Promotion to Full Rank
9:00-11:00 a.m.
February 5, 2015
Campus Center 405

AGENDA

9:00 a.m.  Welcome and Opening Remarks – Melissa Lavitt, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

9:15 a.m.  Overview of Criteria to Attain Full Rank – Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, IUPUI Office of Academic Affairs

9:30 a.m.  Sharing Success Panel Discussion with Recently Promoted Full Professors

Teaching: Angela McNelis, IU School of Nursing
Research: Stephen Randall, Purdue School of Science
Service: Paul Helft, IU School of Medicine

10:15 a.m. Question and Answer Session

10:30 a.m. Taking Stock: Peer-to-Peer Exchange
- Area of excellence
- Progress toward promotion to date
- Biggest obstacle to overcome
- Possible strategies to facilitate progress

10:45 a.m. Evaluation and Adjournment - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Academic Affairs

This event is sponsored by
Faculty Appointments and Advancement and the Office of Academic Affairs
Promotion to Full Rank

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

IUPUI OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
Rank Expectations

Promotion to Professor

- Excellence in Teaching, Research or Service
  - Satisfactory performance in the other two areas
- Balanced Case
  - Excellent overall performance
  - Equivalent to excellence in one area and satisfactory in others
  - Highly satisfactory in all three areas
Rank Expectations

Promotion to Professor

• Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated peer-reviewed scholarship in area of excellence
• 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
Rank Expectations

Promotion to Librarian

- Excellence in Performance
- Excellence in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or Service and at least satisfactory in other area
- Record of superior performance as an associate librarian
- Attainment of state, regional or national recognition in the librarian profession
Rank Expectations
Promotion to Librarian

- Distinguished contributions to the university, profession or community in secondary area of excellence
- Professional development area encompasses all librarian scholarship
Hallmarks of Excellence

- Focus
- Scholarly Dissemination
- Reputation
- Impact
- Leadership
- Integration
- Reflection
- Quality
- Funding
- Mentorship
Hallmarks of Excellence

• The candidate's accomplishments in rank have had impact at the national level.

• The candidate is recognized nationally and/or internationally for contributions to his/her field.

• The candidate has a sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established and cumulative body of work while in rank as an Associate Professor.

• Distinguished contributions must be evident (IU Academic Handbook, 2008).
Teaching Excellence

• Extraordinary success in teaching, advising, mentoring and learning outcomes
• Documented by positive peer and student evaluations in rank with evidence of significant impact on student performance and success
• Sophisticated teaching philosophy
• Evidence of reflective, innovative teaching practice
• Record of disseminated, peer-reviewed, high-quality scholarship with impactful outcomes and contributions to field
• National/international teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects or development of best practices
Performance Excellence

- Based on achievement of position description
  - Excellence demonstrated in the full range of position responsibilities with significant achievement
- Record of grants, materials prepared, involvement with technology, increased access to titles/services
- Evidence of quality or impact on patrons, faculty or other recipients of librarian performance
- Evaluative statements by review committees, external reviewers, evaluative letters from library users, colleagues
Research Excellence

- Evidence of dissemination of high-quality scholarly work - peer-reviewed presentations, publications in top tier journals
- Significant contributions to the knowledge base that improved or extends the work of others
- National/international recognition of expertise and the quality of the research
- Acquisition of external grant funding from competitive, valued sources to support research enterprise
- Evidence of focused ongoing program of research
- Awards and recognition of research excellence
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
  - Longitudinal data demonstrating significance
  - Invited presentations due to service expertise
  - Grant awards to support service activities; endorsement of service program
  - Development of best practice standards,
DOSSIER FORMAT

50 page limit EXCLUDING Administrative additions 01-05, CV, Appendices

- Section 01: Transaction Forms
- Section 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)
- Section 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)
- Section 04: External Assessments
- Section 05: Reference Letters (Not Required)
- Section 06: Candidate’s Statement (7 pages or 5/2)
- Section 07: Teaching (For Librarians: 07 Performance)
- Section 08: Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: 08 Professional Development)
- Section 09: Professional and University Service (For Librarians: 09 Service)
- Section 10: Curriculum Vitae
- Section 11: Appendices
Candidate’s Statement

Speaks for you at all levels of review

- 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, outcomes of your work
What You MUST Do...

