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Agenda

Welcome

Supporting developing research: IU Research

Campus criteria
  Overview-Expectations
  Don’t forget: satisfactory in teaching and service
  Key points:
  – Trajectory: emerging or achieved national reputation; time in rank
  – Independence: Research roles
  – Impact
  – Interdisciplinary? Team? Community-engaged? Unusual for your unit?

Documentation

Process: Levels of review
  External reviewers
  Department; Chair
  School; Dean
  Campus; EVC, Chancellor, President
Quick: Resources for Research Support

IU Office of Research. [https://research.iu.edu](https://research.iu.edu)

IUPUI workshops

[https://research.iu.edu/training/iupui-research-development-workshops.html](https://research.iu.edu/training/iupui-research-development-workshops.html)

**IUPUI resources** for research support (OVCR)

**Data analysis resources** (OVCR)

Also see [theforum.iupui.edu](https://theforum.iupui.edu)
Criteria for Excellence in Research

Overview

Here: Campus level!

Consult department and school criteria
For tenure track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate Professor Tenure Track²</th>
<th>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerging national reputation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor Tenure Track²</th>
<th>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Chart for guidelines]
Key points in discerning excellence

• Trajectory .... Time in rank
• Independence
• Impact
Trajectory; work in rank

For promotion to associate tenure-track: an emerging national reputation

On the one hand:
Reputation is built on EVERYTHING you have done

On the other hand:
What have you done for me lately?

Build a narrative in your candidate statement that shows your past, present and future
Does prior work count???

- YES and NO.
  - For tenure: trajectory
  - For full: national reputation

“In many cases, it is understood that national reputation depends, in part, on foundational work that may have occurred earlier in the candidate’s career.”

“For faculty, publications and presentations in rank at another institution prior to appointment at IUPUI will be considered part of the candidate’s record. The overall pattern of productivity over time will be scrutinized, with emphasis placed on recent work and scholarly trajectory” (p. 29)

You build as you go AND

You can’t stop in place
Work in rank: mark on CV

For promotion to associate:

Usually counts as in-rank:

• Did you receive formal credit on your tenure clock? If yes, those years DO count.

• Were you in the exact same title and status at a previous university (assistant professor, tenure-track) and your total years at that rank are 5-7 years? Those years usually count (even if you didn’t get formal credit).

This doesn’t count:

• Productivity during a postdoc

• Research scientist / equivalent

This might count:

• Visiting

Spell this out absolutely positively clearly at the time of the third year review
Work in rank: mark on CV
For promotion to full

Items count as in-rank if they were not part of the decision for associate

Publications, presentations, or grants which were pending or in-process when you submitted your dossier for associate, can be in-rank for full professor.

Quick hint: don’t needlessly update your associate-rank dossier.

Needlessly: when reviews are positive
Update: pending items.
Work in rank: The COVID problem

IUPUI does not yet have a standard way to address the impact of COVID on productivity

For now:

• An approved tenure clock extension *(for any reason)* means that reviewers and candidates should state that they have had an extension and thus their tenure review period consists of X number of years irrespective of the calendar years.

• Focus on **quality not quantity**. IUPUI criteria ALREADY state that sheer quantity is not a criterion, and asks candidates to identify 3-5 key works.

We are trained to be uncomfortable with thinking about personal lives; but, ignoring reality means rewarding people who have one particular type of personal life and penalizing everybody else.
More on Quality and Quantity

IUPUI Guidelines have the word “quality” 69 times.

“Quantity” appears twice:
  “Quantity of patient service ordinarily is not a sufficient factor in promotion or tenure”

Documenting Research and Creative Activities grid, Research Expectations: Peer Review: “Comment on fit with IUPUI and department/school goals and quantity of effort”

- Identification and discussion of the three-to-five most significant publications that reflect the candidate's major research accomplishments in rank.
  - IUPUI places a higher value on quality and impact of research than number of publications.
Independence

*Be the fisher.....*
Independence

Member of lab
- Do what you’re told
- Co-author with mentor

First real job

Tenure and/or promotion

Head of lab
- Tell others what to do
- Lead author
Other terms for “independence”

Many faculty engage in:
  - multi-author
  - multi-disciplinary
  - collaborative
  - intersectional
  - community engaged work

It is understood that the result (the publication, presentation, impact) is not the sole responsibility or to the sole credit of one person.

