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Agenda

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

9:10 a.m. Overview of Criteria to Attain Full Rank - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Office of Academic Affairs

9:45 a.m. Comparing Notes: Peer-to-Peer Exchange

10:00 a.m. Panel Discussion with Faculty Recently Promoted to Professor

Teaching: Jeffrey Watt, Professor, School of Science
Research: Angeles Martinez-Mier, Professor, School of Dentistry
Service: Anastasia Morrone, Professor, School of Education
Balanced Case: Kristina Horn Sheeler, Professor, School of Liberal Arts

10:40 a.m. Question and Answer Session

10:50 a.m. Announcements and Evaluation - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Office of Academic Affairs

11:55 a.m. Adjournment - Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Office of Academic Affairs

This event is sponsored by the Office of Academic Affairs
Excellence in Teaching
Summary of Lisa Siefker Bailey’s Panel Remarks
April 2, 2015

As I newly promoted Senior Lecturer at the Columbus campus in the Division of Liberal Arts, where I teach English, I am happy to share my best advice for preparing your dossier for promotion. I came to IUPUC in 1997 as an adjunct, was hired as a Visiting Lecturer in 1999, left the university to teach elsewhere for six years, and was rehired as a Lecturer in 2008. My PHD is from Vanderbilt University, where I specialized in Southern Literature and Drama. My dissertation is on Tennessee Williams in cultural context, and I have used my penchant for interdisciplinary studies to become a well-rounded generalist in English.

I constructed a solid case for excellence in teaching by studying my division’s list of suggested evidences for documenting excellence and making a concerted effort each year to check off items from that list and keep records of them for my file. I met with my division head and our dean of academic affairs to seek guidance in focusing on areas the P&T Committee would likely value most and to determine which of those areas I needed to boost. One such area was Peer Review of my teaching. In order to fill that need, I asked a variety of people, ranging from my division head, to colleagues in my division, to colleagues in my discipline, and colleagues from other IU campuses to peer review my classes. The best practice I developed is keeping a teaching journal. I keep one for each course I teach, and I update them weekly by listing how my class activities went, noting what I want to change and what I want to ensure I do again. I also made friends with my FAR. Knowing I could harvest items from that archive, I set out to do a better job of explaining my yearly tasks in that document, and I used it to present ways my duties fit into the category of teaching.

Having been trained at a research institution, and I realized I needed to shape my scholarship to count as the scholarship of Teaching and Learning, not just the scholarship of English or Theatre. I began this tweaking by including a couple paragraphs on applying content in the classroom in articles I had in the manuscript stage. But I knew I had to do more than fit attention to pedagogy into my content area, so I sought out workshops and symposia which focused on pedagogy, such as those offered in the CTL and by FACET. I highly recommend the FALCON conference, where you can attend and present in a myriad teaching sessions. Using leads from conferences, I brought myself up-to-date on the latest literature on pedagogy, so that I could imbue my teaching and my writing with the language of up-to-date practices. I’m sure you are using excellent practices in your teaching. Your task now is to use language that an audience outside your discipline can easily understand in order to convince them of your case. I also focused my energies in areas of teaching that most enthused me. I realized the most exciting types of activities I use in my classroom are in the area of performance pedagogy, and I worked to deepen my expertise in those areas and to write about them for conference papers and publications. I researched places I could place my writing, and I targeted both the top publisher in my field, as well as a couple local and regional publications, so I could have a chance to publish in a variety of places—and to do so in a timely manner.
To prepare my dossier, I met with my division head and asked him to help me set a deadline. I had the personal incentive of wanting a raise in order to pay for my son’s college tuition, so I planned my writing schedule to coincide with that enticement. To do the actual writing, I spent much time reading and rereading the dossier instruction document, and I studied the models of both the lecturer and tenure-track statements to get ideas for ways I could present my case. I advise you to start with putting your CV in IU format, and then spend some time identifying and writing out your teaching philosophy. After you have these foundations, just write the sections of your dossier in pieces. Chunk them out, never letting the magnitude of the task or the claims of what others have done get to you. Just tell your story, making sure you address the most important points, the same way you instruct your students to pull out the key points of your class to demonstrate learning in a paper. Use good writing techniques, too. Make sure you have clear topic sentences, specific examples with explication of how and why your teaching deserves your claim of excellence, and a good final proofreading (read it aloud before you turn it in!).

My biggest challenge was putting aside my regular teaching tasks to clear enough time to complete the tedious work of the actual drafting and collecting of support evidence, and my biggest obstacle was writing with a tone of confidence in making my case. Since lecturers don’t lose their jobs when they don’t go up for promotion in a certain number of years, it’s tempting to keep working hard without doing the extra work of building the dossier. It’s also really scary to know your peers and your superiors are going to judge your work at a high level. I overcame these challenges by committing to a goal with a deadline determined mutually by my supervisors and myself and by imagining I was writing a recommendation about a colleague instead of just writing about myself.

I leave you with these pearls of wisdom:

James Earl Jones said, “If you expect someone else to guide you, you’ll be lost.” Remember his words when you feel like your dossier isn’t good enough. Your case is not anyone else’s, and—no matter what others do—you have include your best practices and your most provocative examples. And choose only the best ones—don’t let the crown jewels of your career get lost in the sea of information you’ve collected over the years.

Woody Allen said, “80% of success is showing up.” You have to show up at the page and write this monster out. Set up your writing schedule, and don’t let anyone take it from you. Write at a reasonable pace, and don’t let other people’s priorities become yours. After you have a full draft, you can get some feedback from colleagues and mentors, but no one can really help you with your writing until you have that initial draft. Its fun to think of all the things you could do—or you can stay forever in the “should” do—but you have to move yourself out of woulda, coulda, shoulda, and into the tangible realm of working with your draft after you have it in a complete form.

Dorthea Brande said, “Act as if it were impossible to fail.” I created an infallible dossier by doing more than the expected work in each category, selecting only my best examples as my evidence, and writing about my case with clarity and conciseness from my heart, to show the committee the real reasons I teach and why I truly am the teacher I always wanted to be.
EXCELLENCE in RESEARCH
Tip Sheet

Charles Goodlett, Professor, Purdue School of Science

What constitutes excellence in research?

- Thematic research that has impact, extends knowledge, advances the field, and stimulates new directions or new applications; often includes both empirical and theoretical advances
- Typically achieved through a focused, organized research program that gains depth through successive achievements that build upon each other
- Achieves independence with demonstrated expertise as primary decision maker about focus, activity or direction of research; scholarly contributions to collaborations should be essential to project success
- Primary emphasis is in high-quality, peer-reviewed publications or comparable alternative scholarship
- Marked by significant outcomes, with an emphasis on dissemination in top tier venues
- In some fields there is an expectation of successfully competing for external funding; external funding from competitive sources is an important indicator of peer recognition
- Evidence of emerging (tenure) or sustained (promotion to full) reputation and leadership in the field
- Development of new interdisciplinary efforts or new collaborative initiatives
- Evidence of integration of research with teaching and service, so that each mutually informs the others
- Clear recognition of emerging (or sustained) contribution to the field by six ‘arm’s length’ external experts

Examples of evidence to document excellence in research

- Quantity and quality of publications that confirm impact and recognition in the discipline
- For a few disciplines, papers published in very selective conference proceedings may have comparable or even more impact / greater recognition than traditional print journals
- Significant contributions are a premium; quantity without clear evidence of quality and impact may not achieve excellence. Evidence of impact can be highlighted in the discussion of the 3-5 most important publications in rank; should be significant, primary authored works in top tier journals
- Significance of work for the field is typically evident from comments of arm’s length external reviewers
- Success in obtaining competitive external funding is expected by many departments or units; funding as PI on major grants supports continued productivity and demonstrates disciplinary peer recognition
- Generation of intellectual property or translation of research into practice
- Awards for research or peer recognition of publications, presentations, or intellectual property
- Invited presentations at regional or national meetings or invited talks at other institutions
- Serving as a peer reviewer for journals or review panels (study sections, editorial boards if more senior)
- Organizing (or presenting in) selective symposia at professional meetings (regional and national levels)
- Collaborative scholarship: Describe and document your essential contribution to the project or product

