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I. Preamble

The School of Physical Education and Tourism Management’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document, is a supplement to the IUPUI Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers, hereinafter, referred to as the IUPUI Guidelines. As noted in the IUPUI Guidelines “each school must have a document that states with reasonable specificity the standards that will be used to evaluate whether or not candidates meet the criteria for promotion and/or tenure”. This school specific document fills that requirement.

The IUPUI Guidelines are revised annually. Thus, faculty should become familiar with and review changes to the document each and every year. The IUPUI Guidelines and information about any revisions can be found on the Academic Affairs website. The school-specific information outlined in this document should be considered as adjunctive and supportive to the IUPUI Guidelines and the Indiana University Academic Handbook. It is imperative that individual faculty members, administrators, and promotion/tenure committee members familiarize themselves with these documents and their contents.

While both promotion and tenure are based on performance commensurate with rank, there are notable differences between the two (see “Distinctions Between Promotion and Tenure” in IUPUI Guidelines). In short, promotion is “recognition of achievement” and tenure is both “recognition of achievement and the promise of continued achievement with distinction”.

Categories for evaluation in regard to promotion and/or tenure in the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management and Indiana University are based on a continuing pattern of achievement in the following areas:

1. Teaching
2. Research and/or Creative Activity
3. Service (University and Professional)

In promotion cases, the activities within each of these categories must have been carried out while the candidate was in the rank from which he/she is being promoted. The information contained within this document and the IUPUI Guidelines should be used to evaluate annual faculty performance, to assess progress toward promotion and/or tenure and to prepare dossiers for consideration during the promotion and/or tenure process.

II. Procedure

The school supports the IUPUI affirmative action program and the Americans with Disabilities Act in assuring that sex, race, religion, national origin or disability will in no way interfere with the promotion and/or tenure proceedings of a faculty member.

A. Nominations:

Nominations for promotion can originate from the following:

- Individual faculty members may nominate themselves
- One or more faculty members may nominate other faculty members
- The Department Chair or Program Director may nominate faculty members
- The school’s Promotion and Tenure Committee may nominate faculty members
- The Associate Dean or Dean of the School may nominate individual members
B. Timeline:

The timeline for the preparation of dossiers for promotion and/or tenure review are elucidated in the *IUPUI Guidelines*. Below is a more detailed PETM-specific timetable for initiating and processing promotions and/or tenure dossiers:

**August (of the year prior to dossier submission for promotion and/or tenure)**
The Dean and the Promotion and Tenure Chair will meet annually to review procedures for any potential candidates coming up for promotion and/or tenure. The Associate Dean (or Department Chair) begins administrative preparation for the ensuing review process for each promotion and/or tenure candidate 12 months in advance of submission of dossier.

**April 1**
If there are candidates undergoing a third year review or that will be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean of the School of Physical Education and Tourism Management will appoint an ad hoc Mentoring Committee of no less than three faculty of rank relevant to the level of promotion being considered to review the dossier and provide editorial suggestions to the candidate.

The candidate undergoing a third year review or being considered for promotion and/or tenure should provide the Dean’s ad hoc Mentoring Committee with a copy of the dossier with required documents as specified in the check list (see “Faculty Promotion and Tenure Dossier Unit/School Review Form and Checklist” in the *IUPUI Guidelines*). A list of potential external reviewers with addresses should also be created by the Associate Dean or his/her designee (see “Chief Academic Officer’s Comments Regarding Outside Letters” in the *IUPUI Guidelines*).

**April 15**
The Dean’s ad hoc Mentoring Committee reviews the dossier and returns it with editorial suggestions to the candidate. The Dean’s ad hoc Mentoring Committee sends a summary of the suggested editorial changes to the PETM P&T Committee.

**May 15**
The candidate for promotion and/or tenure submits the finalized dossier to the Associate Dean (or Department Chair).

**June 1**
The Associate Dean (or Department Chair) reviews the dossier and sends out formal requests to the external reviewers to assess the candidate’s merits for promotion and/or tenure.

**August 1**
The Associate Dean (or Department Chair) ensures that all external review letters have been received and have been added to the candidate’s dossier. If a letter has not been received, follow up with the reviewer is required.

**September 15**
The Associate Dean submits his/her recommendation with the dossier to the PETM P&T Committee.

**October 1**
The PETM P&T Committee completes its deliberation and votes on each candidate.
October 8
The PETM P&T Committee completes its recommendation letter and submits it along with the dossier to the Dean.

October 22
The Dean of the School of PETM completes his/her recommendation and forwards it along with the dossier of the candidate to the Dean of the Faculties, IUPUI.

III. Preparation for Promotion and Tenure

Preparation for promotion and/or tenure begins in the first year at IUPUI. Become very familiar with both the IUPUI P&T Guidelines and this document and review them on an annual basis. This is particularly important because the IUPUI P&T Guidelines are revised every year.

It is also very important to attend an IUPUI Academic Affairs Promotion and Tenure Workshop sometime within your first year. These workshops give you a first hand look at the promotion and tenure process and help get candidates off to a good start in regards to documentation in the areas of teaching, research and service.

Candidates, chairs, deans, the Chief Academic Officer, and FAA all have distinct and significant roles and responsibilities in the promotion and/or tenure process. As a faculty member it is important to review the section entitled “Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

The dossier presents the evidence upon which promotion and/or decisions are to be made. Guidelines for dossier format and documentation are to be used whether the candidate is being reviewed for promotion, tenure or both. Specific details on dossiers preparation and format can be found in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. Lastly, faculty should not hesitate to communicate with members of the PETM P&T Committee and/or senior faculty members whenever questions arise or consultation is needed.

IV. Standards and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

A. Teaching:
Teaching is defined as instruction to any number of students in any appropriate setting such as a classroom, on-line, an activity center, and tutorial/workshop. The quality of teaching must achieve the level of excellence when considered as the primary area for promotion and/or tenure.

