spark innovation in teaching and research. It intentionally forges and sustains connections among various centers, divisions, and offices providing professional development and support, and helps to accelerate progress toward all strategic plan goals.
What Constitutes Excellence?
IUPUI PROMOTION & TENURE GUIDELINES

The Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers are revised annually, based on feedback received during each year's promotion and tenure cycle. Upon completing their deliberations, the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Committee suggests edits or revisions to the campus guidelines. These changes are meant to clarify - not alter - the process for all those involved and are made in collaboration with the IUPUI Faculty Council Executive Committee.

To view the guidelines that govern dossier submissions for the 2019-20 P&T review cycle:

- [Important changes for 2019-20](#)
- [Final version](#)
- [Version showing changes](#)

To view the guidelines that govern dossier submissions for the 2020-21 P&T review cycle:
Excellence in Teaching

- Sophisticated teaching philosophy - reflective, innovative, evolved over time
  - Discussion of approach, methodology, goals and their achievement
  - Teaching innovation, curricular development, incorporation of new technology
- Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated, peer-reviewed scholarship
- Documented by peer/student evaluation over time
- Evidence of impact on student performance and learning outcomes
- Teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects

More on documenting this in a bit.
## Suggested Standards of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course or Curricular Development</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring and Advising</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
## Suggested Standards of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly Activities Including Awards</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development Efforts in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development and achievement

*Especially for teaching excellence, you should demonstrate not only static achievements, but describe your continuing improvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Final/late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend workshop</td>
<td>CTL review of applying workshop ideas</td>
<td>Presenting at a workshop/conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create syllabus</td>
<td>Peer review and student evaluation → design changes</td>
<td>Evidence of student learning achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial teaching philosophy</td>
<td>Reflection on teaching experiences</td>
<td>Teaching philosophy that addresses your growth and has plans for the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer-reviewed dissemination

Scholarship = peer-reviewed dissemination
Why peer review?

Shoot First and Ask Questions Later

Scientific Fraud and Conflict Of Interest In Vaccine Research, Licensing & Policymaking
The 2nd International Public Conference on Vaccination 2000, Arlington Virginia

By Michael Belkin © Sept 10, 2000

These vaccine mandates are despotic intrusions into personal liberty and democracy.

In Business School, (Organizational Behavior) we studied what can happen to organizations that suffer ethical management breakdowns (such as Johns Manville with asbestos, Owens Corning breast implants, etc.). Nothing illustrates the syndrome of management ethical failure more clearly than the current scandal faced by Firestone and Ford. Those companies denied and concealed deaths and injurie caused by tread separation and a high center of gravity in the Ford Explorer for years. Management knew, denied and concealed that their products were defective and were killing people -- the classic ethical breakdown. In the vaccine industry, scientific fraud and conflicts of interest are causing a similar (but much larger) cycle of deaths and injuries that is being concealed and denied by regulators and vaccine manufacturers. However, (as with Firestone and Ford) a noose of their own making may b slowly tightening around the vaccine scandal perpetrator’s necks. Financial conflict of interest is a complex issue -- because few investors (except perhaps Tibetan Monks or Jesuit Priests) are likely to not have pharmaceutical shares in their diversified portfolios in this day and age. But financial conflict of interest and scientific fraud (that lead to corrupt public policy) damage the public interest and could
Tenure-track faculty must work on both:

Scholarship

- Traditional journals
- Books – *be sure to document the review process*
- Textbooks—can you establish adoption by others?
- Electronic media: be sure to document peer review

Reputation

- Blog postings
- Quotes in media
Remember: Your case is Your Case

Instruction
Curriculum Development
Mentoring
Scholarly activities
Awards

Not every case will have the same weight in each area

Undergraduate: probably
  Instruction
  Curriculum development

Graduate: probably
  Mentoring
  Scholarly activities

“Awards” are not required, but are included if available.
Be prepared for campus-level
Begin with school-level

Each school has its own culture, collection of disciplines, and approaches to documentation.

In your school, ask about Trustee Teaching Award criteria.

Most people going up for promotion on teaching will be in the minority within their school, so start early to talk with your department and school people about what makes sense to them.
Satisfactory in Research

All tenure-track faculty must **also** be satisfactory in service AND in research.

"Satisfactory" means some peer-reviewed dissemination that is presented as "research."