Major pitfalls or flaws in P&T cases when research is the area of excellence

- Insufficient impact of research program; too few primary authorships; need quantity and quality
- Did not develop adequate independence from prior mentors or advance beyond dissertation work
- Did not develop a focused or thematic program of research; had a number of isolated publications in a variety of loosely connected areas. No depth of discovery research in a defined area of expertise
- Did not achieve standards of the unit or department
- Did not compete successfully for external funding when it is required or expected for an ongoing research program; relied too much on internal or non-competitive funding sources
- Candidate statement did not provide a coherent description of the thematic nature, significance, and impact of the research program; lacked reflective, systematic description of purpose and future plans
- Inadequate explanation or documentation of intellectual contributions to collaborative efforts. Evidence should be present in statement, in research narrative, in CV listings, and in internal letters
- Inadequate or inaccurate documentation in CV of work done in rank; incomplete or inaccurate listings of types or amounts of grant funding obtained; lack of clarity on type of peer review of some products
EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE
Tip Sheet
Anantha Shekhar, Professor, IU School of Medicine

Evidence of Professional Service
• Curriculum Vita
• Candidate’s Statement
• External reviewer’s letters
• Peer, Department and School assessment of service
• Awards received, offices held, and selections to provide distinguished service activities
• Appendices/Supportive Documents

Rank Expectations - Standard of Excellence
• Associate Professor Tenure Track
  • Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship
  • Emerging national reputation
• Professor Tenure Track
  • Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship
  • Sustained national reputation
• Clinical Associate Professor
  • Record of publically disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence
• Clinical Professor Track
  • Record of sustained nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in area of excellence

Candidate’s Statement – Sets the Stage
• 5-7 page statement reflecting on the assessment of your accomplishments in service and professional development.
• Focus on your area of excellence; articulate what you have done to meet the criteria for promotion/tenure – tell your story, describe your personal growth and achievements along the way
• Address the impact of your work and its significance to the discipline, profession, unit, campus and society
• Discuss the interrelated aspects of your career and how the various elements come together to produce a greater whole
• Discuss what you have learned and how you have improved during your career

Excellence in Service
• Demonstrated by extraordinary success in service and outcomes
  • Documented by outcome evaluation over time
    ▪ Longitudinal data showing sustained excellence in service and outcomes
    ▪ Clinical outcomes summarized over time; normed with peers, discipline, school, campus
  • Describe the value and impact of your service on patient outcomes, external program recognition, performance on nationally normed outcome measures
  • Include peer advising, mentoring and other forms of service dissemination
• Evidence of innovation, development and improvement of existing service
• Developed a service approach that is innovative in practice and has grown over time
  • Critical part of you candidate’s statement; describe your journey, your goals, their achievement, innovations or changes to improve service outcomes and evidence of those outcomes
  • Discuss inclusion of novel technologies, community engagement, or other alternative strategies; how those approaches impacted service delivery
  • Provide evidence of continuing professional development; what you have learned and how you have improved your skills as a service provider
• Characterized by a record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated, peer reviewed high quality scholarship
  • Service products – outstanding results, procedure manual, techniques, specific methodology
  • Peer-reviewed publications in quality journals
  • Textbooks, textbook chapters
  • Presentations (especially invited) at national meetings – abstracts, papers, posters, program
  • Development of best practices and their dissemination
  • Reputation as a leader or expert in a discipline
  • Grant awards for service activities or procedural innovation
  • External endorsement of service – positions in National bodies, professional organizations, societies
  • Recognition of service to profession – awards, grants, other recognitions

Most Common Pitfalls
• Lack of dissemination of the scholarship of service
• Inadequate evidence to support excellence (e.g., emerging national reputation) in service
• Lack of normative data for service impact
• Documentation of excellence with reference to peer institutions
Librarian Promotion and Tenure at IUPUI
Tip Sheet
Miriam Murphy, Interim Director, Ruth Lilly Law Library

Documents upon which Promotion and Tenure are based:

1. IU Academic Handbook
2. Library Faculty Handbook (approved by IU Librarians System-wide)
3. IUPUI Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarians (Approved by IUPUI Library Faculty in February 2008)
4. IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Dossiers - Guidelines (New version published each spring)

Librarian areas of Excellence for Promotion to Associate

Performance
Must be a librarian’s primary area and must be excellent. Performance is evaluated in reference to the librarian’s position description.

Service
Must be at least satisfactory but if selected as secondary area, then must be above satisfactory. This covers activities that fall outside of librarian’s performance responsibilities and utilize librarian’s skills to benefit librarianship, the discipline (i.e.--social work, chemistry, etc.), or the community, or the university.

Professional Development, Research, Creativity
Must be at least satisfactory but if selected as secondary area, then must be above satisfactory. All dissemination/scholarship goes here, unless otherwise designated in librarian’s position description.

Librarian areas of Excellence for Promotion to Librarian

Performance
Superior performance is required – the candidate must show evidence of performance that is achieved by few others at IUPUI.

Professional Development
If selected as secondary area then must be excellent – the candidate must show a continued significant contribution at the state, regional, national, or international level.

Service
If selected as secondary area then must be excellent – the candidate must show a continued significant contribution at the community, state, regional, national, or international level.

For either area not chosen as secondary, performance in that area must be at least satisfactory.
Dossier organization

In addition to the five-page personal statement, two pages of narrative on the primary area of excellence (performance) and two pages of narrative on the secondary area (either service or professional development) are allowed. Supporting documentation in each section of the dossier may include: position descriptions; charts that summarize major projects, products, or activities; statistical summaries; letters addressing the significance/impact of the activities. Copies of articles, grants or other full text supporting documents should be placed in the appendix.

Tips:

- Be sure to always refer back to institution mission statements.
- Focus your written statements on outcomes and impact and not just completion or participation.
- The broader the geographic area affected the better. (local, state, regional, national)
- Peer reviewed is better than non-peer reviewed. Quality is better than quantity.
- Dossiers must be written as though the reader is completely uninformed – make sure you explain the importance of that conference, association, journal, etc.
- Be sure to show focus and a pattern of growth in each area.
- Your part of collaborations needs to be explained.
IUPUI eDossier Information for 2015-16 P&T Submissions

Beginning with 2015-16 P&T dossier submissions, eDossier will be used university-wide with the exception of Librarians and the School of Medicine, who will be using the existing IUPUI system. eDossier organizes a promotion and/or tenure candidate’s dossier according to the various sources of evidence typically used to make a case for excellence. NOtE: Some of the suggested content may not be applicable to all campuses or all case types.

The table on the following pages maps the sections from IUPUI’s current dossier format to the appropriate location in the new eDossier system.

Please note the following:

- Upload all documents as searchable PDFs only.
- Name each file to clearly reflect its contents.
- eDossier organizes and routes the 50-page dossier. The 50-page limit includes the 5-7 page Candidate Statement and all the evidence provided in the Teaching, Research, and Service sections.
- If an appropriate folder cannot be found, use any folder in the related area (Teaching, Research, or Service) and name the file appropriately regardless of the existing title for the folder.
- Candidate should only use those folders that are relevant to their case. Some of the suggested content may be more appropriate to include in an Appendix.
- If candidates wish to make their appendix electronic, they may be uploaded to eDossier; however, this is not required. Hard copies of candidate’s appendix are to be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested.
- In order for the candidate submit button to appear, there must be one file in the first three subfolders in the General section (Department and School Criteria, Candidate's Curriculum Vitae and Candidate's Statements). The candidate or their delegate (see instructions on how to assign a delegate in candidate help document) should upload an official copy of the current department and/or school criteria for excellence in the appropriate subfolder.
  - Please note: As of July 30, 2015, a blank document under General - Department (School) List of Prospective Referees and General - Candidate's List of Prospective Referees is no longer required to trigger the submit button. Please leave these subfolders blank as these lists are not required for IUPUI dossiers.
  - The submit button is has been activated for the IUPUI campus. All candidates and administrators were sent notifications.

For eDossier help:

- Candidate User Instructions: http://go.iu.edu/zmD
- Reviewer and Administrative Access User Instructions: http://go.iu.edu/zmE
- Instructions on how administrative access users can set up review routing: http://go.iu.edu/zmF
- Video on how administrative access users can set up review routing: http://go.iu.edu/zmG
- eDossier Overview PowerPoint: http://go.iu.edu/zmC

For additional assistance with:

- IUPUI dossier content, contact Gail Williamson (gwilliam@iu.edu) and/or Melissa Lavitt (mlavitt@iupui.edu).
- IUPUI routing, access or other P&T Process questions contact Christy Cole (ckcole@iupui.edu).
- eDossier technical problems, contact edossier@indiana.edu.