Satisfactory in Teaching:
For satisfactory in teaching, the candidate’s teaching activities should equal, both in quality and quantity, that which is normally expected of one in the present rank. For the candidate’s total time in the current rank, the candidate is expected to produce documented evidence of accomplishment in criteria 1, 3, 5, and 6 in Table 1 (see below).

Excellence in Teaching:
Candidates pursuing excellence in teaching should exceed in quality and quantity that which is normally expected of one in the present rank. The candidate should demonstrate a potential for continued productivity, demonstrate an independent scholarship of teaching and learning agenda and a potential for continued productivity. For the candidate’s total time in the current rank, the candidate is expected to produce documented evidence of accomplishments in all nine criteria listed in Table 1 (see below).
Evaluation Criteria for Teaching:

### Table 1
Criteria for Rating Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Quality and Quantity of Teaching</strong></td>
<td>a. Documented student evaluation scores that are slightly below, above or at the departmental averages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Documented expected teaching load (i.e., 6 - 12 hours/semester) dependent on faculty appointment or as otherwise adjusted by alternate teaching-related departmental duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Documented PETM P&amp;T committee classroom visit evaluation ratings at or above 2.0 based on PETM P&amp;T Committee’s classroom visit review form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Documented student evaluation scores that have been consistently above the departmental averages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Documented typical teaching load (i.e., 6 - 12 hours/semester) dependent on faculty appointment or as otherwise adjusted by alternate teaching-related departmental duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Documented PETM P&amp;T committee classroom visit evaluation ratings at or above 3.0 based on PETM P&amp;T Committee’s classroom visit peer review form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Documented laudatory external peer review of teaching by a recognized teaching professional**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Evidence of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)</strong></td>
<td>a. Documented presentations related to teaching at professional conferences and/or workshops. The reach of the presentation (i.e., (campus, local, state, regional, national, or international) should be in alignment with faculty rank expectations. A summary of the audience evaluation should be included whenever possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Documented publication(s) related to teaching such as articles in local, state, regional or higher publications, book chapters, textbooks, instructional software, or invited reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Nature and Quality of Courses | Documented comprehensive syllabi with clear delineation of course objectives, content, and assessment that connect with department and school learning outcomes and with campus initiatives such as Principles of Undergraduate Learning (hereafter PULs), Research-International-Service-Experiential Learning (hereafter RISE) | a. Documented comprehensive syllabi with clear delineation of course objectives, content, and assessment that connect with department and school learning outcomes and with campus initiatives such as PULs, RISE  
b. Documented teaching philosophy and evidence that it is practiced in the classroom or learning environment  
c. Documented use of innovative pedagogical methods (e.g., service learning, technology)  
d. Documented laudatory peer evaluation of syllabi and other relevant course materials** |
| 4. Course and/or Curriculum/Program Development | Documented use of assessments and reflections and how such items have been used to improve teaching and learning | a. Documented new course development, curriculum and/or program development or substantial course revision  
b. Document how courses are aligned with overall curriculum and how course content develops new learning or skill but is tied to overall student learning goals |
| 5. Ongoing Assessment of the Learning Environment | Documented use of assessments and reflections and how such items have been used to improve teaching and learning | Documented use of assessments and reflections and how such items have been used to improve teaching and learning |
| 6. Efforts by the Candidate to Improve Teaching | a. Documented acquisition of new teaching techniques, skills and strategies  
b. Documented active participation in educational projects and programs that improve teaching, change course delivery or impact student learning** | a. Documented acquisition of new teaching techniques, skills and strategies  
b. Documented active participation in educational projects and programs that improve teaching, change course delivery or impact student learning** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Teaching Awards</td>
<td>Documented nomination or receipt of campus, local, state or regional teaching awards including information about their stature and significance**</td>
<td>Documented evidence of mentoring students, such as (but not limited to): joint workshop/conference presentations, co-authored papers, ongoing work with scholarship students (e.g., Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program, Multidisciplinary Undergraduate Research Institute, Diversity Scholars Research Program or other selected groups), and/or work with honor students, interns, and student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Mentorship</td>
<td>Documented involvement/participation with grants (school, campus, local, state or regional) to assist with teaching practices, course development, course assessment, and/or curriculum development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** (Seek advice from the PETM Mentoring Committee or a senior faculty member)

Further Information on Teaching:

Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer must achieve excellence in teaching and demonstrate an emerging local, state or regional reputation related to teaching.

Clinical assistant to clinical associate professor candidates choosing teaching as their area of excellence must meet the criteria 1-9 in Table 1 and demonstrate an emerging local, state, or regional reputation related to teaching. Those seeking promotion to Clinical Professor must meet the same teaching criteria 1 – 9 (see Table 1) in addition to demonstrating a “sustained national reputation”.

Assistant to associate professor candidates seeking teaching excellence should meet the teaching requirements (i.e., criteria 1-9, Table 1) and demonstrate an “emerging national reputation” in the area of teaching while those seeking promotion to full professor must demonstrate a “sustained national reputation”.

All candidates should understand that there should be a degree of balance in activity in each of the above listed teaching criteria (see Table 1) within one’s dossier. Where candidates pursue an activity that requires an excessive amount of time (e.g., federal grant, service learning development, curriculum development...
development) in one criterion area, the disproportionate time commitment of the activity will be considered in evaluating their productivity. Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek advice from their department chair/program director and mentoring committee when productivity concerns arise.

Those seeking excellence in teaching should also consider the importance of seeking external funding as compared to internal funding. Finally, all candidates should understand that the impact and/or importance of the various teaching activities may differ depending on the discipline and/or school expectations.

For additional information on documentation of teaching, see the table entitled “Documenting Teaching Performance” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

B. Research and Creative Activity:

**Research** is defined as either singular or collaborative scholarly and scientific investigation, which may be basic or applied. Research involves peer-reviewed abstracts resulting in state, national, or international presentations, refereed proceedings, peer-reviewed journal publications, and internal/external/contract grant submissions.

