Agenda

Welcome

- Research scientists
- Supporting developing research: IU Research

Campus criteria

For promotion to associate
- Trajectory: pre-work, emerging national reputation, research potential
- Independence: Research roles
- Impact

For promotion to full
- Time in rank
- Sustained/special circumstances
- National reputation

Common critical points:
- Community-engaged scholarship
- Unusual research for your unit

Don’t forget: *satisfactory* in teaching and service

Process:
- External reviewers
  - Selection, materials
- Review committees
Research scientists [professors]

Differences from tenure-track expectations:

- **No teaching** expectation.
  - Research scientists may teach, but they may not be evaluated on teaching for the purposes of promotion.
  - In your dossier you can include teaching materials, but do not spend more than 1 paragraph of your candidate statement on this.
- **Limited service** expectations: “as unit requires.”
  - Internal: be clear about what your expected service is, and what you do. (e.g. serve on IRB panel).
  - External: use work with and for organizations, agencies, and journals to demonstrate your research expertise.
- **Reputational / independence** expectations:
  - Check with your unit!
  - For promotion to associate, campus does NOT require research independence (PI, lead author).
Quick: Resources for Research Support

IU Office of Research. https://research.iu.edu

IUPUI workshops

https://research.iu.edu/training/iupui-research-development-workshops.html

Also see theforum.iupui.edu
Quick: New course: Research Impact Challenge (March 21-25 2022 or at your own pace)

Research Impact Challenge

This week-long event includes quick and effective challenges to help you raise the visibility and impact of your scholarship. You will get hands-on practice using tools and platforms to enhance the impact and visibility of your research. For this 5-day challenge, instructions and tasks to complete each day will be provided through email allowing you to work at your own pace. If you would like email reminders (1 per day) and extra resources sent to you each day during the event, you can register below.

Register Now  DIY on your schedule
Criteria for Excellence in Research

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>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tenure Track²</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                   | 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.
Side trip: Reputation, Research

In IU language about “promotions” national reputation is essential to research cases. (ACA-38 Faculty and Librarian Promotions.)

[associate] “If research or other creative work is the primary criterion, the candidate should have demonstrated a broad grasp of his or her own and related fields and should be establishing a national reputation as a scholar.” [full] “If research or other creative work is the primary criterion, the candidate should have shown a continued growth in scholarship which has brought a national reputation as a first-class productive scholar.”

For teaching: [associate] “If teaching is the primary criterion, it should be distinctly superior to that of effective teachers at this and other major institutions.” [full] “If teaching is the primary criterion, the candidate must have demonstrated an extraordinary ability to stimulate in students, either undergraduate or graduate, a genuine desire for scholarly work. Wherever feasible he or she should have demonstrated the ability to direct the research of advanced students.”

For service: [associate] “If service to the University, profession, or community is the primary criterion, it should be discharged with merit and should reflect favorably on the University and on the individual’s academic status.” [full] “If administrative, professional, or academic service is the primary criterion, distinguished contributions must be evident.”
For promotion to associate
Key points in discerning **excellence** for promotion to associate

- Trajectory
- Independence
- Impact
Trajectory

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 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).

These don’t *usually* count:

- The dissertation itself
- Productivity during a postdoc
- Research scientist / equivalent

This might count:

- Visiting

For librarians: all work done at a professional level prior to promotion to associate counts.
Candidate statement

Highlight **three to five key items**.

At least two to three of them ought to be finalized at IUPUI.

Prior work may be mentioned as part of a research stream that culminated in the three-five items:

“In my dissertation I started exploring companion llamas, as an under-researched area, and in my postdoc years I published five subsequent articles on llama breeding and husbandry, one of which has been cited 127 times. This laid the foundation for my key work, *Llamas as PostModern Companions*, recently recognized as the outstanding paper of the year by the *Hobby Agricultural Science Society.*"
Independence

Be the fisher.....

YOU CAN GIVE A CAT A FISH, AND HE'LL EAT FOR A DAY

OR YOU CAN TEACH A CAT TO FISH, AND HE'LL SIT IN HIS BOAT, POUTING ALL DAY BECAUSE NOBODY GAVE HIM ANOTHER FISH
Independence

Tenure track faculty are tenured *one by one*.

Lab ➔ Team ➔ Leader

As a graduate student, you worked in a lab.

As a faculty member you are an essential part of a team.

As a senior faculty member you are expected to lead a lab.
You must describe your own unique contribution to team/group projects

Lab → Team → Leader

As a graduate student, you worked in a lab.

You do what you are told.

As a faculty member you are an essential part of a team.

You are responsible for choosing what is best to do.
You make a unique contribution based on your expertise.

As a senior faculty member you are expected to lead a lab.

You coordinate everybody to do what is best

Your candidate statement should be assured, direct, and explicit about what role YOU play, and the YOUR importance to each project.
Multi-author/investigator situations

Reviewers within your field will know author and investigator conventions.

Most campus reviewers will NOT know, and many school reviewers also will not know.

You AND YOUR CHAIR should explain:

• First author, last author, corresponding author, alphabetical listing if applicable.