7/31/2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous IUPUI Dossier Format</th>
<th>eDossier Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 01: Transaction Forms</strong></td>
<td>Does not apply; the checklist and routing and action forms will no longer be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 02: Review Level Two (Unit/School)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Letters</strong>: The Dean Letter and School Committee Letter are uploaded as separate documents after the vote is recorded in the <strong>Vote Record</strong> folder and before routing to the next level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 03: Review Level One (Primary/Department)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Letters</strong>: The Chair Letter and Department Committee Letter are uploaded as separate documents after the vote is recorded in the <strong>Vote Record</strong> folder and before routing to the next level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 04: External Assessments</strong></td>
<td><strong>External Letters</strong>: The required documents are uploaded as a single PDF. In addition, the Chair’s assessment of dissemination outlets will be uploaded here as a separate document (see Section 10 below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 05: Reference Letters</strong></td>
<td><strong>Optional</strong>: Not all cases will have letters for this section; however, if an administrator requests reference letters on behalf of a candidate, they will be uploaded to the <strong>Solicited Letters</strong> section under the appropriate subfolder: Teaching, Research, or Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 06: Candidate’s Statement</strong></td>
<td><strong>General - Candidate’s Statement</strong>: Not to exceed 7 pages. In addition, if candidate’s appendix is electronic, it will be uploaded here as a separate document (see Section 11 below). Candidate’s appendix is <strong>not</strong> required to be electronic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Section 07: Teaching** | **Teaching**: Candidate will upload their evidence for this section in the appropriate subfolders. Faculty for whom teaching is not required will not have materials to upload in this folder.  
- Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.  
- If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.  
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in the Appendix.  
- Note: Everything uploaded in this section counts towards the 50-page limit. |
| **Section 08: Research/Creative Activity** | **Research/Creative Activity**: Candidate will upload their evidence for this section in the appropriate subfolders. Faculty for whom research is not required will not have materials to upload in this folder.  
- Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty. The subfolder labeled “Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues” should be left blank as this information is provided by the chair. (See Section 10 below.)  
- If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.  
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in an Appendix.  
- Note: Everything uploaded in this section counts towards the 50-page limit. |
| **Section 09: Service/Engagement** | **Service/Engagement**: Candidate will upload their evidence for this section in the appropriate subfolders. Faculty for whom service is not a required will not have materials to upload in this folder.  
- Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.  
- If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.  
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that for IUPUI should be included in an Appendix.  
- Note: Everything uploaded in this section counts towards the 50-page limit. |
Section 10: Assessment*/Curriculum Vitae

**General - Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae:** If the candidate is in a core school and needs to provide their CV in two different formats, one should be clearly labeled IUPUI format.

**External Letters:** The assessment of dissemination outlets* in the candidate’s area of excellence, typically prepared by the department chair, is uploaded as a separate document to the External Letters section prior to the dossier being routed for review.

Section 11: Appendices

Electronic copies of candidate’s appendix can be uploaded to eDossier in the **General - Candidate’s Statement** folder; however, it is not required. If the candidate’s appendix is not electronic, it still needs to be submitted per school and/or department guidelines. It shall be retained at the school level and will be available upon request by the Campus Committee and Executive Reviewers.

**New for eDossier**

**General - Department and School Criteria:** Candidate should upload an official copy of the current department and/or school criteria for excellence.

**General - Department (School) List of Prospective Referees:** Not required for IUPUI dossiers, leave this subfolder empty. (As of July 30, 2015, uploading a blank document in order for the system to function correctly is no longer required.)

**General - Candidate's List of Prospective Referees:** Not required for IUPUI dossiers, leave this subfolder empty. (As of July 30, 2015, uploading a blank document in order for the system to function correctly is no longer required.)

Additional Materials and/or Reconsideration Documentation

**Supplemental Items:** Once the Candidate has submitted their dossier, this folder will appear. Candidate will upload any additional materials or reconsideration documents in PDF format to the Supplemental Supporting Items subfolder.

*The Vote Record, Internal Letters, External Letters and Solicited Letters folders are not visible to the Candidate. Deans, department chairs and support staff with administrative rights have access to the External Letters and Solicited Letters folders while the candidate is preparing their dossier and during the routing process to upload documents. They are also able to view all of the candidate folders at any time; however, they cannot make any changes or upload documents to the candidate folders unless the candidate has specifically given them delegate access. Those with access at the department level can only see dossiers for candidates in their department. Those with access at the school level will see dossiers for all the candidates in their school.

During the review process, in addition to having view only access to all other folders in the dossier, the Vote Record and Internal Letters folders will be accessible to committee chairs, department chairs and the dean. Once the review for a level is done, the vote is recorded in the Vote Record and the review letter uploaded to the Internal Letters folder then the dossier is routed to the next level for review. They will only have access to enter votes and upload while the dossier is at their level for review; once it is routed to the next level their access changes to view only. Each level can view items in these two folders for their level and below.

Committee reviewers will have view access only to all folders in the dossier once it is routed to their committee for review. Each committee can only view items the Vote Record and Internal Letters folders for their level and below.
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## SUMMARY OF AREAS OF EXCELLENCE AND EXPECTATIONS FOR VARIOUS FACULTY CATEGORIES

<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>Associate Professor Tenure Track²</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 independent⁵ 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>Professor Tenure Track²</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 independent⁵ 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 disrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Librarian³</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 independent⁵ peers outside unit on IUPUI campus</td>
<td>(No Additional requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian⁴,⁶</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 independent⁵ 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.”

2015-16 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**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of teaching performance</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section I: CV</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching load</strong></td>
<td>List of courses, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching goals</strong></td>
<td>Goals and/or Teaching Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing professional development</strong></td>
<td>List of formal activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of exemplary teaching methods</strong></td>
<td>Description of methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of teaching</strong></td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence of student learning</strong></td>
<td>Reflective comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td>Self-report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship of teaching and national leadership</strong></td>
<td>Publications, presentations, national leadership on teaching in discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course and curriculum development</strong></td>
<td>List of committees, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition (grants, awards)</strong></td>
<td>List of recognitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Suggested Standards for Evaluating Teaching Performance

