Excellence in Research
For tenure-track faculty
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

If time:
Third year reviews,
Negative P&T votes
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

NIH Biosketch support page. (There are workshops via IUPUI and IU on optimizing the biosketch. Parts of the biosketch can serve as the introduction to your candidate statement and help you structure your critical content.)

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
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>
</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]
For promotion to associate
Key points in discerning **excellence** for promotion to associate

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

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

Promotion to any rank is a recognition of past achievement and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments. (IU policy ACA 38)

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.

Spell this out **absolutely positively** clearly at the time of the **third year review**
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 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*.”

Consider using your **grant biosketch as a starting point**

Not at IUPUI but evidence of reputation

Done at IUPUI
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 $\rightarrow$ Team $\rightarrow$ 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.
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
Special note: student co-authors

The marking for a student author is a dagger. (if you have trouble using that with your font, choose something else (not an asterix nor a #) and explain it.)

Many campus reviewers come from departments that have doctoral programs.

*Those reviewers often expect student co-authors, and are puzzled when they don’t see any students listed in multi-author works.*

Explain:

• Whether your own department or discipline has masters or doctoral-level students.

• If only undergraduate, what work you do with undergraduate research (RISE).
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](https://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 so much.
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.”
Special note: “special circumstances...”

“Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.” ←IUPUI Guidelines

After achieving tenure and associate rank, many faculty take on service and administrative roles of great importance to their unit, but which use time that otherwise might be used in pure research activities. Others have personal and family issues, because, life happens.

If you choose a research case, you may briefly describe these activities in your candidate statement to give context to your activities. Focus on the quality of what you have done, and on recent activity. You do not have to apologize for prior years.

Have a discussion with your chair or dean about how they will address this. Simply skipping it leaves some reviewers questioning. Be proud of the choices you’ve made.

Special, special, note: if you consider that your faculty life is really holistic with enthusiastic contributions to teaching and service (making our university and its units stronger) as well as research, consider a balanced case.
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. IU policy says: “Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity.”

“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.
Yes, reviewers are likely to look you up on Google Scholar. (Establish a profile!)

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

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

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

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
Satisfactory
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.
Special note: Medicine and teaching

Tenure track faculty in Medicine who apply for promotion and tenure on the basis of research are also expected to demonstrate that they are satisfactory in teaching.

The Faculty Affairs, Diversity, and Professional Development office will assist you in collecting teaching documentation. Work with them and with your division or department leadership on arranging for teaching opportunities.

Describe what a normal “teaching load” is for someone in your position: running a whole class (very rare!), giving occasional lectures (common!), teaching in the lab or at the bedside (common.)
Satisfactory in service

Internal: satisfy typical expectations
- Department and school meetings; serve on committees. May or may not chair.
  - Service 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:
- Manuscript reviewing
- 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.

P&T Cycle, process and roles
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

Candidate

Dean

Campus P&T Committee

EVC Kathy Johnson

independent vote

Chancellor Paydar

and Pres. Whitten

Update materials?

Evaluation: own, plus summing up external, chair, department and school

Comparison to campus standards

Evaluation of process

Minor: new acceptances

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

October

January-February

March-April

vote

vote, submission to trustees
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

Amber Comer
Associate Professor
Dept. of Health Sciences
School of Health and Human Sciences

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

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

rapplega@iupui.edu for individual questions!

Rachel Applegate
Assistant Vice Chancellor
for Faculty Affairs