**Creative Activity** is defined as work outside the typical genre of journal publications and grants but relates to the dissemination of peer-reviewed, scientific investigation or inquiry. Examples include technical briefs, patentable products or procedures, invited research reviews, conference research roundtables, or special sessions at professional conferences.

**Satisfactory in Research and Creative Activity:**
For satisfactory in research, the candidate’s research should equal, both in quality and quantity, that normally expected of one in the present rank. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate an independent research agenda and a potential for continued productivity. For satisfactory in research, guidelines will vary slightly depending on the candidate’s assigned teaching load per academic year (see Table 2 below).

**Excellence in Research and Creative Activity:**
For excellence in research, guidelines for research productivity are typically double that presented in Table 2.

**Evaluation Criteria for Research and Creative Activity:**
Research productivity is defined by the three following research activities:

- Peer-reviewed publications or full paper proceedings
- Peer-reviewed presentations and published refereed abstracts
- Grant and/or contract funding, preferably from external sources
**Table 2**

Satisfactory Performance in Research in Relation to Assigned Teaching Load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year Teaching Load (Fall/Spring)</th>
<th>Academic Year Research Load (Fall/Spring)</th>
<th>Research Productivity Guidelines**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 of 3 research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 of 3 research activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 of 3 research activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**for excellence in research, expectations are typically doubled**

Further Information on Research and Creative Activity:

Research activity is not a requirement for lecturers and clinical faculty. Therefore, any research or creative activity that is performed should be listed under scholarship in the areas of teaching or service, not research.

Assistant to Associate professor candidates seeking research excellence should demonstrate an “emerging national reputation” while those seeking promotion to full professor should demonstrate a “sustained national reputation”.

Candidates should understand that there should be a degree of balance in the research activities within one’s dossier. For example, a person should not have 5 presentations and no refereed publications or grant/contract submissions.

As noted above, for candidates pursuing research excellence, productivity expectations are typically double that indicated in Table 2. Where candidates pursue an activity that requires an excessive amount of time (e.g., NIH grant; publication in one of the top journals in their field), the disproportionate time commitment of the activity will be considered in evaluating their productivity. Candidates are strongly encouraged to seek advice from their Dean, Associate Dean and/or mentoring committee when productivity concerns arise.

Those seeking excellence in research should also consider the importance of seeking external funding as compared to internal funding. Finally, all candidates should understand that the impact of the various types of research and creative activity may differ depending on discipline.

For additional information on documenting research and creative activity, see the table entitled “Documenting Research and Creative Activities in the Dossier” in the *IUPUI Guidelines.*
C. Professional and University Service:

The area of service is composed of two component parts: Professional Service and University Service. Professional Service is characterized by activities that apply a faculty member’s professional knowledge, skills, and disciplinary expertise to benefit others in a manner that is consistent with the mission of the School of PETM and the university. The types of professional service will vary, but are generally defined as:

- Professional service to the Institution (e.g., Department, School, Campus, University);
- Professional service to the Profession or Discipline;
- Professional service to the Public (e.g. local, national, and international communities; clients; and/or patients)

University Service, which is alternatively referred to as service to the university or university citizenship, is distinctly different than the “professional service” described above. University service entails committee work, administrative work, and/or participation in school related functions that do not necessarily require application of ones’ professional skills or expertise. Examples of university service would be serving on the departmental, school and/or campus committees; attending miscellaneous school related functions; engaging in various initiatives as they arise, etc. University service is critical to the support and development of the school and university and as a result, is a required responsibility of all faculties. In fact, as stated in the Dean of the Faculties’ Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers, “unsatisfactory service to the University may preclude successful application for promotion and/or tenure”. It should be noted that not all committee service is equal and some committees require extensive time commitments and/or address issues fundamental to the continued effectiveness of the campus. Thus the special features of each type of university service needs to be documented and recognized. While satisfactory university service is required of all faculties, it should be understood that it is “professional service” that should constitute the bulk of evidence when excellence is being sought.

Evaluation Criteria for Service:

Evaluation of service is based on the information and documentation provided in the dossier. As noted above, the importance assigned to each activity will differ depending on the type of service and the features/characteristics of each service activity. Regardless, at a minimum satisfactory university and professional service is required of all faculty members. For additional information and clarification regarding service expectations, faculty members should refer to the School of PETM Faculty Workload Guidelines and the service section in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines. The table below outlines the general expectations for achieving satisfactory or excellence in service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>The candidate’s service activities should equal, both in quality and quantity that normally expected of one in the present rank.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>The candidate’s service activities should exceed, both in quality and quantity that normally expected of one in the present rank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information, including examples within each category of service performance, see the table entitled, “Suggested Standards for Evaluating Professional Service” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.

Further Information on Service:

Faculty members seeking tenure and/or promotion should review the IUPUI P&T Guidelines (at least
annually) regarding the expectations for documenting service. Similar to teaching and research activities, faculty members should consider documentation of service an ongoing process. For tenure and/or promotion consideration, sufficient and appropriate documentation should be included in the candidate’s dossier to enable evaluators to appropriately assess a faculty member’s quality and quantity of professional and university service. Types of documentation will vary greatly, primarily due to differences in kinds of services provided and the constituencies served. However, personal reflection of one’s service work, examples of scholarly/analytical service work, and evaluative entries (e.g. peer review) may be summarized and used to offer concise and effective documentation. Providing only a list of all service activities is insufficient documentation for proper evaluation.

In the Candidate’s Statement and, if service is the area of excellence, in the Statement of Service, the faculty member should provide a brief, narrative summary of his/her service activity, distinguish the individual role(s) and individual contribution(s) for each type of service, demonstrate the significance and impact of the service work, and briefly describe the manner in which the impact was assessed. In this regard, all faculty members, particularly those declaring service as the area of excellence, 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 document the significance and impact of the faculty member’s intellectual and professional service work.