<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>Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Incomplete lists of formal instruction</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, students, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective and innovative instruction</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete evidence to interpret load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete information about goals of instruction 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course or Curricular Development</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Evidence of new course development or significant course revision (e.g., use of technology, service learning) presented with evidence on effectiveness</td>
<td>Nature of course or curricular development clearly reflects an informed knowledge base, clear instructional goals, and assessment of the outcomes</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring and Advising</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized Student satisfaction indicated by evidence Satisfactory impact on student achievement clear</td>
<td>Important impact and student achievement documented</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Scholarly Activities, including Awards** | No teaching awards or other recognition of successful teaching and learning  
No evidence of dissemination of good practice or scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) | Evidence of some local dissemination of good practice and/or SoTL Some recognition of teaching efforts | Evidence of regular and significant 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) | 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. |
| **Professional Development Efforts in Teaching** | 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 | 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 | High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers  
Indications of substantial positive impact on colleagues  
Positive peer assessment of these teaching experiments  
(For clinical and lecturer categories, this level constitutes excellence) | 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 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three to five most significant publications or creative activities which reflect</td>
<td>List all publications or creative activities and indicate whether in rank and whether refereed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major research accomplishments</td>
<td>Description in personal statement may also note the most significant publications or creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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>Evaluation of stature of journals in which articles appear</td>
<td>Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May be an indication in CV (refereed v. non-refereed, name of publisher, age of journal title)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate may also comment on a journal’s quality in the Candidate’s Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External assessment letters may also provide guidance on the stature of journals and other publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of stature of galleries where works appear or stature of performance</td>
<td>Provided by department or school. Committee reports and letters from Dean and Chair may also provide evidence of stature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venues</td>
<td>May be an indication in CV (stature of gallery or performing venue, city, potential size of audience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate may also comment on galleries in the Candidate’s Statement, especially when the significance is not self-evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External assessment letters may also provide guidance on the stature of galleries and performance venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expectations</td>
<td>As above: a letter often points out unusual circumstances related to work load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This may also be commented on in the personal statement (but seek confirmation from other documents in the dossier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May be more detailed comments on this, particularly where load is considered heavy in school or department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment on fit with IUPUI and department/school goals and quantity of effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research goals/program of research or creative activities</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List of goals and candidate’s description of continuing program of research, scholarship or creative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of candidate’s research or creative activities progress and future potential in external assessment letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of research or creative activities</td>
<td>Primary and unit committee reports, letters from Chair and Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate’s Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective comments by candidate not already in the Candidate’s Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experts in candidate’s field through letters solicited by chairs or deans                                                                ---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</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>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary or Professional</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and external support</td>
<td>No evidence of attempts to seek support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Review the candidate's funding in light of the present context for funding in the field)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>Local and external peer reviews have evaluated the work as unsatisfactory. [Procedures require internal and external reviews.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly activities, including awards</td>
<td>None are documented</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.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Highly Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Service*</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Citizenship: Routine department expectations Chair's determination that service is more than mere participation Noted in CV, but not in promotion and tenure document</td>
<td>Accompanied by independent testimony of value of work (e.g., letter from the committee chair; acceptance by Faculty Council) &quot;wrote a policy that was approved by committee&quot; &quot;not required or expected&quot; 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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Discipline</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Activities: routine, required, or expected</td>
<td>Accompanied by independent evidence of success, impact (e.g., ratings by participants) &quot;organized a workshop series for conference that was successfully offered&quot; 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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Community</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Professional Activities: routine, required, or expected</td>
<td>Accompanied by independent evidence of impact &quot;chaired a subcommittee of the board that accomplished X, Y, &amp; Z&quot; &quot;played a leadership role in developing the capacity of a community-based organization&quot; 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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DOCUMENTING PERFORMANCE IN IUPUI LIBRARIAN DOSSIERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Required</th>
<th>Potential Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listing of major performance achievements and positions held</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section I: CV</strong> May be referenced in all of these sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of performance</strong></td>
<td>All of the above sources may contain evidence of the effectiveness of the librarian's performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation</strong></td>
<td>Indication in the materials submitted above (use to cross-check against materials supplied by candidate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contribution of librarian's performance to library operations quality of services</strong></td>
<td>All of the above; include a copy of the library's mission statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of contributions when more than one librarian is involved in a project</strong></td>
<td>Specific notations in all of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of teaching when teaching is part of job assignments</strong></td>
<td>See grid for Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing efforts to enhance performance</strong></td>
<td>Above documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 06: Candidate’s Statement:  This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

- Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate’s statement that reflects their own assessments of their accomplishments in teaching, research and creative activity, and service (for tenured or tenure track faculty); teaching and service (for clinical and lecturer faculty); or performance, professional development, and service (for librarians). Prospects for continued development in these areas must be addressed.

- Candidates have the option to limit the Candidate’s Statement in Section 06 to five pages and include two single-spaced pages, addressing the area of excellence, as a section introduction in either Section 07, 08 or 09 depending on chosen area of excellence.

- Candidates going up on a balanced case should prepare a maximum of 7 single-spaced pages for their candidate’s statement, inclusive of the three areas of highly satisfactory work in Section 06. In cases where the candidate undergoes unit-level review at another campus (e.g., Core Schools like Business, Education, etc.), an accommodation with the page-length expectations of those campuses may be needed.

- Candidates are cautioned to describe their work in clear language that can be understood by readers from other disciplines.

- The Candidate’s Statement is a place for reflective commentary focused on the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

- The Candidate’s Statement should address the interrelated aspects of a whole, integrated career. Few candidates make sharp distinctions among the various aspects of their work as they do it, and the statement should indicate how the candidate views the integration of these aspects, even while assessing achievements in each. Special attention should be given to work that cuts across specializations and disciplines and that helps integrate and apply knowledge to broad patterns of intellectual activity.

- Candidates engaged in interdisciplinary work or team science should make every effort to represent their contribution to collaborative scholarship clearly, as well as the significance and value of any interdisciplinary approach they are pursuing. Candidates should carefully document their individual contributions within this context and should also demonstrate some level of independent research beyond the team science work.

- Candidates involved in public scholarly work or civic/community engagement should clearly articulate the nature of their work and how it differs from traditional scholarship, evidence metrics and dissemination outlets.

- Candidates should be careful to provide clear and sufficient information about their individual roles in collaborative projects, publications, presentation, or grants.

- Candidates should explain how their service has contributed to the common good of the campus and University and how these contributions reflect department and school/unit expectations.

- Candidates should especially address their own assessment of the impact, significance or value of their work to their discipline or profession, to the unit and campus, and to society as a whole.

- Candidates should also indicate the prospects for continued personal development in their defined areas of professional activity.
  - Whenever possible, tenure-track faculty members should state specific plans for a research or creative activity agenda, for a plan to enhance teaching effectiveness, and for continued participation through professional service in their profession, the campus, and a community.
  - Faculty in non-tenure track appointments should focus on their respective areas of performance.
  - Similarly, librarians should indicate the prospects for maintaining excellent performance and for contributing to their profession through their engagement in professional development and service activities.

- Candidates who seek advancement based on excellence in professional service should be able to demonstrate that such service is, in fact, academic work, which has significant results that have been communicated or disseminated in such a manner as to be reviewed by peers. The application of criteria to professional service should be clear, and professional service must be clearly related to the mission of the University, campus, and school/unit.

- The candidate’s case for excellence should be made in relation to department, school/unit, and University criteria.

SECTION 07: Teaching (For Librarians: Performance):  This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier. This section is excluded for non-tenure eligible research ranks.

Faculty: Documenting Teaching

IUPUI requires documented evidence of at least satisfactory teaching by each faculty member for tenure and for advancement in rank (with the exception of those classified as research faculty, scientists and scholars).
This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to teaching and, if this is the area of excellence, the candidate has the option to limit the Candidate’s Statement in Section 06 to 5 pages and add a Statement of Teaching (a narrative analyzing the teaching area that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages as a section introduction). Candidates should provide the following evidence to document teaching and advising in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers (required for satisfactory level or higher).

- Peer review of teaching is as important as peer review of research and creative activity.
- Review of teaching is a formative activity to facilitate improvement and skill development in teaching. Rank requirements such as those used for external evaluators are not applied to the formative teaching review processes.
- Local disciplinary peers can provide essential information and assessment based on observation of the classroom, studio, laboratory, or other learning environments, including those based on technology. Additionally, local peers outside the discipline can provide an additional perspective of excellence in teaching, including practices in the classroom, teaching materials, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Peer review of classroom instruction is most effective when it is based on multiple visits to classes and examination of materials; isolated observations are rarely helpful.
- It is much more difficult for external peers (i.e., external to IUPUI) to observe actual teaching, and thus local peers should prepare reports sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers along with other documented results of effectiveness.
- Evidence in the dossier should summarize statements, checklists, and methods used by peers to comment upon the quality of classroom performance and the quality of course design as evident in the syllabus and other course materials reviewed by colleagues. Similar statement or summary evidence of instruments may be submitted to document impact on student learning based on peer review of such indicators as student work (papers and projects), performance on standard exams, or personal experience with students in subsequent courses or institutions of higher learning. This evidence from peers may have resulted from in-person review or from review of materials in print or electronic form by those at a distance who teach in similar fields or use similar methods.

Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or better).

- Such assessments are most effective when conducted over a period of years and compared to other faculty in the school/unit.
- Only summaries should be included in dossiers. The summary should include (in grid format if possible) results by course, year and item to establish trend lines where applicable.
- The summary should discuss individual results within the context of the department or school/unit to enhance the usefulness of the information to outside readers. When norms are available for comparison to others in the program, school/unit, campus, or discipline, these should be included.
- When results of scaled questionnaires are used, the values of the numeric ratings should be stated.

Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of knowledge about teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media, is required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence.

- Such activities, while listed on the curriculum vitae, should also be documented and discussed in this section.
- Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in teaching should have peer-reviewed publications that document student accomplishment or contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning.
- Discussion of 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 is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.
- In some instances, and particularly for the lecturer and clinical ranks, publication may not be the most effective or feasible means of disseminating the results of effective teaching practices or pedagogical research. When other forms of disseminating results are more appropriate, this fact should be explained and those evaluating the candidate’s work at the primary, unit, and campus levels should consider this alternative form of dissemination. Candidates and department chairs (or deans) may wish
to take special care in explaining why alternative forms of dissemination may better fit with standards in the field.