  BUT

Be sure to describe how YOU contributed to the whole:

  - Unique contribution
  - Essential part of a team
  - Catalytic coordinator

What distinguishes you from unnamed staff who do what they are told?

How would the effort change (falter, fail) if you weren’t involved?
Path to independence: Single-author

Dissertation

Publishing chapters or books from dissertation

Articles in middle-range journals

Chapters or books that extend beyond dissertation

Articles in leading journals
Path to independence: Multi-author, grants

Unnamed staff
Consultant
Key personnel // co-Investigator
Training/early career grant PI*
Co-PI, PI major grant*

* major role in grant, major percent of effort covered by grants
Path to independence: Multi-author, publications

Student co-author with lab director

3rd or lower-listed author, with lab director

Lower-listed author, with others not at Ph.D. institution

Corresponding author

Lead author
Documenting independence

**Candidate statement**: Vivid, knowledgeable and assured description of YOUR own research agenda—your ideas and projects.

**CV, publication**: Progression from being-a-student-co-author, to being a lead or leading or communicating author; having student co-authors
  - Publishing with people OTHER than mentor
  - Publishing items where the science has markedly progressed beyond dissertation or post-doc work.

**CV, grants**: Progression from project staff (unnamed), consultant / key personnel (named), co-I, then PI or co-PI

**External affirmation**: Description of your role from collaborators
External affirmation of your role

At least:

• From at least one co-author for your “3-5 significant items.”

Best:

• Each multi-author work as you go along:
  
  • Journal / form for author responsibilities ← preserve
  
  • Email to a co-author: “I need to document my role. It was ____; do you agree? If so please respond, if not, let me know how to describe it.”
Impact

This week I achieved unprecedented levels of unverifiable levels of productivity.
What do you mean by “impact”? Think of both:

Proxies for impact of your work:
- Peer-review
- Prestige or competitiveness of venue
- Receipt of funding

Direct evidence of impact of your work:
- Citations
- Downloads
- Use in teaching or industry
- Knowledge/reputation
h-index is quick, easy, and limited

Rachel Applegate
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
Verified email at iupui.edu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cited by</th>
<th>VIEW ALL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Since 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-index</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i10-index</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cited by</th>
<th>VIEW ALL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Since 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-index</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i10-index</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Google Scholar

Cited by
VIEW ALL
|
| Citations | 813 | 362 |
| h-index   | 14  | 8   |
| i10-index | 15  | 7   |
Support available

IUPUI University Library
Research Metrics Team

https://researchmetrics.iupui.edu
resmet@iupui.edu

Includes University Library, Law Library, Medicine Library, and Dental Library

Or contact your subject liaison librarian

Subject Librarians: Find your librarians

Subject Librarians

What is a subject liaison?

Subject liaisons are librarians designated by the library to serve specific schools, departments, and programs and to support the teaching, learning, and research needs of faculty and students in these units. The extent of each liaison’s activity will be affected by the nature of the discipline; departments, schools, and programs are not all alike and will not require the same degree of liaison activity.
Unusual research

P&T guidelines on interdisciplinary research

Can also be applied to:

- Community-engaged scholarship
- New areas of inquiry
- New methods of inquiry

New to your department

“In the instance of candidates who work in interdisciplinary fields that transcend the intellectual authority of any single school/unit, special arrangements for primary and unit committee reviews may be necessary.” p. 33

“If the candidate’s scholarship is interdisciplinary, team science, or public in nature, consider adding additional ad hoc members who can appreciate the interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of the work to be reviewed to the primary/department committee for that case. Such ad hoc members should be added in consultation with the duly constituted primary committee.” p. 10
For community-engaged research

1. New campus committee: Public-community Engaged Scholarship Review Committee (PESRC)

2. Candidates at the third year review may choose to have their candidate statement and CV reviewed. The resulting letter can be used:
   - To help the candidate see how to express their work clearly
   - To point out to the candidate community-engagement factors that are strong and those that need strengthening
   - The candidate can also submit it to their department review committee, to illustrate their community engagement profile.