Peer review within IUPUI and by discipline-specific or professional peers at other universities or public settings is an essential component for evaluating all aspects of professional service and should be included (when applicable) when documenting service activity. For additional information on documenting professional service, see the table entitled “Documenting Professional Service” in the IUPUI P&T Guidelines.
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND REHABILITATION SCIENCES
GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION, TENURE, AND LONG-TERM CONTRACT

This document is to be utilized in a corollary and simultaneous manner with the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines For Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers, the Indiana University Academic Handbook, the IUPUI Supplement to the Indiana University Academic Handbook, and the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences Policy and Procedure Manual. The tenure and promotion guidelines herein are subject to the rules and regulations put forth by the University. It is therefore the responsibility of all candidates for promotion, promotion and tenure, promotion and long-term contract, or promotion only to familiarize themselves with these documents.

IUPUI revises the Guidelines For Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers document annually. As such, all candidates must familiarize themselves with the most recent version available and follow the recommended Candidate Responsibilities and Recommended Timeline. Updated documents can be located on the IUPUI Academic Affairs web site (http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu) or in the SHRS Dean’s office. The IUPUI dossier format is required for the SHRS dossier. The same dossier is to be used for both tenure and promotion reviews. Any questions regarding appropriate format or documentation should be directed to the candidate’s supervisor.

Advancement is based on continued improvement, whether in quality of teaching and the scholarship of teaching, research and the scholarship of research, or in the scholarship of service and the performance of service roles. Refer to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for specific information and where to place the information in the dossier that documents performance in TEACHING, RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES, and SERVICE.
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<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1: TEACHING (EDossier Section 07)

IUPUI requires documented evidence of at least satisfactory teaching by each faculty member for tenure and advancement in rank (with the exception of those classified as non-tenure track research faculty, scientists and scholars). Teaching is defined by the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences as formal or informal instruction to any number of students in any appropriate setting, including classroom, clinical, tutorial, online and preceptorship. The quality of teaching, learning, advising and mentoring should denote continuous improvement.

Section 1-A Criteria for satisfactory teaching, required by each faculty member with a designated area of excellence in research or service for tenure and advancement in rank.

Section 1-B Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor Ranks and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer when teaching is the designated area of excellence.

Section 1-C Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Associate to Full Professor, Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor when teaching is the designated area of excellence.

Section 1-D Useful resources.

1 With the exception of those classified as non-tenure track research faculty, scientists and scholars.

SECTION 1-A

Criteria for satisfactory teaching, required by each faculty member with a designated area of excellence in research or service for tenure and advancement in rank; teaching is NOT the designated area of excellence.

Candidates should provide examples through the following types of evidence to demonstrate performance throughout the review period.

A. Instruction

1. Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers (required for satisfactory level or excellence).
   i. Peer evaluations should cover a variety of the courses taught and occur in each year of teaching.
   ii. One or more teaching evaluations performed by the Center of Teaching & Learning or an external reviewer are highly recommended.

2. Evidence of quality of teaching, advising, or mentoring as evaluated by students (required for satisfactory level or excellence).
   i. Data from student evaluations should be presented for all courses in which there was a major teaching responsibility.
   ii. Include information as to whether the teaching reviews solely reflect your teaching or if the course is taught by more than one professor.
3. 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.

4. Information on the teaching load of the candidate.
   i. Include information on role in each course you teach, and how much of the course you teach compared to the other instructors you teach with.

B. Course or Curricular Development
1. Interdisciplinary/interprofessional education work.
   i. Include information on role in the inter-disciplinary or interprofessional education work team.
2. Evidence of the nature and quality of course and curriculum development and implementation to enhance the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of teaching is expected.
3. Use of technology, distributed education, problem-based learning, community-based learning or other techniques, tools, and high impact practices to enhance student learning.

C. Mentoring and Advising
1. Evidence of undergraduate or graduate research and effective mentor relationships with students leading to documented learning outcomes should be provided when applicable.
2. The number of student graduate committees the candidate has served on or chaired with the role specified and the evidence of the quality of results.
3. Involvement in student retention.

D. Scholarly Activity including Awards
1. Evidence of effective teaching through scholarly dissemination of teaching pedagogy, and/or discipline based teaching, especially in peer-reviewed media (recommended for satisfactory; required for documenting teaching at the level of excellence).
   • Refer to Appendix 1 for assessing the quality of journals and other media.
2. Local, regional, national, or international teaching, advising or mentoring awards.
3. Teaching and advising grants.

E. Professional Development Efforts in Teaching
1. Leadership roles in professional associations, conferences, presenting papers related to teaching, learning, advising or mentoring.

2 A peer in the review of teaching is a recognized excellent teacher and has expertise in teaching pedagogy or is a disciplinary content expert. A review of teaching does not have rank requirements for the reviewer. In other words, unlike external reviews, a reviewer of one’s teaching need not be at the aspirational rank of the candidate.

SECTION 1-B
Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer when teaching is the designated area of excellence.

Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. When teaching is the primary criterion on which promotion is based, it should be...
distinctly superior to that of effective teachers at this and other major institutions and there must be documented evidence the candidate has:

1. Excellence in teaching as defined in the IUPUI PT Guidelines.
2. Sustained excellence in teaching while in current rank.
3. Recognition for excellence in teaching within or outside the University.
4. Satisfactory participation in service to the University beyond the department level.*
5. Satisfactory participation in professional activities at the state or national level or has been active in professional service to the community.*
6. For tenure track – Satisfactory productivity in research, scholarship, or creative activity.*
   For clinical rank – Research productivity is not required; however, the candidate should demonstrate scholarship in the context of teaching.
   For lecturers – Research productivity is not required; however, the candidate should demonstrate scholarship in the context of teaching. Scholarship examples for lecturers may include teaching materials and teaching products.

*Refer to IUPUI P&T guidelines for further detail, including the summary of areas of excellence and expectations for various faculty categories.