**Evidence that courses taught contribute to the overall student learning outcomes specified by the unit and evidence that students have met or exceeded course or curricular learning objectives should be provided.**

- The role of the faculty member in assisting students to meet learning objectives should be documented and assessed in ways appropriate to the discipline and to the mission of the unit.
- This may be captured through peer review or through systematic assessment of student achievement or from standardized, nationally-normed profession-related tests.
- Faculty who teach undergraduate students should also address how their courses and scholarship of teaching contribute to learning outcomes specified by their academic unit and the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PULs) in the statement they submit for this section.
- At the graduate and graduate professional levels, comparable assessment measures for student learning should be developed if they do not yet exist and the Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (PGPLs) should be addressed.

**Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable.**

- This evidence can be provided by listing co-authored papers or joint conference publications with students on the curriculum vitae or by discussing the nature of the student outcomes in the statement for this section.

**Evidence of the nature and quality of course and curriculum development and implementation to enhance the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching is expected.**

- Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present these aspects of course design (even experimental use), and how they conform to or extend principles of good practice.
- Course and curriculum development and implementation activities not reported in the candidate’s statement or in the curriculum vitae may be included in this section.
- Evidence about student learning associated with these activities can be part of the peer review or student evaluation evidence, especially when reviewers have been asked to comment on these specific innovations.
- Improvement in teaching for probationary faculty can be compelling when documentation demonstrates that the improvements can be sustained.
- External peer evaluation of course development is highly recommended for faculty documenting excellence in teaching.

**The number of student graduate committees the candidate has served on or chaired and the evidence of the quality of results as documented by student achievements should be provided, as appropriate.**

**Local, regional, national, or international teaching, advising or mentoring awards,** including information about their nature and significance (e.g., criteria, competitiveness, pool of applicants, number awarded) should be listed. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae, but if explanatory details are needed, they may be included in this section.

**Teaching or advising grants** (including training grants) received and their outcomes should be included. These can be listed on the curriculum vitae with outcomes information included in the statement for this section.

**Leadership roles in professional associations in organizing conferences, in presenting papers at conferences related to teaching, advising or mentoring,** and in advancing other aspects of teaching should be included.

- While these can be listed as professional service on the curriculum vitae, they may be included in the statement for this section if explanatory details are needed to support the candidate’s case.

**Information on the teaching load of the candidate should be reported.**

- While the teaching load is reported on the curriculum vitae, an indication of whether it is greater or less than the average teaching load in the department should be reported in this section.
- A large number of students is not *per se* evidence of achievement; teaching and student learning must be evaluated.
- Similarly, teaching a small number of students does not indicate diminished achievement if the teaching load is appropriate and there is a sufficient threshold for evaluating the quality of the teaching.
- Faculty may hold part-time appointments at any rank and in any classification; the expectations and measures for teaching achievement should be proportionate.
Using technology, distributed education, problem-based learning, community-based learning, international videoconferencing, or other new techniques and tools to enhance student learning.

- Faculty are encouraged to report their experiments and to document results.

**Interdisciplinary work**

- Faculty engaged in interdisciplinary teaching are encouraged to describe the significance and impact of bringing multiple disciplinary approaches to their area of interest.

**Retention**

- Since retention of students is of considerable importance to IUPUI, faculty members involved in retention efforts should include a description of these activities.
- Include any evidence that indicates the impact these activities have had on increasing retention, either in their own classrooms or in a broader school/unit or campus setting.

**Librarians: Documenting Performance**

The *Indiana University Academic Handbook* requires that the primary area of excellence for every librarian be Performance. This section consists of supporting documentation related to librarian performance. Any scholarship related to performance is considered Librarian Professional Development.

Candidates should provide the following evidence to document librarian performance in Section 07 of the dossier:

- **A Statement on Performance** describing performance activities and their impact is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian performance area. When performance is highly repetitive, as is often the case for librarians, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated activities.

- **Position description(s) detailing performance responsibilities.**

- **Evidence of quality or impact by patrons, faculty or other recipients of librarian performance.** It is difficult for external peers to observe actual performance, and thus, these activities should be sufficiently descriptive to be useful to external peers.

- **Other documentation addressing the quality of performance can be included, and might contain:**
  - Table or charts that summarize major performance projects/products.
  - Statistical summaries over time.
  - Other documentation addressing the quality of performance, as described in the “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Librarian Performance,” should be included.

**SECTION 08: Research and Creative Activity (For Librarians: Professional Development):** This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

- Research or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty at IUPUI, as well as all research faculty, scientists, and scholars.
- For these faculty members, a threshold of documented satisfactory performance is required for promotion and/or tenure.
- In some units, funded research is an expectation and has become incorporated in departmental or school/unit standards for assessing excellence or satisfactory performance. Candidates should be careful to understand departmental or school/unit standards for external funding. Expectations should be applied consistently and equitably to all faculty within units. Information regarding the expectation for externally funded research should be available to all faculty in written form if it is a requirement for advancement.
- Peer review of research and creative activity is required, both for satisfactory and for excellence levels of evaluation.

**Faculty: Documentation of Research or Creative Activity**

This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to research or creative activity and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Research or Creative Activity (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the research or creative activity area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to document research or creativity in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

- **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.
In order to help reviewers outside the discipline to understand the importance placed on the order in which authors are listed in a publication notation, candidates should include descriptions of these conventions in their dossier.

- Increasingly, research or creative activity involves collaboration. Such collaboration across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work. They should make clear their individual role (e.g., conception of work; acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing, revisions, and other communication; administrative and material support; corresponding or primary authorship) in such collective activity, preferably as related by colleagues involved in the joint work. Department or school/unit assessment of the individual contributions of the candidate who works with more than one author or collaborator must be included.
- The candidate’s own description of a continuing program of research or creative activity that will carry forward into the future.
- Discussion of 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 is expected. Because a presentation may take many forms, it must be documented and retrievable, and is valued for promotion and tenure purposes to the extent it reflects the same criteria of scholarly value as standard professional publications, including its breadth of exposure and dissemination; its scholarly impact; and the selectivity, scale, scope, and the prestige of the presentation venue.
- Where applicable, there should be an assessment of the candidate's contributions to interdisciplinary research, including written evaluations from appropriate peers in research centers or other departments.

Librarians: Documentation of Professional Development
Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to Performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If Professional Development is selected, a Statement on Professional Development describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian’s Professional Development. Librarian Professional Development includes all scholarship (including any scholarship of performance, professional development, and service).

- Documentation may take many forms, such as research (both applied and theoretical), publications, or presentations to professional or disciplinary groups.
- Documentation should include a definite continuing program of professional development that advances ideas, knowledge, and technical ability to the whole profession and academic life, including internal and external peer review. Annual reviews may also be included.

SECTION 09: Professional and University Service (For Librarians: Service): This section counts toward the 50-page limit on the dossier.

Faculty: Documentation of Professional and University Service
This section generally consists of supporting documentation related to service and, if this is the area of excellence, a Statement on Service (a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the service area). Candidates should provide the following evidence to service in this section. They should feel free to address other points not identified below:

- Professional service is normally provided to three specific groups:
  - the public (e.g., various local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients);
  - the profession or discipline; and
  - the campus and University.
- Satisfactory professional service is expected of each faculty member and librarian.
- The importance assigned to service in considering candidates for promotion or tenure may vary according to individual circumstances and the mission of the unit.
- Professional service, including professional service in the community and patient or client services, is characterized by those activities conducted on behalf of the University that apply the faculty member's and librarian's disciplinary expertise and professional knowledge of interrelated fields to issues in society.
In documenting excellence in professional service, faculty must be alert to the need to collect information and evidence at the time services are provided so that it can be used later to demonstrate impact.

To be the basis for tenure or 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 assessed as academic work 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; and evidence of impact.

Peer review within IUPUI and by disciplinary or professional peers at other universities or public settings is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service, as it is for teaching and research.

Evaluations of effectiveness by clients, patients, and other recipients of or participants in professional service activities may be critically important as evidence that can be summarized and assessed by disciplinary peers. Evaluation of service impact may include outcome data for the population served, compliance with evidence-based practice guidelines, or comparative data from benchmark groups.