Contact Margie Ferguson mferguso@iupui.edu
Documentation
You need to prepare materials outside the edossier

For distribution to external reviewers:

• Candidate statement (7 pages)
• CV in IUPUI format
• Key research pieces often parked in OneDrive or Scholarworks

Winter->Spring before the campus cycle starts
Evidence for documenting **research** mentioned in P&T guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three - five most significant publications which reflect major research accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of stature of journals in which articles appear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research goals/program of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of contributions when more than one author or collaborator or performer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to interdisciplinary research or creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stature of grants and other awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing efforts to enhance research and scholarship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- You
- Chair
- And chair
- External
- And external

---

IUPUI
Flash guide: eDossier

Workshops:
- Video from December
- PPt from December
eDossier available in mid-summer

Candidate statement (5-7 pages) + CV

Main dossier candidate sections (45 page limit)

Details, description, and substantiation

“3-5 key accomplishments in rank” ←most important!

Appendices

Full, original, and/or raw items: student evaluation reports, copies of articles, letters from collaborators

Not used at the campus level. Not very used at the schools
Guides to eDossier folder contents

• Set up your own folders
• Label documents (files) carefully
• Everything should be in pdf format
• Folder guide:
  – Tenure track, research as area of excellence
  – Also included in the P&T Guidelines
P&T Cycle, process and roles

Exact timing depends on YOUR SCHOOL! (and department).

The fall before you enter the cycle, make sure your chair knows your plans.
## People and PT cycle responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Statement, CV, Research examples, Dossier</td>
<td>January - April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Evaluation of outlets, External letter solicitation</td>
<td>April – May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department committee</td>
<td>Assessment compared to department standards: closest <em>disciplinary</em> examination</td>
<td>prior Sept-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair (again)</td>
<td>Chair’s assessment</td>
<td>August-Sept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School (unit) committee</td>
<td>Assessment compared to school standards: broader, but still <em>colleagues</em></td>
<td>Sept-Oct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People and responsibilities - within the PT cycle

Candidate | Update materials?
---|---
Dean | Evaluation: own, plus summing up external, chair, department and school
Campus P&T Committee | Comparison to campus standards
EVC Kathy Johnson | Evaluation of process
independent vote | vote
Chancellor Paydar | vote, submission to trustees
and Pres. MacRobbie

Minor: new acceptances
Major: in response to negative votes: New evidence OR new arguments

October
January-March
March-April
Topics we won’t address here:

• How to document satisfactory teaching and service (not-your-area-of-excellence).
  – This is highly dependent on what your school expects to see.
  – Generic campus expectations are in the eDossier workshops.

Make sure you have student evaluations, at least 2 peer evaluations of teaching, and you serve on appropriate school committees.
Thanks
Panelists!

Margie Ferguson
Professor
Dept. of Political Science
School of Liberal Arts

Joseph Wallace
Professor
Dept. of Biomedical Engineering
School of Engineering and Technology

Katharine Head
Associate Professor
Dept. of Communication Studies
School of Liberal Arts

Davide Bolchini
Professor
Dept of Human-Centered Computing
School of Informatics and Computing

Sample dossiers:

To associate:
Aaron Ganci, Herron
Kati Head, Liberal Arts
Leslie Hulvershorn, Medicine
Lixin Wang, Science
AJ Baucum, Science
Tamika Zapolski, Science
Nikki Munk, Health & Human Sciences
Catherine Hudnall, Herron
Heather Hundley, Medicine
Carly Schall, Liberal Arts

To full:
Wan-Ning Bao, Liberal Arts
David Basile, Medicine
Diane Von Ah, Nursing
Leslie Ashburn-Nardo, Science
Davide Bolchini, Informatics
Ray Konger, Medicine
Thank you!

rapplega@iupui.edu for individual questions!

Rachel Applegate
Assistant Vice Chancellor
for Faculty Affairs