Examples of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion of Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Evidence the candidate has:

- Peer evaluations that document qualities of excellence in teaching.
- Student evaluations of teaching documenting high levels of learning and teaching. A summary comparing individual results to program/school/unit averages is helpful to include.
- Documentation of the primary responsibility in a team for development/implementation of an aspect of scholarship of teaching or learning.
- Generation, utilization and integration of research related to teaching or learning.
- Disseminated of integrative reviews of the literature related to teaching and learning.
- Presentation of scholarly findings on teaching or learning at state, regional, or national levels.
- Publication of teaching or learning scholarship in peer-reviewed journals (see Appendix 1).
- Authorship of a chapter or a book on scholarship of teaching or learning or disciplinary based content, for example a textbook or chapter for disciplinary instruction.
- Participation in the development of computer/media/distance related curriculum applications.
- Revision of current teaching or learning strategies based on best practices.
- Demonstration of versatility in teaching strategies to enhance student learning.
- Active participation in the development of new courses.
- Evidence of significant contributions to new curriculum or policy statements related to teaching.
Integration of Principles of Undergraduate Learning and Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning in course and curricular development.

Facilitation of student’s efforts to become published or co-authorship with students on abstracts and/or manuscripts.

Receipt of an award for excellence in teaching from students or peers.

Receipt of internal funding to support teaching or learning scholarship agenda.

Submission or receipt of external funding for scholarship of teaching or learning program.

Leadership positions in state/regional professional teaching related organizations.

Evidence of effective teaching and student learning, such as performance on national licensure examinations.

Guest editorship or reviewer for teaching related journal(s).

Consultant to other internal/local groups for curriculum and teaching.

Provision of continuing education offerings for peers.

Routine involvement with student independent study, groups, or journal clubs.

**SECTION 1-C**

Criteria for Promotion in Rank for **Associate to Full Professor, Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor** when teaching is the designated area of **excellence**.

**Associate to Full Professor, Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor.** This promotion is based on achievement beyond the level required for the associate professorship. If teaching is the primary criterion on which promotion is based, the candidate must have demonstrated an extraordinary ability to motivate undergraduate, graduate, or professional students to excel in learning. The candidate must demonstrate a sustained national or international reputation and there must be documented evidence the candidate has:

1. Demonstrated excellence in the quality of teaching as defined in the IUPUI PT Guidelines.
2. Received recognition for excellence in teaching within and outside the University.
3. Demonstrated excellence in the scholarship of teaching and learning
4. Satisfactory productivity in research, scholarship, or creative activity.*

   *For tenure track* – Satisfactory productivity in research, scholarship, or creative activity.*

   *For clinical rank* – Research productivity is not required; however, the candidate should demonstrate scholarship in the context of teaching.

5. Satisfactory participation in service to the University beyond the department level.*
6. Satisfactory participation in professional activities at the state, national or international level or has been active in professional service to the community.*

*Refer to IUPUI P&T guidelines.
Examples of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion of Associate to Full Professor, Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor. There is documented evidence the candidate has:

- Documentation of extraordinarily successful teaching and learning outcomes through peer evaluations, student evaluations, publications and presentations.
- Documented excellence as a mentor/advisor for faculty and graduate students regarding scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Publication of integrative reviews of literature.
- Author of research-based teaching or learning article(s) in peer reviewed journal(s).
- Authorship of book or chapter related to scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Publication of works that have been widely cited by other scholars in teaching and learning.
- Obtained peer-reviewed internal or external funding to support program of scholarship of teaching and learning resulting in publications or presentations.
- Obtained external funding to support program of scholarship of teaching and learning related to special content or curriculum development.
- Developed and utilized computer/media/distance related curriculum applications that have received recognition.
- Chairperson of campus level committee related to curriculum or assessment.
- Service on an editorial panel for scholarly teaching and learning journal.
- Leadership roles in teaching related organization at national or international levels.
- Receipt of multiple awards for teaching excellence within and outside the University system.
- Reviewer of proposals for external funding related to scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Demonstrated excellence as an educational leader on the regional/national/international level.
- Presentation of continuing education offerings that are nationally recognized.
- Leadership role in incorporating inter-professional education within the professional curricula.

SECTION 1-D

Useful resources:

- A link to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  [http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines)
- The following PDF is a table from the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that summarizes standards for evaluating teaching performance.
SECTION 2: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (EDossier Section 08)

IUPUI requires documented evidence of at least satisfactory performance in research for faculty on a tenure track. Clinical track faculty (non-tenure) are not required to perform research; however, scholarship related to excellence in teaching or service is expected and required for promotion. The scope of research accepted by the SHRS includes basic research, applied research, and translational research. The outcomes of research must enrich the body of knowledge in the realm of health or rehabilitation sciences. Results must appear in refereed or professional journals. The scope of creative activities includes a tangible outcome, product, or method to enrich or upgrade the health knowledge, education, or services. The quality of creative activities must show evidence of scholarly endeavor and impact.

Section 2-A Criteria for satisfactory performance in research/creative activity for tenure track faculty with a designated area of excellence in teaching or service.

Section 2-B Criteria for promotion in rank for Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure when research is the designated area of excellence.

Section 2-C Criteria for promotion in rank for Associate to Full Professor when research is the designated area of excellence.

Section 2-D Useful resources.

SECTION 2-A
Criteria for satisfactory performance in Research and Creative Activities for tenure track faculty with a designated area of excellence in teaching or service; research and creative activities is NOT the designated area of excellence.

Candidates should provide examples through the following types of evidence to demonstrate performance throughout the review period of the time-in-rank.

A. Disciplinary or Professional Research
1. Evidence that the research or creative activities performed by the candidate is appropriate to the discipline/profession and reflects standards of good practice.
   i. Achievements in research activities that show progression through the candidate’s time-in-rank.
   ii. Research-related knowledge extended to colleagues, other disciplines, and constituencies through collaboration and consultation activities.
   iii. Research-related teaching competence, i.e., effectively engaging learners in acquiring knowledge related to research.
   iv. The candidate should clearly define his or her role and contributions to research involving collaborations.