Faculty claiming excellence in service, whose professional service consists primarily of patient or client service, must document how their work exceeds normative levels of activity and quality and is, in fact, excellent because it represents exceptional outcomes that result in the faculty member being recognized as an expert in their field and brings prestige to the candidate, the primary/department and the unit/school. Such service based on exceptional care contributes to the knowledge base or demonstrates a level of proficiency that itself illuminates practice for others. In all cases, this work must have impact beyond the direct recipient of the service; and be documented through appropriate publications or dissemination activities.

For lecturers, service may be directed toward the academic unit, but must be characterized as intellectual work to be considered as professional service. For example, developing standards for the assessment of the portfolios of entering students may be appropriately classified as professional service.

Excellence in professional service ordinarily results in the dissemination of results and findings through appropriate publication, whether in print or electronic media. The journals, books, or web documents in which faculty publish the results of their service activities should be assessed and evaluated by department chairs (or deans) in the same manner as they are for research or teaching publications.

As with research, professional service may span traditional disciplinary boundaries. In such instances, candidates and chairs or deans may wish to develop appropriate procedures (e.g., a specially composed primary committee) to ensure that the nature of interdisciplinary professional service is fully and adequately understood and assessed.

Professional service to clients and patients as well as to the discipline may be local, regional, national, or International

This section should minimally include the following items:

- **Description of the candidate's professional service activities.**
  - Faculty involved in clinical practice should describe the variety and extent of patient or client care.
  - Those activities that are truly exceptional should be annotated to differentiate these activities from the level of clinical service expected as a normal distribution of effort.
  - Faculty presenting committee or voluntary service as evidence of achievement in service should demonstrate that it is a direct reflection of professional expertise and has been evaluated by peers as substantive professional and intellectual work.
  - Professional service that is the basis of advancement in rank or tenure must be clearly established as academic work.

- **Evidence of the significance and impact of the professional service** should be provided through tangible results that can be assessed in the context of unit and campus mission.

- **Evidence of the candidate's individual contributions,** especially when the professional service is collaborative in nature; specific contributions of the candidate should be noted.

- **Evidence of leadership** in providing professional service, especially when there is a collaborative environment, including contributions that build consensus, help others (including patients or clients)
complete required assignments, and reflect the best practices and standards of the discipline; evidence of increasing levels of responsibility and sustained contributions are important.

- **Evidence of effective dissemination of results to peers, practitioners, clients, patients or service recipients** in reports, documents, or other means of dissemination that are designed appropriately to make the results understood and useful. While these reports may not be peer reviewed as a part of the publication and dissemination process, they should be evaluated by disciplinary peers for appropriateness and effectiveness as a part of the advancement review process. **Evidence and evaluation of the impact of university service.**

- **Documenting professional service activities when excellence in professional service is the primary basis for promotion or tenure:**

- **External peer evaluation of products or results of professional service**, including refereed and nonrefereed publications or other means of dissemination. While some peers may come from the practice community, a majority should be independent academic peers from institutions with an equal or greater reputation in the area of professional service. Special care must be given to assure that the external reviewers are at “arm’s length” or independent as described in the section on **External Assessment.**
  - Care should be taken in describing the qualifications and relevance of external reviewers, especially when the reviewers are not academically based.
  - When professional service is conducted outside the U.S., it is advisable to seek some evaluation by appropriate peers in the relevant countries.
  - Client evaluations may not be substituted for peer evaluations.

- **Assessments from local faculty colleagues** who can place the quality of professional service within a context of departmental, school/unit, or interdisciplinary standards.

- **Evaluation by clients, patients or service recipients.** Faculty should arrange for timely evaluations by recipients and determine appropriate ways to use this information.

- **When professional service is highly repetitive**, as is often the case in patient care, candidates should comment on the cumulative impact of the repeated activities. Quantity of patient service ordinarily is not a sufficient factor in promotion or tenure, although it is expected to be high to support an area of excellence.

**Librarians: Documentation of Service**

Librarians must select a secondary area for promotion and/or tenure in addition to Performance, which is always the primary area of excellence. If Service is selected, a Statement on Service, describing the impact of activities in this category is expected. The statement should be a narrative that is a maximum of 2 single-spaced pages analyzing the librarian’s Service. The notion of professional service, as it is applied to faculty, is seldom applicable to librarians since ‘professional service’ is more typically an aspect of librarian performance. Nonetheless, professional services that do not fall within the scope of a librarian’s position description may be included as evidence satisfying the service criterion. These may take the form of professional consulting or teaching.

- Documentation of service should focus on impact.
- A librarian must present evidence of satisfactory service for tenure and, if service is cited as an area of emphasis, evidence of continued improvement beyond the satisfactory level for promotion from assistant to associate librarian.
- Service to national or international organizations is highly encouraged, but not required. Institutional, local, regional, and national service should be documented through peer and external review.

**SECTION 10: Assessment/Curriculum Vitae**

This section of the dossier is prepared by the candidate and the primary/department level reviewers/administrators. For core schools based in Bloomington, this is typically the Executive Associate Dean or their designee. For schools that do not have a level one review this will be done by unit/school level reviewers/administrators. This section contains the following documents which should be placed in the dossier in the exact order listed below:

- An assessment the dissemination outlets in the candidate’s area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case). This is typically prepared by the department Chair (see **Year 6 under Chair Responsibilities** for complete details); however, it could be prepared by the primary committee chair, unit committee chair, dean, or designee. It is NOT prepared by the candidate. Department or school/unit evaluation of the stature of the journals in which the publications appeared, the museums or galleries showing creative work, or other venues for disseminating the results of research or creative
activity must be included. Whenever available, the acceptance rates (or other evidence of stature or quality) should be noted. Avoid abbreviations; reviewers outside the candidate's field are not likely to be familiar with them. In instances where a candidate is working in an interdisciplinary field and is publishing in journals or media other than the normal disciplinary publications, care should be taken to explain the nature, quality and role of the journals. If the published work is of demonstrably high quality, the fact that a journal is not (yet) highly ranked or even recognized within a discipline should not by itself be grounds for disqualifying or devaluing the publications. **The actual assessment must be placed here; it is not acceptable to simply place a marker that asks the reviewer to refer to the chair's letter or some other place in the dossier.**

- A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accord with the standard format.

**SECTION 11: Appendices:** Appendices are not part of the 50-page limit.

- Appendices should provide documentation for all of the assertions made in the Candidate's Statement.
- Appendices may include articles published or accepted for publication, grant proposals accepted or under consideration, syllabi for redesigned courses, or any other materials that support a case for excellence in a chosen area and at least satisfactory performance in the other areas.
- Librarians, in accord with guidelines for librarian dossiers, should add separate appendices that include supporting documents for: (1) performance; (2) professional development; and (3) service. Appendices should be as succinct and as carefully selected as possible.
- Appendices are to be retained at the school/unit level, but be available to the campus level upon request. **Do NOT forward hard copies of Appendices to Faculty Appointments and Advancement unless specifically requested.** If candidates wish to make their appendices electronic, they may be included in the electronic copies sent to FAA; however, this is *not* required.
1. Provide a brief overview of your background and area of excellence.

I am a dentist with a PhD who conducts research in caries (tooth decay) prevention. I went up for promotion to full rank with research as my area of excellence. My focus is translational research that moves innovations produced in laboratory and translates them to applications that can be used in the community to prevent caries. I built my case based on the evolution of my research. Your narrative is crucial in making your case for promotion. Make sure you tell your story and why what you do is relevant. To document excellence in research, non-traditional federal/NIH funding is OK but you need to tell how it fits with what you do and why it is significant and impactful.

2. Discuss what steps you took to prepare yourself for promotion to full professor.

To prepare for the promotion process, I reviewed guidelines and expectations for full rank. It is important to be intentional and selective. Create a strategic plan. Find a problem of relevance that you can tackle, identify who is funding in that area and develop key action steps - pilot data, post-docs, students, publications. Find a niche, something you can do well, that is specific enough so you can start creating a reputation in that area. In my case, my niche is fluoride analysis which has broad applications globally. My expertise in this area generated many opportunities to serve on panels and invitations to speak at national and international conferences. It is important to look for and establish international collaborations.

3. How did you sustain your national reputation, expand scholarship and mentor students in your area of excellence to meet full rank expectations?

Be intentional and selective. After you find your niche, make time to attend conferences, become officer, volunteer, chair sessions, and network.