• Consult your School-specific guidelines and the IUPUI Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure

• Know what constitutes excellence in your primary mission.

• Know what constitutes satisfactory achievements in your secondary missions.
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 EVC/Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Immediately following campus committee reviews; early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC/Chief Academic Officer completes an independent review and forwards recommendations to Chancellor</td>
<td>Mid-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor reviews cases, confers with IU &amp; PU Presidents on joint recommendations which are forwarded to the respective BOTs</td>
<td>Late March</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>
</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
Typically, external evaluators are accustomed to evaluating research excellence. However, when excellence in teaching, professional service or performance 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. Student and peer evaluation data is also useful.
• Consider materials prepared for use with new technologies (e.g., internet, multimedia, videos, computer simulations, databases, software) or for judging the incorporation of service learning or other experiential learning as a part of courses.

For performance
• Librarians should provide external reviewers with materials appropriate to their context, in addition to the standard information on responsibilities and publications and presentations documented in the vitae and candidate’s statement.

For professional service
• Sample reports, presentation materials or other items, illustrating their scholarship of service
• Evaluation or impact data related to their work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>External Review</th>
<th>Rank Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advancement to 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 tenured full professor.  
• Reviewers should be from peer or higher institutions.                                                                    |
| Advancement to Librarian    | • 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 tenured librarian.  
• Reviewers should be from peer or higher institutions.                                                                    |
SCHOOL LEVEL REVIEWS

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

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
CAMPUS LEVEL REVIEW

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
LATER LEVELS OF REVIEW

• Executive Vice Chancellor/Chief Academic Officer
  • 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
SHARING SUCCESS
Panel Discussion

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

Excellence in Service:
Paul Helft, MD, Professor of Medicine, Division of Hematology and Oncology, IU School of Medicine

Excellence in Teaching:
Angela McNelis, PhD, RN, Professor of Community & Health Systems, IU School of Nursing

Excellence in Research:
Stephen Randall, PhD, Professor of Biology, Purdue School of Science
Review your progress toward promotion.

- Evidence in area of excellence
- Evidence for satisfactory performance areas
- What needs the most work?
- Biggest obstacle to overcome
- Strategies to facilitate progress
- Plan your work and work your plan
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/
• Office of Research Development http://research.iupui.edu/
• OVCR - Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research http://research.iupui.edu/ovcr/
• 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/
• Office for Women http://ofw.iupui.edu/
### SUMMARY OF AREAS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR VARIOUS FACULTY CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement to</th>
<th>Area of Excellence</th>
<th>Other Areas of Performance</th>
<th>Expectation for External Peer Review of Case</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school Highly satisfactory in all three areas for a balanced case</td>
<td>Letters from independent peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship Emerging national reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tenure</td>
<td>Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in areas not chosen for excellence as well as University Service as specified by the school Highly satisfactory in all three areas for a balanced case</td>
<td>Letters from independent peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>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. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Beyond satisfactory in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Letters from independent peers outside unit on IUPUI campus</td>
<td>(No Additional requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Excellence in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service and at least satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Letters from independent peers, preferably in higher rank, at peer or higher institution</td>
<td>Record of superior performance as an associate librarian and attainment of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession (Indiana University Academic Handbook, UFC, 1978). Record of exceptional achievements in performance and a record of distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community in the secondary area of excellence. Quality is considered more important than mere quantity (Library Faculty Handbook, Promotion and Tenure Criteria for Librarians, 2004).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Balanced case expectations are defined by the Indiana University Academic Handbook as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit [to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others] to the University.” This category applies to only tenure-track faculty and is to be used in exceptional cases.
2. For tenure decisions, tenure expectations are for performance commensurate with rank and evidence of continued service with distinction.
3. For tenure decisions, performance must be excellent, and professional development and service must be satisfactory. Tenure is granted to those librarians whose professional characteristics indicate they will continue to serve with distinction.
4. Balanced case exceptions for librarians only apply to the secondary criteria (to professional development, research and/or creativity and to service).
5. Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.
6. For more detailed information regarding evaluating librarian performance, please review the “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance.”