2. Evidence of dissemination of research or creative activities in scholarly journals and other appropriate venues.
i. The results of the candidate’s research/creative activities have been disseminated and externally reviewed.
ii. Refer to Appendix 1 for assessing the quality of journals and other media.

3. The candidate’s research program is clearly articulated to show a commitment to a program of research related to scholarship that results in knowledge development. The research program is consistent with the vision and mission of the SHRS.

B. Grants and External Support
1. Evidence of attempts to obtain funding to support the candidate’s research program and creative activities, which show promise for future success.
   i. There is evidence of ongoing submissions of funding applications.
   ii. Include information about funding amounts and dates.

C. Peer Review
1. Evidence of information about the stature of journals and the significance of the candidate’s publications.
   i. Research and creative activities with high recognition by colleagues within or outside the University.

D. Scholarly Activities, Including Awards
1. Evidence of local dissemination of good practice and recognition.
   i. Adequate self-development activities related to scholarship of knowledge generation.
   ii. Leadership related to scholarship of knowledge generation.

SECTION 2-B
Criteria for promotion in rank for Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure when research is the designated area of excellence.

Assistant to Associate Professor. When research or creative activity is the primary criterion on which promotion with tenure is based, the candidate should have demonstrated a broad grasp of his/her own and related fields and have a record of at minimum nationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship. A comprehensive plan of future research covering a number of years and a beginning thereon, which extends well beyond the limits of the doctoral dissertation, should be evaluated and there must be documented evidence the candidate has:

1. Demonstrated excellence in the quality of research or creative activities defined in the SHRS standard for research, scholarship and creative activity.
2. Satisfactory performance in formal and informal teaching activities to the School at the Department level and to the University beyond the department level.
3. Satisfactory performance in service to the University beyond the department level.*
4. Satisfactory participation in professional activities at the state or national level or has been active in professional service to the community.*

*Refer to IUPUI PT guidelines, including the summary of areas of excellence and expectations for various faculty categories.
Examples of Excellence in research/creative activities for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with tenure. In addition to the standards in Section B1, there is documented evidence the candidate has:

A. Disciplinary or Professional Research
   1. Significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that clearly demonstrates attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including peer refereed publications and presentations and national recognition of the quality of research.
      i. Presented research findings at research conferences at the local and national levels.
      ii. First authorship on peer reviewed research papers (see Appendix 1).
      iii. Authored a book chapter in field of research interest.
      iv. Edited a book in research field of interest.
      v. Consistently included innovations via media or informatics in disseminated findings.
      vi. Co-authored with graduate students.

B. Grants and External Support
   1. Significant contributions that clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with obtaining external support.
      i. Public or private funding as a principal investigator.
      ii. Internal funding to support program of research.
      iii. Participated as a co-investigator in an externally funded project and/or in development of the project.
      iv. Served as principal investigator for a research utilization/integration project.
      v. Involvement in translational research.

C. Peer Review
   1. Expert external peer review clearly demonstrates the attributes of scholarly work associated with research.
      i. Coordinated peer-reviewed symposium at national conference related to research focus.
      ii. Independently conducted integrative reviews of the literature.
      iii. Reviewed proposal(s) for external funding.
      iv. Reviewed manuscripts submitted for peer review to journals.
      v. Consulted in an area of research.
      vi. Collaborated with recognized experts in field related to development of program of scholarship.
      vii. Citations from scholars in scholarship focus.

D. Scholarly Activities, Including Awards
   1. Evidence of a program of scholarly work that has contributed to knowledge base and improved the work of others.
      i. Has a self-developed data base that is utilized to conduct analysis.
      ii. Knowledge to independently formulate on-going program of theory development or knowledge generation.
      iii. Lead journal clubs related to scholarship.
      iv. Mentored others for research development.
      v. Directed undergraduate/graduate research fellowships.
      vi. Served on dissertation committee(s).
vii. Chaired research-related dissertation committee.
viii. Awards for excellence in scholarship/research.

SECTION 2-C
Criteria for promotion in rank for Associate to Full Professor when research is the designated area of excellence.

Associate to Full Professor. This promotion is based upon achievement beyond the level required for the associate professorship in Section B2. When research or creative activity is the primary criteria for promotion, the candidate should have evidence of continued growth in scholarship with a sustained reputation at the national level and an emerging presence at the international level. This evidence is documented with the following:

Demonstrated excellence in the quality of research/creative activities defined in the SHRS.

1. Satisfactory performance in formal and informal teaching activities to the School at the Department level and to the University beyond the department level.
2. Satisfactory performance in service to the University beyond the department level.*
3. Received recognition in professional activities at the national level or recognition for professional service to the community.*

Examples of Excellence in research/creative activities for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor. There is documented evidence the candidate has:

A. Disciplinary or Professional Research
   1. Publications/Presentations
      i. Presented research findings/critical integrative reviews/theory development at national or international scholarly conferences.
      ii. First or senior authorship in research/scholarly journals.

B. Grants and External Support
   1. Grantsmanship
      i. Served as principal investigator or co-principal investigator on an external funded research project related to research. The level of competitive of the funding must be clearly demonstrated.
      ii. Served as a member of a research team for an external funded research project relevant to research. The level of competitive of the funding must be clearly demonstrated.
      iii. Served as principal investigator on continuously internally funded project.
      iv. Sponsored externally funded graduate research.

C. Peer Review
   1. Recognition in Research
      i. Widely cited publications by other researchers.
      ii. Sustained evidence of having been invited presenter for empirically-based research.
      iii. Invited speaker in area of research focus or related areas.
      iv. Independently led research utilization/integrative projects resulting in documented change in standards or practice.
      v. Reviewer for research proposals at national or international level in professional organizations.
vi. Served on editorial panel for scholarly journals.

vii. Receive multiple awards for research locally or a significant award for research nationally or internationally.

viii. Served as a board member for public/private agency concerned with research area.

ix. Served as consultant to national or international organizations in scholarship focus.

x. Consulted for funded research studies for investigators.