4. How did you balance your academic and/or administrative responsibilities with your need to produce and disseminate peer-reviewed scholarship?

No sleep! The hard thing or challenge is balancing children, partner, parents, and work. Find your rhythm; carve out time, make a schedule and stick to it! Create scholarship opportunities out of administrative tasks or teaching – integrate them. In my case, international service helped me integrate student learning and caries prevention research. I organized a service learning trip - taught class, had four master’s students do research, produced four publications, and used the pilot data for developing external grant proposals.

5. What advice would you offer colleagues who are planning to pursue full rank?

Document, get organized, and create a strategic plan.
Promotion to Full Rank

Melissa Lavitt, Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Gail Williamson, Director of Faculty Enhancement, Academic Affairs
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WHAT IS EXPECTED FOR FULL RANK?

Tenured Faculty
Librarian Faculty
Clinical-track Faculty
Research-track Faculty
## Tenured Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Sought</th>
<th>Area of Excellence</th>
<th>Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Excellence Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Teaching, Research, or Service</td>
<td>Other two areas</td>
<td>Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A sustained national reputation as demonstrated by a well-established, cumulative body of work in rank. Special circumstances where scholarly productivity has been interrupted can be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Case</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfactory in all three areas; scholarship required in all three areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**IUPUI**
## Tenured Librarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Sought</th>
<th>Area of Excellence</th>
<th>Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Excellence Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Performance and excellence in either Professional Development, Research and/or Creativity or in Service</td>
<td>At least satisfactory in other area</td>
<td>Record of superior performance as associate librarian; attainment of state, regional, or national recognition in the library profession. Record of exceptional achievements in performance and a record of distinguished contributions to the university, profession, or community in the secondary area of excellence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NonTenure-Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Area of Excellence</th>
<th>Satisfactory Performance</th>
<th>Excellence Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Teaching or Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory other area</td>
<td>Record of sustained nationally or internationally disseminated peer-reviewed scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professor, Senior Scientist or Scholar</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Service expectations, if any, as set by school</td>
<td>Record of sustained nationally or internationally disseminated peer-reviewed scholarship and/or grants in research; evidence of independent work, substantial research contributions to field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOSSIER FORMAT OVERVIEW

TIMELINE
ADMINISTRATIVE SECTIONS
CANDIDATE SECTIONS
<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>
When Do You Submit Dossier?

- Tenured faculty/librarians and non-tenure rank faculty for promotion
  - Submit in the May or August of selected year depending on School timeline
  - Submit when achievements and evidence meet criteria
Common Themes of Excellence

• **FOCUS** – Well-established and cumulative body of focused work in rank that further advances knowledge base and brings recognition

• **SCHOLARLY DISSEMINATION** - Dissemination of peer-reviewed scholarship through publication, presentation or other media; increase in senior authorships

• **REPUTATION** - Sustained national reputation

• **IMPACTFUL OUTCOMES** - Impactful products and outcomes that are innovative

• **SERVICE** – Evidence of national and international professional service
Common Themes of Excellence

- **INTEGRATION** - Evidence of integration of all areas of endeavor appropriate for rank
- **REFLECTION** - Approach is reflective, systematic and purposeful
- **QUALITY** - Evidence of quality work and significant achievement
- **FUNDING** - Supports continued innovations or ongoing research in area of excellence
- **MENTORSHIP** – Mentoring the next generation of educators, clinicians, researchers
DOSSIER FORMAT

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

• Section 01: Transaction Forms – no longer used
• 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
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

Minimum of 6 arms-length letters of external review required.

CANDIDATE’S ROLE

May
- 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
06 Candidate’s Statement

Section 06 – It’s Your Unique Story

• Narrative addressing one’s work (7 pages)
  • Option to split 5/2 with area of excellence
• Well-organized with headings/subheadings
  • Understandable outside of discipline
  • Reflective, explanatory, well-written
• Identify present and future focus
• Describe journey and accomplishments in each area of evaluation
• Discuss outcomes, impact and significance of your work

Speaks FOR YOU at all levels of review.
Excellence in Teaching

• Sophisticated teaching philosophy - reflective, innovative, evolved over time
  • Discussion of approach, methodology, goals and their achievement
  • Teaching innovation, curricular development, incorporation of new technology
• Record of nationally and/or internationally disseminated, peer-reviewed scholarship
• Documented by peer/student evaluation over time
• Evidence of impact on student performance and learning outcomes
• Teaching awards or significant funding for teaching projects
Section 07 Teaching

• Supporting documentation related to teaching
  • Statement of Teaching (optional 2-page narrative analyzing teaching if area of excellence)
  • Teaching load information
  • Aggregated peer and student evaluation of teaching
  • Evidence of the student learning
  • Evidence of scholarly dissemination and leadership on teaching
  • Evidence of undergraduate/graduate student research mentoring
  • Evidence of course development/innovation
  • Evidence of teaching developmental efforts
Excellence in Performance

- Based on achievement of position description
  - Excellence demonstrated in the full range of position responsibilities with significant achievement
  - Professional development area encompasses all librarian scholarship

- Examples of evidence
  - 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
07 Performance

• Statement on Performance describing performance activities and their impact as well as secondary area of excellence
• Position description(s) detailing performance responsibilities.
• Evidence of quality or impact by patrons, faculty or other recipients of librarian performance.
• Other documentation addressing the quality of performance and secondary area of excellence.
Excellence in Research/Creative Activity

• Evidence of dissemination of high quality scholarly work: peer-reviewed presentations, publications in top tier journals
• Significant ongoing contributions to the knowledge base that improve or extend 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 fund ongoing program of research
• Evidence of independent/collaborative focused ongoing program of research
• Awards and recognition of research excellence
Section 08 Research

- Supporting documentation related to research or creative activity
  - Statement on Research or Creative Activity (optional 2-page narrative analyzing research if area of excellence)
  - Identification and discussion of the 3-5 most significant peer-reviewed publications in rank.
  - Evidence of scholarly products/presentations
  - Research load information
  - Individual contributions to collaborative work
  - Peer review of research
  - Description of a continuing program of research or creative activity.
Excellence in Service

• Evidence of dissemination of high-quality scholarly work including peer-reviewed presentations, publications in service

• Awards and recognition that acknowledge the significance, quality and leadership in service

• Evidence of significant impact and outcomes of service
  • Establishment of best practices, standards protocols, policies, procedures
  • Longitudinal outcome data normed against national measures; patient outcomes data
  • Grant awards to support service activities; endorsement of service program
Section 09 Service

- Supporting documentation related to service.
  - Statement on Service (optional 2-page narrative analyzing service if area of excellence)
  - Description of the candidate's professional service activities and service load
  - Evidence of significance/impact of the professional service and university service
  - Evidence of scholarly publications, presentations and other forms of dissemination
  - External peer evaluation of the quality and quantity of professional service
  - Evidence of individual contributions
  - Evidence of leadership in professional service
Section 10 Curriculum Vitae

• Assessment of dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case) prepared by the Department Chair, Primary Committee or School Committee. This assessment is not prepared nor inserted by the candidate.

• A copy of the candidate's current curriculum vitae prepared in accordance with the standard P&T format. [http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines/Resources](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines/Resources)
Section 11 Appendices

- Appendices are not part of the 50-page limit
- Appendices provide documentation for all of the assertions made in the Candidate’s Statement
- Provide a table of contents with page references
- Appendices may include articles published or accepted for publication, grant proposals accepted or under consideration, syllabi for redesigned courses, or other materials
- Be selective; avoid excessively large appendices
Comparing Notes - Peer Exchange

1. Where are you on the path to full rank?
2. What area/criterion is most challenging?
3. What area of documentation needs the most work?
4. What is your plan for submission of your dossier for full rank?
eDOSSIER

PREVIEW OF THE FACULTY DOSSIER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
Introduction to eDOSSIER

• Candidates submitting a dossier will have an eDossier file created in year of submission

• Candidates can access via edossier.iu.edu or One IU

• All documents must be searchable PDFs

• Each file must be named to clearly reflect its contents.

• Candidate User Instructions
Welcome Screen

WELCOME TO THE EDOSSIER SYSTEM!

