Promotion in the Clinical Ranks
10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
January 21, 2015
ES 2132 and Remote Sites

AGENDA

10:00 am  Welcome and Program Overview – Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

10:15 am  Criteria for Promotion in the Clinical Ranks - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

10:30 am  Overview of P&T Timeline and Process – Melissa Lavitt, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

10:45 am  Sharing Success Panel Discussion - Guidance from Recently Promoted Clinical Faculty

Excellence in Service:
• Dr. Elaine G. Cox, Clinical Professor of Clinical Pediatrics, IU School of Medicine

Excellence in Teaching:
• Professor Connie Justice, Clinical Associate Professor, Purdue School of Engineering and Technology

11:45 am  Q&A Session - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

11:55 am  Wrap-up and Evaluation - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

12:00 pm  Adjourn

This event is sponsored by
Faculty Appointments and Advancement and the Office of Academic Affairs
Promotion in the Clinical Ranks

Gail F. Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement,
IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs
Many IUPUI schools have clinical appointments
Nature of clinical appointments varies greatly among the schools
School/departmental guidelines are critical in guiding candidates regarding school level expectations for promotion
Consult the IUPUI P&T Guidelines
Review updates for the 2014-15 cycle
Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

- Excellence in Teaching or Service
- Satisfactory performance in the other area
- Research is not an area of evaluation; section is excluded
  - Any research conducted should be used to support teaching or service
- Record of publicly disseminated, peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence; some level of national dissemination
Promotion to Clinical Professor

- Excellence in Teaching or Service
- Satisfactory performance in the other area
- Research is not an area of evaluation; section is excluded in dossier
  - Any research conducted should be used to support teaching or service; area of excellence
- Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship in area of excellence
Teaching Excellence

- Extraordinary success in teaching, advising, mentoring and learning outcomes
- Documented positive peer and student evaluations in rank with evidence of significant impact on student performance and success
- Sophisticated teaching philosophy that has evolved over time
- Evidence of reflective, innovative teaching practice
- Record of disseminated, peer-reviewed, high quality scholarship with impactful outcomes and contributions to field
Teaching Excellence

• Scholarly output may include course, curricular and instructional products; textbooks, book chapters, presentations and non-traditional forms of scholarship
• Evidence that the disseminated work has been adopted by others
• Professional development that indicates participation in experimentation, reflection, pursuit of conceptual and practical knowledge of teaching and learning
• Teaching awards or funding for teaching projects or development of best practices
Service Excellence

To be the basis for advancement in rank, University and professional service must be
• directly linked to the unit and campus mission
• the quality and impact of professional service must be evaluated within this context and must be characterized by the following:
  • command and application of relevant knowledge, skills, and technological expertise
  • contributions to a body of knowledge
  • imagination, creativity and innovation
  • application of ethical standards
  • achievement of intentional outcomes
  • evidence of impact.
Service Excellence

• Evidence of dissemination of high quality scholarly work including peer-refereed presentations & publications in service
• Awards and recognition that reflect the significance and academic nature of the service
• National/international recognition of the quality of the service work and leadership in service
• Evidence of significant impact and outcomes of service
  • Longitudinal data demonstrating significance
  • Textbooks, book chapter, web documents
  • Invited presentations due to service expertise
  • Leadership in national organizations
  • Development of best practice standards
SCHOLARSHIP

• Traditional publications may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating scholarship in teaching and service.
• When other forms of disseminating results or dissemination outlets are more appropriate, this fact should be explained.
• Those evaluating the candidate’s work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination.
• Candidate, department chairs and/or deans may wish to take special care to explain why alternative forms of dissemination may better fit with standards in the field.
Dossier Format

50 page limit EXCLUDING Administrative additions (01-05), CV, Appendices
Searchable PDF document
• Section 01: Transaction Forms
• Section 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)
• Section 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)
• Section 04: External Assessments (Solicited by Chair)
• Section 05: Reference Letters (Solicited by Chair)
• Section 06: Candidate’s Statement (7 pages or 5 pages with other 2 in area of excellence)
• Section 07: Teaching
• Section 08: Excluded (ANY Research activities should be placed in most relevant section 07 or 09)
• Section 09: Professional and University Service
• Section 10: Curriculum Vitae
• Section 11: Appendices
Section 06