D. Scholarly Activities, Including Awards

1. Other Evidence
   i. Independent data analysis.
   ii. New development in research related procedure, data collection, instrument development.
   iii. Leadership of faculty/graduate student interest groups.
   iv. Mentored junior faculty and graduate student in research.
   v. Directed post-doctoral fellowships.
   vi. Chaired or served on multiple students’ dissertation committees relevant to research.

SECTION 2-D

Useful resources:

- A link to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  [http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines](http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines)

- The following PDF is a table from the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that summarizes standards for evaluating teaching performance.
SECTION 3: SERVICE (EDossier Section 09)

IUPUI requires documented evidence of a minimum of satisfactory service by each faculty member for tenure and advancement in rank (with the exception of those classified as non-tenure track research faculty, scientists and scholars). Service is defined by the School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences as active participation in activities that support the mission of the university, as well as service contributions to the community and profession. The quality of service can be addressed by the impact, significance or value of the service to the university, community and/or profession.

To compile evidence for the dossier related to service please select criteria A, B or C from section 1 below to use as a guideline.

Section 3-A Criteria for satisfactory service, required by each faculty member\(^1\) with a designated area of excellence in research or teaching for tenure and advancement in rank.

Section 3-B Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer when service is the designated area of excellence.

Section 3-C Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Associate to Full Professor and Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor when service is the designated area of excellence.

Section 3-D Useful resources.

\(^1\) With the exception of those classified as non-tenure track research faculty, scientists and scholars.

SECTION 3-A

Criteria for satisfactory service, required by each faculty member\(^1\) with a designated area of excellence in research or teaching for tenure and advancement in rank; service is NOT the designated area of excellence.

Candidates should provide examples through the following types of evidence to demonstrate performance throughout the review period to meet a satisfactory level of service.

A. University service
   1. Citizenship
      i. Meets routine departmental expectations determined by the department chair with service being more than participation, the faculty member is actively involved in department service activities.
      ii. Include information on outcomes of collaborative work, with evidence of your individual contribution.
      iii. Service on one or more university level committees is recommended.

B. Service to discipline
   2. Professional activities
i. Include specific activities addressing service to the profession or interprofessional teams/committees.

ii. Include information on outcomes of collaborative service work with evidence of your individual contribution.

iii. Include specific service activities to the profession, for example:
   - Journal or book reviews.
   - Committee or board positions.
   - Volunteer work for your professional organization.
   - Assisting with developing continuing education programming.
   - Service on an external advisory board.

C. Service to community
   3. Activities
      i. Include specific activities addressing service evidence of activities and/or results of individual contribution.
      ii. Include specific activities addressing service to the community.

*Refer to IUPUI P&T guidelines for further detail, including the summary of demonstrating satisfactory expectations for various faculty categories.

SECTION 3-B
Criteria for Promotion in Rank for Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer when service is the designated area of excellence.

Candidates should provide examples through the following types of evidence to demonstrate performance throughout the review period to meet an excellent level of service. When service is the primary criterion on which promotion is based, it should be distinctly superior to colleagues at this and other major institutions and there must be documented evidence of the service provided. Additionally for service to the basis for tenure or advancement in rank, University and professional service should be directly linked to the unit and campus mission.

A. University service
   1. Exceeds routine department expectations determined by the department chair, the faculty member is a leader in department service activities.
   2. Include information on outcomes of collaborative work with evidence of individual contribution.
   3. Evidence of significant contributions to university service should include:
      i. Scholarly products (see Appendix 1).
      ii. Peer refereed presentations
      iii. Publications (see Appendix 1).
      iv. Seeking out and award of external funding.
   4. Awards and recognition that reflect the significance and academic nature of the service provided.
   5. Documented evidence of national recognition of the quality of work.

B. Service to discipline
1. Include specific activities addressing service to the profession or interprofessional teams/committees.
2. Include information on outcomes of collaborative service work with evidence of your individual contribution.
3. Include specific service activities to the discipline or profession with evidence of significant contributions, for example:
   i. Journal or book reviews.
   ii. Committee or board positions.
   iii. Assisting with developing continuing education programming.
   iv. Peer refereed presentations.
   v. Publications
   vi. Podcasts/blogs
   vii. Other scholarly products.
4. Awards and recognition that reflect the significance and academic nature of the service provided.
5. Documented evidence of national recognition of the quality of work.

C. Service to community
1. Evidence of significant contributions to community or public service including:
   i. Peer refereed presentations
   ii. Publications (see Appendix 1).
   iii. Other scholarly products
2. Awards and recognition that reflect the significance and academic nature of the service provided
3. Documented evidence of national recognition of the quality of work

*Refer to IUPUI PT guidelines for further detail, including the summary of areas of excellence and expectations for various faculty categories.

Examples of Excellence in Service for Promotion of Assistant to Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate and Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. Evidence the candidate has:

- Peer evaluations that document qualities of excellence in service.
- Documentation of the primary responsibility in a team for development/implementation of an aspect of service.
- Generation, utilization and integration of research related to service.
- Disseminated of integrative reviews of the literature related to service.
- Presentation of scholarly findings on service at state, regional, or national levels.
- Publication of service activities in peer-reviewed journals.
- Authorship of a chapter or a book on service or disciplinary based content, for example a textbook or chapter for disciplinary instruction.
- Participation in the development of computer/media/distance related curriculum applications related to service.
- Revision of current teaching or learning strategies based on best practices.
- Active participation in the development of new courses on community service.
- Evidence of significant contributions to new curriculum or policy statements related to service.
- Facilitation of student’s efforts to become published or co-authorship with students on abstracts and/or manuscripts.
- Receipt of an award for excellence in service from students or peers.
- Receipt of internal funding to support service scholarship agenda.
- Submission or receipt of external funding for scholarship of a service learning program.
- Service leadership positions in state or regional professional related organizations.
- Guest editorship or reviewer for service related journal(s).
- Consultant to other internal/local groups for community engagement and service.
- Provision of continuing education offerings for peers on community engagement and service.