Getting Started

- To get started as a Candidate, click on the "Dossiers" tab and then on the "View Dossier" button. This will open up the dossier menu on the left pane. Clicking on the arrows > on each section will expand that section further.
- If you are a Reviewer of a dossier, click on the "Reviews" tab and then on the candidate name you want to view, click the "View Dossier" button. This will open up the dossier menu on the left pane. Clicking on the arrows > on each section will expand that section further.
- Under the "Help" tab you will find some general application documentation. It may be useful to read through it before diving in.

Candidate User Instructions
Area of Excellence
Assign a Delegate or Guest

To assign a delegate:

1. Click ‘Assign a Candidate Delegate’ link, located at the top of the left-hand menu pane.
2. Enter the "IU Username" of the delegate and click the "Search" button.
3. The name of the person should show up on the "Name" field.
4. If desired, you can enter a "Start and End Date" during which time the delegate has access to your eDossier. With or without start/end dates, click the "save" button to establish your delegate until you remove/delete them.
5. To delete delegate access, click the delete button under the "Action" column to remove their access to your eDossier. Note: Delegate permissions automatically expire once the dossier has been formally submitted (see Section D).

Naming a Guest:

Candidates may also allow guest access. After logging in, on the upper left side of the window, click on “Assign a Guest”. A guest has view only access. This role may be useful if, for example, you are asking a colleague or mentor to review your dossier.
General Folder Contents:

- **Department and School Criteria:** Candidate uploads an official copy of current department/school criteria for excellence.
- **Curriculum Vitae:** Candidate uploads CV; if core school upload both IUPUI and IUB required formats clearly labeled
- **Candidate’s Statement:** Candidate uploads statement not to exceed 7 pages
  - **Appendix:** Candidate uploads electronic appendix as separate document in this folder
- **Department (School) List of Prospective Referees:** Not required for IUPUI dossiers
- **Candidate’s List of Prospective Referees:** Not required for IUPUI dossiers
File Upload
Recommended Approach

- General folder contents remain the same; Department/School Criteria, 10 CV, 06 Candidate’s Statement, 11 Appendix.
- 08 Research/Creative Activity - upload PDF in 1st file folder
- 07 Teaching – upload PDF in 1st file folder
- 09 Service - upload PDF in 1st file folder
Teaching Folder Contents:

- **Teaching:** Candidate will upload their evidence in appropriate subfolders.
  - Faculty for whom teaching is not required will not have materials to upload in folder.
  - Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.
  - If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in the Appendix.
- Files uploaded in this section count toward the 50-page limit.
Section 08 Research/Creative Activity

Research Folder Contents:

- **Research/Creative Activity:** Candidate will upload their evidence in appropriate subfolders.
  - Faculty for whom research is not required will not have materials to upload in folder.
  - Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.
  - The subfolder labeled “Evidence for the Stature...should be left blank.
  - If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in the Appendix.
- Files uploaded in this section count toward the 50-page limit.
Sections 09 Service

Service Folder Contents:

- **Service/Engagement**: Candidate will upload their evidence in appropriate subfolders.
  - Faculty for whom service is not a required will not have materials to upload in folder.
  - Subfolders that do not apply to candidate’s case should be left empty.
  - If candidate cannot find a subfolder with desired title, upload to any section and name file clearly.
- Some subfolders in eDossier refer to items that, for IUPUI, should be included in the Appendix.
- Files uploaded in this section count toward the 50-page limit.
Candidate

During e-dossier preparation

• Checklist (main and subfolders) are visible to the candidate
  – Before submission and through the e-dossier system itself, the candidate may designate delegates who can view and/or assist in uploading materials

After the department chair ‘signs-off’ and the e-dossier formally enters the review process:

• The candidate’s e-dossier is frozen
• Delegate permissions expire
• At this point, candidates may give ‘guest’ access to anyone, but only for viewing of candidate-submitted materials
• A “Supplemental” folder is activated and serves as the means through which the candidate can add materials to his/her e-dossier

Administrative Folders

• External letters, internal evaluative letters and vote records are not accessible/viewable to the candidate at any time during the review process
  – Access to any of these should be managed outside the e-dossier system and according to policy and local practices
Submit

Submit Button

- The submit button is currently disabled for the IUPUI campus for the next cycle. All candidates will be notified when the submit button is activated for the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Shah, Akash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>BL-CRIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>BL-EDUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier Type</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dossier Status</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank Sought</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Excellence</td>
<td>Balanced Case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dossier Status Ready for submission. Submit your Dossier.
Dossier Routing

• e-dossiers move (or “route”) individually from one level to the next via Kuali Workflow

• **Principal routing responsibility rests with certain individuals at each level**
  – *Principals*: Department Chair, Chair of School Committee, Dean, Chair of Campus Committee, Vice Provost/Chancellor, and Provost/Chancellor
  – Certain actions (i.e., vote recording, uploading of evaluative letter) must be met before an e-dossier can be routed forward
  – Through the e-dossier system itself, the principal may designate a delegate who can route and/or assist in routing activities; however, delegates **may not** ‘acknowledge or acknowledge with action’ the addition of supplemental materials

• **After routing, reviewers will receive an email notification alerting them that an e-dossier has arrived at their level and is now accessible to them**
  – How a level manages the review process itself is up to local practice and policy (e.g., a committee may meet before any action is taken)

• [Reviewer and Administrative Access User Instructions](#)
Using e-dossier tools, they will set-up access lists. Some may also serve as 'principal' delegates.

Workflow:

1. Department Eligible Faculty
2. Department Chair
3. School Committee Chair
4. Dean
5. PAC/TAC Chair
6. Vice Provost/Chancellor
7. Provost/Chancellor
8. President

Admin Support

Admin Support

Admin Support
Supplemental Folder:

- Once the Candidate has submitted their dossier, this folder will appear.
- Candidate can upload any additional materials or reconsideration documents in PDF format to the Supplemental Supporting Items subfolder.
Supplemental Documents

**A candidate may add supplemental documents at any time**
- Documents will be date and time-stamped
- When a supplemental document has been submitted, workflow notifications will be sent as a function of “where” the e-dossier currently is in the review process

**Current level: ‘for your information’**
- You are being informed that Candidate X, whose e-dossier is currently under review at your level, has added material(s) to the supplemental folder. *(Please notify others at your level (i.e., committee members) of these materials.)* No other action is required.

**Past level:**
- Candidate X, for whom you have already voted on, has added material(s) to their supplemental folder. Please consider these materials *(and notify others at your level (i.e., committee members) to do so as well).*
  - Choosing ‘Acknowledge’ means that upon review, no further action will be taken.
  - Choosing ‘Acknowledge with Action’ means that upon review, a formal response (i.e., letter and possible revote) will be uploaded.

**‘Acknowledge with Action’ by an earlier level of review:**
- A notification will only be sent to the principal at the current level
  - “In response to the addition of new materials by Candidate X, a formal response has been offered by an earlier level of review. Please consider these responses *(and notify others at your level (i.e., committee members) to do so as well).* No other action is required.”
- A delegate cannot acknowledge
Panel Discussion

Documenting Excellence for Full Rank
Panel Discussants

**Teaching** – Jeffrey Watt, Professor, School of Science

**Research** – E. Angeles Martinez-Mier, Professor, School of Dentistry

**Service** – Stacy Morrone, Professor, School of Education

**Balanced Case** – Kristina Horn Sheeler, Professor, School of Liberal Arts
Questions and Answers
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
EDOSSIER RESOURCES

• eDossier
  http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/eDossier

• eDossier Help
  – Candidate User Instructions
  – Reviewer and Administrative Access User Instructions
  – Instructions on how administrative access users set up review routing
  – Video Tutorial on how administrative access users set up review routing

• Additional Assistance
  – IUPUI dossier content, contact Gail Williamson and/or Melissa Lavitt.
  – IUPUI routing, access or other P&T process questions, contact Christy Cole
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/
Upcoming Programs

• Research Metrics: Gathering Evidence of Impact
  – November 11, 2015
  – 1:30-3:30 pm in UL 1130
  – Register at https://ulib.iupui.edu/node/7842

• Excellence in Research
  – Tuesday, December 8, 2015
  – 9:00 – 11:00 am in CE 405
  – Register at events http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/
Evaluation and Announcements

• Complete program the evaluation – your feedback and ideas are important to us!
• Thank you for your attendance today.
• We hope you found this information helpful.
• Have a great day!
Adjournment

For additional clarification or questions, please contact Gail Williamson (gwilliam@iu.edu) or Melissa Lavitt (mlavitt@iupui.edu).