- Briefly address required areas of endeavor; 7 pages total
  - Option to split 5/2 with 2 pages in the area of excellence
- Well-organized with headings and subheadings
  - Understandable outside of discipline
  - Reflective, explanatory, well-written
- Identify present and future focus
- Describe your journey and accomplishments in each area of evaluation
- Discuss significance, impact and outcomes of your work
Dossier Preparation Tips

- Document activities and collect evidence from the very beginning of rank appointment
- Utilize your annual reviews for content
- Organize, select and prepare your evidence
- Make sure your CV is in the P&T format
- Examine Reviewer’s Form for essential components
- Ask for help from chair and colleagues
- Attend programs and workshops
Where Will the Evidence Be Found?

- Candidate’s Statement
- Curriculum Vitae
- Narrative of Area of Excellence
- Reference Letters
- External Letters of Review
Academic Affairs Website

Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines

Dossiers
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/Dossier-Samples

Resources
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/Resources

Adobe Presenter Online Foundational Programs
http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/Online-Foundational-Programs
Campus Resources

- Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching (FACET)  
  https://facet.indiana.edu/
- Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)  
  http://ctl.iupui.edu/
- Center for Research and Learning (CRL)  
  http://www.crl.iupui.edu/
- Center for Service and Learning (CSL)  
  http://csl.iupui.edu/
Timeline
External Review
School Level
Campus Level
Executive Vice Chancellor
Executive Review
Board of Trustees

P&T Levels of Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate prepares dossier</td>
<td>Winter prior to dossier year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair sends dossier for external review</td>
<td>Based on school process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier submitted for school level reviews</td>
<td>Based on school process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School submits dossier to FAA</td>
<td>End of October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Committee reviews and evaluates all dossiers</td>
<td>December, January, February, sometimes early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Committee recommendations are forwarded to Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Immediately following campus committee reviews; early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer completes an independent review and forwards</td>
<td>Mid-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations to Chancellor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor reviews cases, confers with IU &amp; PU Presidents on joint</td>
<td>Late March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommendations which are forwarded to the respective BOTs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action by Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Mid-April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion takes effect</td>
<td>July 1 (12 month faculty) or August 1 (10 month faculty) start of academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure takes effect</td>
<td>July 1 of the following academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXTERNAL REVIEW

PURPOSE
Objective Evaluation
- national reputation
- accomplishments in area of excellence
- significance of scholarship
- stature of dissemination outlets
- contributions to professional organizations
- professional standing and expertise

CANDIDATE
Can
- provide a list of experts or leaders in their field
- provide names of persons not to contact

Cannot
- provide the summary of reviewers
- know the final list of reviewers
- list mentors, close personal friends, co-authors, collaborators
When excellence in teaching or professional service is a basis for advancement, it is important to provide documentation that will enable external reviewers to make informed judgments.

For teaching
- External evaluation of course design and materials as part of their review of teaching accomplishments.
- Considering materials prepared for use with new technologies (e.g., internet, multimedia, videos, computer simulations, databases, software) or for judging the incorporation of service learning as a part of courses.

For professional service
- Sample reports, presentation materials or other items, illustrating their scholarship of service
- Evaluation or impact data related to their work

Without documented results and without external peer review, candidates for advancement based on excellence in teaching or professional service should not expect to succeed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical Rank</th>
<th>External Review</th>
<th>Rank Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advancement to Full Clinical Professor | • 6 arms-length reviews required  
• A maximum of 2 peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. | • Reviewers should be at the rank of full professor.  
• They may be tenured or on clinical track. |
| Advancement to Associate Clinical Professor | • 6 arms-length reviews required  
• A maximum of 2 peers from other campuses of Indiana University or Purdue University may be considered “external” if they are not collaborators or do not have other, direct personal or professional associations that could affect objective evaluation. | • Reviewers should be at the rank of associate or higher.  
• They may be tenured or on clinical track. |
SCHOOL LEVEL