2014-15 Chief Academic Officer’s Promotion and/or Tenure Guidelines
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement to</th>
<th>Area of Excellence¹</th>
<th>Other Areas of Performance</th>
<th>Expectation for External Peer Review of Case</th>
<th>Standard for Excellence (over and above record of quantity, quality, and impact of internal work)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area and in University Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI or department</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Professional Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area and in University Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Satisfactory in University and Professional Service</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI or department</td>
<td>Record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Professor, Associate Scientist/Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, set by unit</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Professor, Senior Scientist/Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, set by unit</td>
<td>Independent² peers external to IUPUI</td>
<td>Record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of independent work; evidence of substantial research contributions to the discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Balanced case expectations are defined by the Indiana University Academic Handbook as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit [to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others] to the University.” This category applies to only tenure-track faculty and is to be used in exceptional cases.

² Independent is defined in the section on External Assessment.
### DOCUMENTING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of teaching performance</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I: CV</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section II: Candidate’s Statement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section III: Statement contained in Evaluation of Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Review (may be part of Sections I-Dean, Chair Comment or Ill-internal and external peers)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>List of courses, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching goals</td>
<td>Goals and/or Teaching Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing professional development</td>
<td>List of formal activities and their significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of exemplary teaching methods</td>
<td>Description of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of student learning</td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of teaching and national leadership</td>
<td>Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course and curriculum development</td>
<td>List of committees, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition (grants, awards)</td>
<td>List of recognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Instruction          | Incomplete lists of formal instruction  
Incomplete evidence to interpret load  
Incomplete information about goals of instruction  
Incomplete or only raw student evaluation data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative  
Incomplete information on learning outcomes  
Absence of peer review evidence or superficial peer commentary not based on systematic review  
Poor performance on many of the above measures | Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes | Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction | 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. |
| Course or Curricular Development | Incomplete evidence of nature of activities or results  
Incomplete evidence of individual role in outcomes  
No review by others  
No evidence on how work is connected with department or campus goals  
Poor course or curricular design products | Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness | Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes | 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 |
| Mentoring and Advising | Numbers of students mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided  
Comparative load for unit not indicated  
Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented  
Poor performance indicated by data | Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized  
Student satisfaction indicated by evidence  
Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear | Important impact and student achievement documented | 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarly Activities, including Awards</th>
<th>Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL Some recognition of teaching efforts</th>
<th>Evidence of regular local/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice Recognition of high quality of teaching Grants or awards at the department or campus level (For the lecturer category, this level constitutes excellence)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Efforts in Teaching</td>
<td>No information about teaching development efforts given Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise No mentoring of colleagues Evidence of ineffective performance in this area</td>
<td>Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance, personal experimentation, or reading Record of mentoring other teachers Reflective commentary on candidate’s own teaching Peer assessment on effectiveness of efforts toward personal growth or mentoring of others</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>
### Documenting Research and Creative Activities in the Dossier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three to five most significant publications or creative activities which reflect major research accomplishments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section I: Chair's Letter, Dean's Letter, Primary and Unit Committee Reports</strong> &lt;br&gt; List all publications or creative activities and indicate whether in rank and whether refereed &lt;br&gt; <strong>Section I: CV</strong> &lt;br&gt; Description in personal statement may also note the most significant publications or creative activities &lt;br&gt; <strong>Section II: Candidate's Statement</strong> &lt;br&gt; May contain a more thorough discussion of the most significant published research or creative activities and the status of the journals, other publications, or venues for creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of stature of journals in which articles appear</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature</strong> &lt;br&gt; May be an indication in CV (refereed v. non-refereed, name of publisher, age of journal title) &lt;br&gt; <strong>Candidate may also comment on a journal's quality in the Candidate's Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of stature of galleries where works appear or stature of performance venues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature</strong> &lt;br&gt; May be an indication in CV (stature of gallery or performing venue, city, potential size of audience) &lt;br&gt; <strong>Candidate may also comment on galleries in the Candidate's Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Expectations</strong></td>
<td><strong>As above: a letter often points out unusual circumstances related to work load</strong> &lt;br&gt; This may also be commented on in