SECTION 3-C

Criteria for Promotion in Rank for **Associate to Full Professor and Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor** when service is the designated area of **excellence**.

This promotion is based on achievement beyond the level required for the associate professorship. If service is the primary criterion on which promotion is based, the candidate must have demonstrated an extraordinary academic work in the area of service for the basis to gain tenure or advancement in rank. University and professional service should be directly linked to the unit and campus mission.

A. Service to the university, discipline and community

1. The candidate must demonstrate a sustained national or international reputation and there must be documented evidence the candidate has:
   i. Demonstrated excellence in the quality of service as defined in the IUPUI PT Guidelines.
   ii. Received recognition for excellence in service within and outside the University.
   iii. Demonstrated excellence in the scholarship of service.
   iv. Satisfactory productivity in research, scholarship, or creative activity.*
      a. For tenure track – Satisfactory productivity in research, scholarship, or creative activity.*
      b. For clinical rank – Research productivity is not required; however, the candidate should demonstrate scholarship in the context of teaching.
   v. Satisfactory performance in teaching.*

*Refer to IUPUI PT guidelines for further detail, including the summary of areas of excellence and expectations for various faculty categories.

**Examples of Excellence in Service** for Promotion of **Associate to Full Professor, Clinical Associate to Clinical Full Professor**. There is documented evidence the candidate has:

- Documentation of extraordinarily successful service outcomes through peer evaluations, student evaluations, publications and presentations.
• Documented excellence as a mentor/advisor for faculty and graduate students regarding scholarship of service.
• Publication of integrative reviews of literature.
• Author of service-based teaching or learning article(s) in peer reviewed journal(s).
• Authorship of book or chapter related to scholarship of service.
• Publication of works that have been widely cited by other scholars in service.
• Obtained peer-reviewed internal or external funding to support program of service endeavors resulting in publications or presentations.
• Obtained external funding to support service programs.
• Developed and utilized computer/media/distance related service curriculum applications that have received recognition.
• Chairperson of campus level committee related to service or community engagement.
• Service on an editorial panel for a service learning journal.
• Leadership roles in service related organizations at national or international levels.
• Receipt of multiple awards for service excellence within and outside the University system.
• Reviewer of proposals for external funding related to service learning or community engagement.
• Demonstrated excellence as a leader on the regional/national/international level.
• Presentation of continuing education offerings that are nationally recognized in the area of service.
• Leadership role in incorporating inter-professional organizations within the professional curricula.

SECTION 3-D

Useful resources:

• A link to the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
  http://academicaffairs.iupui.edu/PromotionTenure/IUPUI-Guidelines

• The following PDF is a table from the IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that summarizes standards for evaluating service performance.

Approved SHRS Faculty Organization [insert date of approval at SHRS faculty meeting].
APPENDIX 1: Assessing the Quality of Journals & Other Media

Assessing the quality of journals and other media: predatory journals.

Information from Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis Chief Academic Officer’s Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Promotion and Tenure Dossiers 2018-2019.

“Provide an assessment of the dissemination outlets in the candidate's area of excellence (or in all areas for a balanced case), such as the quality of journals, peer-reviewed conferences, and venues of presentations or performance. Analyze the stature of journals, presses, editions, galleries, presentations and other means of disseminating the results of the teaching, research and creative activity, or professional service of the candidates, including the quality of electronic publications. This assessment is required by the University standards. Stature may be reflected by acceptance rates, the nature of peer review (such as the stature of the reviewing agency/organization), or other measures and, whenever possible, these indices should be cited. Although the notation for each journal or other entity should be brief (ordinarily two or three sentences), special commentary may be required when faculty are working in interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary areas.

Additionally, journals devoted to practice as well as theory development in teaching and professional service may not be as widely known or understood, even by colleagues within the same department, compared to other scholarly journals. Special care should be taken in assessing the stature of such journals or presses. In recent years, electronic journals have emerged in some fields that may contain material that is comparable in quality and stature to print media. If there is any question about the quality of electronic publications, the chair should address this issue explicitly. In circumstances where publication occurs outside the usual disciplinary journals or presses, chairs may wish to seek an assessment of the stature of these publications from chairs or deans in other disciplines. In order to promote and encourage interdisciplinary teaching, research and creative activity, and service, IUPUI encourages dissemination of results in appropriate media of high quality even when these outlets are unusual for the discipline. Peer review of the material, therefore, is especially important. Whenever a chair is not the appropriate administrative officer to provide an assessment of the media of dissemination, deans should arrange to include this information.”

Resources from IU libraries
Resources for help with determining a predatory journal. Please contact the librarians at Ruth Lilly Medical Library. They will assist in helping you determine the quality of the publication/media for which you are interested. http://library.medicine.iu.edu/services/ask-a-medical-librarian/

Statement from IU libraries on predatory journals
Predatory journals are journals which provide misleading information in order to attract authors to submit papers to their publication. These journals will have a fee associated with publication and often have additional "processing" fees that are not made entirely clear to authors on submission of their manuscript. Open Access journals do charge authors to publish, but the fees are clearly stated and authors do not receive surprise charges.

What makes a journal "predatory"?
• Claims to have established peer-review process when either no process exists or it is severely lacking.
• Charges additional "processing fees" and traps your submission if you decide you no longer wish to publish with them.
• Editorial board is made up of unqualified/under-qualified individuals.
• Journal claims wide scope, (international) and editors all appear to be from same location.
• Boasts high impact factor - either cites an unheard-of source or when fact-checking this does not hold up.
• States it is indexed in multiple databases when it is not.

*Disclaimer*
Not all journals who fall under the "predatory" namesake have malicious intent - some are newly created journals and need to make appropriate changes to their publication practice due to mistakes and missteps. Use the steps listed on the Journal Checker page to make your own decisions. When in doubt contact the library and we can help you make an informed decision!