For co-PI, co-I, and other grant roles, please ensure that your wording matches IU records exactly. Add notes if needed if you:

• Take over the execution of a project where the proposal was authored by someone else
• Author a grant but do not execute it yourself.
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.”
You will need to provide evidence of the impact of your work.

Carefully distinguish between your individual item and the venue in which it appears.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal, Conference, Edited Volume</th>
<th>Article, Presentation, Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selectivity (% acceptance rate)</td>
<td>Citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact factor</td>
<td>Downloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher or sponsor</td>
<td>Usage in courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

researchmetrics.iupui.edu
Peer-reviewed....and impact

1. Scholarly work must be presented in peer-reviewed venues

2. The results of the scholarly work may also be disseminated in:
   - Self-published blog postings / tweets
   - Op-eds
   - Newspaper or TV interviews

Diversity of skin color, skin tone lacking in sex ed textbooks

IU press release, not that important. External news source quoting it, yay!
For promotion to full
Time in rank

There is no rule

• “Five to ten years” is suggested....expected....commonly seen

“Sustained” ← what does that mean in your discipline?

Sustained WORK or sustained REPUTATION?

• “Sustained” in IUPUI guidelines is applied primarily to the **reputation** and not to the work:
  
  • “record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work in rank.”

  • “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.”

  • “Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.” *Your productivity does NOT have to be perfectly consistent.*
Does prior work count???

NO and YES

• No: mark all items that were added to your CV after you submitted your dossier for consideration for associate level = work ‘in rank.’

Typical reviewer focus:

- Internal: what have you done lately? (“No.”)
- External: all of what you have accomplished in your area of expertise (“Yes.”)
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.
Reputation

This week I achieved unprecedented levels of unverifiable levels of productivity.
h-index is quick, easy, and limited

Reviewers ARE going to check Google Scholar [this is just a fact of life]. Be sure you are not inconsistent with that data.
National reputation

1. Direct evidence from usage of scholarly items.

2. Indirect evidence:
   - Invited presentations, keynotes
   - Editorial positions for important journals
   - Media citations
   - Blog / tweet followers
Common critical points
New campus committee: Public-community Engaged Scholarship Review Committee (PESRC)

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
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 promotion or tenure, all TT faculty must present evidence of at least “satisfactory” in ALL THREE AREAS.
Satisfactory in teaching

Required documentation:

- Student evaluations (refer to in statement, summarize in dossier, provide raw copies in appendices.)

- Peer evaluations: at least two.

Reflect on how you use these and other evidence to continually improve.

**Solely reciting scores is not sufficient!**

In dossier: *describe your teaching load throughout the probationary period.*

Teaching takes many forms, all of which are respected:

- Bedside teaching of medical learners
- Mentoring of graduate students
- Stand-alone lectures

*Workshops given at conferences are usually considered ‘service.’ Being invited to do a workshop is evidence of reputation.*
Satisfactory in service

Internal: satisfy typical expectations
• Department and school meetings; serve on committees. May or may not chair.
  • Work on dissertation committees is generally listed in “teaching”
• List and mention any across-campus roles.

External:
Commonly seen at associate rank:
• Reviewing manuscripts
• Serving on conference committees; chairing subcommittees
• Grant review panelist

Commonly seen at full rank:
• Reviewing manuscripts
• Editorial board memberships; associate or full editorships
• Significant scientific/professional organizational 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

Candidate
- Statement
- CV
- Research examples
- Dossier

Chair
- Evaluation of outlets
- External letter solicitation

Department committee
- Assessment compared to department standards: closest *disciplinary* examination

Chair (again)
- Chair’s assessment

School (unit) committee
- Assessment compared to school standards: broader, but still *colleagues*
# People and responsibilities within the PT cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Update materials?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus P&amp;T Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC Kathy Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>independent vote</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Paydar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>and Pres. Whitten</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Candidate**
- **Update materials?**
  - Dean
  - Evaluation: own, plus summing up external, chair, department and school
  - Comparison to **campus** standards
  - Evaluation of **process**
  - **vote**
  - **vote, submission to trustees**

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

- October
- January-February
- March-April
Special notes

• If your department or school is very small (or you are applying for full), it is your chair or dean’s responsibility to populate the review committee(s).

• It is your chair’s responsibility to choose external reviewers, but you can help. They must not be co-authors/co-PIs.

• If you have a majority-negative vote for tenure, you may proceed with a formal reconsideration request.

• If you have a few (small percentage of) negative votes for promotion, please just chill. If more than a few, you may submit additional materials or argumentation.
Panel

Rob Rebein
Professor of English
P&T Committee member
Former Interim Dean

Raymond Konger, M.D.
Professor of Pathology and Emergency Medicine

Lynn Dombrowski
Associate Professor
Dept. of Human Centered Computing
School of Informatics and Computing

Ayoung Yoon
Associate Professor
Dept. of Library and Information Science
School of Informatics and Computing
Thank you!

rapplega@iupui.edu for individual questions!

Rachel Applegate
Assistant Vice Chancellor
for Faculty Affairs