the personal statement (but seek confirmation from other documents in the dossier) &lt;br&gt; May be more detailed comments on this, particularly where load is considered heavy in school or department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research goals/program of research or creative activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Letters from Chair and Dean may comment, as may committee reports (important for tenure, as the University is projecting candidate's future contributions and productivity)</strong> &lt;br&gt; <strong>List of goals and candidate's description of continuing program of research, scholarship or creative activities</strong> &lt;br&gt; <strong>May include a more thorough discussion of the research projects in progress and/or future research plans; may include listing of manuscripts or creative activities submitted for publication or performance and their status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of research or creative activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</strong> &lt;br&gt; <strong>CV</strong> &lt;br&gt; Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate's Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Category</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of contributions when more than one author or collaborator or performer</td>
<td>Departmental evaluation, committee reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to interdisciplinary research or creative activities</td>
<td>Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and awards (Review the candidate's funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)</td>
<td>Committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statute of grants and other awards</td>
<td>Departmental evaluation, committee reports, letters from Dean and Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing efforts to enhance research, scholarship and creative activities</td>
<td>Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Suggested Standards for Evaluating Research and Creative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplinary or Professional Research</strong></td>
<td>Research has not been regularly conducted or there is no evidence of dissemination. Evidence comes only from colleagues, collaborators, or ex-students. Individual role and level of collaborative work is unspecified. Research is of poor quality. No research program has been presented.</td>
<td>Candidate has performed research that is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice. Candidate has disseminated the results of research in scholarly journals and other appropriate venues. Research program is clearly articulated.</td>
<td>Candidate’s work has attracted favorable peer review and peer commentary notes promise. Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required.</td>
<td>Significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that clearly demonstrate attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and external support (Review the candidate’s funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)</strong></td>
<td>No evidence of attempts to seek support.</td>
<td>Evidence of attempts, which show promise.</td>
<td>Successful grant and external support has been obtained and continuing efforts and promise are documented.</td>
<td>Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support, including the degree to which the process was competitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer review</strong></td>
<td>Local and external peer reviews have evaluated the work as unsatisfactory. [Procedures require internal and external reviews.]</td>
<td>Departments provide clear information about the stature of journals and the significance of the research publications. Departments affirm the candidates’ plans for continued research.</td>
<td>Regular local and external peer review.</td>
<td>Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed presentations, grants, and publications. Evidence of national recognition of the quality of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarly activities, including awards</strong></td>
<td>None are documented.</td>
<td>Local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred.</td>
<td>Regular and significant local dissemination of good practice and recognition has occurred.</td>
<td>Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others. Departmental evaluations of the stature of the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# DOCUMENTING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Section I: CV</th>
<th>Section I: Reference Letters &amp; Reports</th>
<th>Section II: Candidate’s Statement</th>
<th>Section III: Evaluation of Professional Service</th>
<th>External Peer Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory University Service*</td>
<td>List of university service</td>
<td>Evidence (e.g., assigned responsibilities context, role, growth, impact) and basis for judging it satisfactory</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals as well as evidence of impact</td>
<td>Annotation of roles, contributions, and impact</td>
<td>External assessment letters evaluate the achievement evident in the products of research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance and impact of professional service</td>
<td>List of community, disciplinary/professional, and university service</td>
<td>Assessment of significance and impact to the context of the unit or campus mission</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals and evidence of impact</td>
<td>Evidence of impact on constituencies and intellectual contribution from and to the discipline or profession</td>
<td>External assessment letters evaluate the adequacy of the evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of activity and individual’s responsibility</td>
<td>List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer)</td>
<td>Evidence of candidate’s contribution</td>
<td>Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and contributions</td>
<td>Specific details on activity and roles, responsibilities, and intellectual contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and leadership</td>
<td>List of positions (e.g., chair of committee, program organizer)</td>
<td>Evidence of leadership</td>
<td>Self-assessment of growth and leadership</td>
<td>Annotation of specific roles, responsibilities, intellectual contributions</td>
<td>Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications related to service</td>
<td>List of refereed publications and non-refereed publications</td>
<td>Assessment of significance to the discipline, constituencies, and mission</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals</td>
<td>Annotation on significance as intellectual work</td>
<td>Comments on this criterion within letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of results of service</td>
<td>List of presentations, workshops, and reports</td>
<td>Assessment of significance to the discipline or profession</td>
<td>Relevance to professional development and goals</td>
<td>Annotation of nature of dissemination as appropriate and effective</td>
<td>Comments on this criteria within letters from external reviewers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University service is necessary for promotion and/or tenure. It qualifies as professional if it is documented as intellectual work that relates to the discipline or to the mission of the university. For example, the economist on the task force charged with revising university revenue distribution policies may be performing professional service but the English professor would be engaged in university citizenship.