- You cannot put **all** of your scholarship into the ‘teaching’ bin.
- You must have at least some research that is disciplinary-focused.
- Dividing scholarship between ‘teaching’ and ‘research’ is **arbitrary**. It needs to be plausible, not perfect.
  - Scholarship on how undergraduates learn = ‘teaching’
  - Scholarship on how high school students learn could be ’research’
How do you document excellence?
Making the unseen, obvious: for others

Sending to external reviewers:

• Candidate’s statement: 5+2 pages describing your role and achievements as a faculty member

• Work products demonstrating skills
  – Syllabi/course materials
  – Dissemination products (papers, presentations)
  – Summarized peer or student evaluations

• CV in IUPUI format: teaching activities and “bins”

This packet for external reviewers is sent in spring before the fall in which you are reviewed on campus. It must be ready BEFORE your eDossier.
External Review

PURPOSE

Objective Evaluation

- National/international reputation (tt)
- Accomplishments in area of excellence
- Significance of scholarship
- Stature of dissemination outlets
- Contributions to professional organizations
- Professional standing and expertise

Minimum of 6 arms-length letters of external review required
Not more than one per institution

CANDIDATE’S ROLE

May

- Provide a list of experts or leaders in their field
- Provide names of persons not to contact

Cannot

- Control the final selection of reviewers
- Know the final list of reviewers
- List mentors, close personal friends, co-authors, and collaborators
Candidate’s Statement

It’s Your Unique Story

• Narrative addressing one’s work (7 pages single-spaced)
  ▪ Option to split 5/2 with area of excellence
• Well-organized with headings/subheadings
  ▪ Understandable outside of discipline
  ▪ Reflective, explanatory, well-written
• Identify present and future focus
• Describe journey and accomplishments in each area of evaluation
• Discuss outcomes, impact, and significance of your work

Speaks FOR YOU at all levels of review
IUPUI P&T CV: 
not to be confused with a real CV

• A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accordance with the standard P&T format

• Use DMAI to generate

Your faculty annual report
“Bins” in the IUPUI CV

- Everything in DMAI and the CV needs to be tagged as belonging to teaching, research, or service.
- Individual items could potentially be in more than one: prioritize your area of excellence.
- Student contact of any kind, even on ‘disciplinary research’ (e.g. supervising masters theses) can be considered ‘teaching’ work.

If you are tenure track you need things in each ‘bin’
If you are clinical or lecturer you cannot have things in the ‘research’ bin
Pause to complain about the bins

The Bad:

- Dividing one’s life seems arbitrary or illogical.
- It’s a pain to separate parts of one’s CV.
- It has little resemblance to any real-world CV.

But....

- It’s required!
- It focuses on the main reason why you should be promoted or tenured.
- It’s better than pretending that everybody is excellent at everything.
Making the unseen, obvious: at IUPUI eDossier

- Candidate’s statement
- IUPUI CV
- Main sections of eDossier (50 pages)
  - Summarized and reflective materials
  - Illustrations of key points
- Appendices
  - Raw materials
Some documents listed on this page are available in Word format. Contact Karen Lee for availability.

**eDossier**

- eDossier overview
- Candidate, chair and administrator FAQs
- eDossier administrative FAQs

**Guides to Dossier Folders**

- eDossier folder structure
- Generic
- Clinical balanced
Each document covers exactly what you should **include** and also what **you can skip**.

- On: Charts and Guides page, see a Quick Guide to Candidate Statements
- You cannot access the actual edossier until mid-summer. Park your materials in Box or other medium while you wait.
Teaching: \( \text{required} \)
- Teaching statement: Option A: 7 page candidate statement, and separate 2-page teaching philosophy.
- Teaching load and goals: Brief discussion; note change.
- Peer review of teaching (aggregated): Include your current teaching load.
- Student evaluation of teaching (aggregate): Include.
- Disseminated scholarship on teaching and learning: [A dissemination. The actual items will go in the Appendix.]
All the raw material:

- Actual course evaluations
- Actual peer evaluations
- Articles, presentations, and papers*
- Course materials (syllabi and assignments)

Consult with your school about what is expected
- Campus does not use these
- Can create hyperlinks from regular sections to this
- NO GIANT PDFS: Provide tables of content and other guides for readers

*Consider using ScholarWorks for these materials: makes them accessible to external reviewers.
Assistance

To be a good teacher: theforum.iupui.edu

School and program-specific advice
  Your school chairs, deans or P&T committee
    – OAA will do school or department-specific workshops

Sample dossiers
  Also check with your program
Panel: I made it, so can you

Andy Buchenot
Associate Professor of English
School of Liberal Arts

Corinne Renguett
Associate Professor, Technical Communication
School of Engineering and Technology

James Mendez
Associate Professor, Chemistry
IUPUC Division of Science
Thank you!
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