- Primary Committee or Department Level
- Department Chair
- Unit Committee or School Level
- School Dean
CAMPUS LEVEL

Non-controversial Cases with no Divided Votes at any Level

• Two reviewers (primary and secondary) each read dossier and complete an evaluation form
• Evaluation forms distributed to committee
• Reviewers present case to committee
• School representative asked to comment if appropriate
• Committee has minimal discussion on case
• Members vote and submit ballot
Controversial Cases or ALL Read Cases with Divided Votes at any Level

- All committee members read the dossier
- Two reviewers (primary and secondary) each read dossier and complete an evaluation form
- Evaluation forms distributed to committee
- Reviewers present case to committee
- School representative asked to comment as needed to clarify information
- Committee discusses case
- Members vote and submit ballot
Executive Vice Chancellor
• Reviews case and completes an independent review
• Forwards recommendations to the Chancellor

Executive Review
• IUPUI Chancellor reviews cases and confers with the IU and Purdue Presidents on joint recommendations
• Forward recommendations to the respective Board of Trustees

Board of Trustees
• Promotion takes effect July 1 for 12-month faculty/ August 1 for 10-month faculty
• Tenure takes effect July 1 the following year
SHARING SUCCESS
Panel Discussion

Moderated by Gail Williamson
Director of Faculty Enhancement
Office of Academic Affairs
PANEL DISCUSSION

Excellence in Service:
Dr. Elaine Cox, Clinical Professor of Clinical Pediatrics, IU School of Medicine

Excellence in Teaching:
Prof. Connie Justice, Clinical Associate Professor, Purdue School of Engineering and Technology
Following the program, take time to assess your progress toward promotion.

- Evaluate evidence to document area of excellence
- Evaluate evidence for satisfactory performance in secondary area
- Identify the deficits
- Identify biggest obstacle to overcome
- Formulate strategies to facilitate progress
- Outline your plan of attack
IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines - 2014-2015 Revisions Summary

Details and clarification on preparing dossier (pgs. 14, 15, 17, 18)
- Dossier format will differ based on the nature of one’s appointment. Non-tenure eligible faculty will include sections in their dossier relevant to their appointment.
- Margins - one inch
- Font no smaller than 11 point
- Candidate has the option to include two single spaced pages addressing area of excellence
- Candidates involved in public scholarship or civic engagement should articulate the nature of their work and how it differs from traditional scholarship.

Chair responsibilities (pgs. 10, 11)
- Chair will address the authorship conventions for the discipline
- Chair will discuss the candidate’s right and the process for reconsideration at first negative vote.

Divergent evaluation (pg. 12)
- The report from each committee should account for negative votes.

Addition of Materials (pg. 31, 32)
- At the campus level, additional materials should be sent to Faculty Appointments and Advancement, attention Christy Cole.
- When documents are added, please make sure they are searchable.

Reviews
- A review of teaching does not have rank requirements for the reviewer. In other words, unlike external reviews, a reviewer of one’s teaching need not be at the aspirational rank of the candidate. (pg. 18)
- External assessment, on the other hand, is a summative evaluation with associated rank requirements (pg. 25)
- There is a maximum of two peer reviews that are external to the department for clinical track advancement & librarians. (pgs. 27, 28)
- The External Referee Form asks about a past and or present relationship as student, trainee or colleague (pg. 64)
- The EVC provides independent review and recommendation to next level. (pg. 33)

Presentations (pgs. 19, 21)
- Candidates should discuss the "significance and impact of peer reviewed presentations, including status of the venue, competitive acceptance rates (where available), number of attendees and any retrievable evidence of the presentation.”

Institutional values (pgs. 33, 36)
- Additional description has been added to the Guidelines to better reflect the nature and evidence used to support excellence in Civic Engagement or an appointment as a Public Scholar. In general, these newer forms of public scholarship will likely rely on non-traditional metrics, outcomes and dissemination outlets.