# Suggested Standards for Evaluating Professional Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **University Service**<sup>+</sup> | No evidence of activities or results  
Evidence on outcomes of collaborative work, but no evidence of individual contribution  
No review by others  
No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals  
Poor performance on service activities | **Citizenship:**  
Routine department expectations  
Chair's determination that service is more than mere participation  
Noted in CV, but not in promotion and tenure document | Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance by Faculty Council)  
"wrote a policy that was approved by committee"  
"not required or expected"  
Played a major role in initiative over a period of time that contributed to campus or unit goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others | Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work  
Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received |
| **Service to Discipline** | No evidence of activities or results  
Evidence on outcomes, but no evidence of individual contribution  
No review by others  
No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals  
Poor performance on service activities | **Activities:**  
routine, required, or expected | Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants)  
"organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered"  
Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to discipline's goals or organization's mission, with independent evidence of significance, impact, role, and effective communication to others  
Some level of national peer-reviewed dissemination of scholarship is required | Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work  
Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received |
| **Service to Community** | No evidence of activities or results  
Evidence on outcomes, but no evidence of individual contribution  
No review by others  
No evidence on how service work is consistent with professional development or goals  
Poor performance on service activities | **Professional Activities:**  
routine, required, or expected | Accompanied by independent evidence of impact  
"chaired a subcommittee of the board that accomplished X, Y, & Z"  
"played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization"  
Played a major role in an initiative over a period of time that contributed to community goals, with independent evidence of significance, role, impact, and effective communication to others | Significant contributions that clearly demonstrate the attributes of scholarly work, including peer refereed presentations and publications and national recognition of the quality of work  
Awards and recognition that reflect on the significance and academic nature of the work have been received |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I: CV</strong></td>
<td>May be referenced in all of these sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I: Reference Letters &amp; Reports</strong></td>
<td>List of positions in CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section II: Candidate’s Statement</strong></td>
<td>Description in personal statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section III: Evaluation of Professional Service</strong></td>
<td>May be more fully described in personal statements (changes in job responsibilities and major projects may be highlighted by series of position descriptions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Peer Review</strong></td>
<td>May be referenced in letters from peers, unsolicited testimonials from library users and from solicited external assessment letters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of performance</th>
<th>All of the above sources may contain evidence of the effectiveness of the librarian’s performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflective comments on performance may certainly appear in personal statement, especially achievements of significance or patterns of professional growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written compilation of performance activities, including summary of annual review statements; supervisor’s statements from annual review (with permission from supervisor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters and testimonials from those familiar with the librarian’s work, but external assessment letters may also be useful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Expectation</th>
<th>Indication in the materials submitted above (use to cross-check against materials supplied by candidate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referenced in personal statement (# of hours at reference desk compared to others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional detail, particularly in position descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional evidence of this, particularly in solicited external assessment letters (i.e., candidate’s performance is particularly noteworthy since he/she is on the reference desk # hours per week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution of librarian’s performance to library operations quality of service</th>
<th>All of the above; include a copy of the library’s mission statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV notations, particularly if publications or presentations given as part of job responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting materials on any grants received that relate to library services and their impact on the library or materials prepared (bibliographies, research aids, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters solicited through school procedures from peers or students, faculty, staff and others who have benefited from the librarian’s expertise and contribution in this area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of contributions when more than one librarian is involved in a project</th>
<th>Specific notations in all of the above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List in CV using citing conventions appropriate to the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint statements or letters when librarian served as part of a team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of teaching when teaching is part of job assignments</th>
<th>See grid for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See grid for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See grid for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See grid for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuing efforts to enhance performance</th>
<th>Above documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List of professional development activities related to performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of significant continuing education and training activities undertaken to improve performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights in Summary of Performance Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters on the significance of these activities in enhancing the librarian’s performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.