GUIDANCE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE CANDIDATES
O’NEILL SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

IUB Campus

Revised September 2000; August 2005; May 2016

This document is specific to O’Neill-IUB. A separate document with a parallel structure has been/will be developed for O’Neill-IUPUI.

I. O’Neill Core School

All dossiers for tenure and/or promotion for tenure-track and clinical faculty must use the eDossier system required for candidates at their respective campuses. Instructions for accessing and uploading documents to the eDossier system are available through one.iu.edu (look for eDossier system). Throughout this document reference to the campus Executive Associate Dean means this individual or her/his designee (such as the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs). The O’Neill Core School becomes involved at two key phases in the process: (1) review by the O’Neill Core School Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and (2) review by the O’Neill School Dean. These are flagged below in text preceded by “Core School Phase.”

II. O’Neill-IUB

The Academic Handbook requires that normally each candidate excels in one area and is satisfactory/effective (or better) in each of the other two. In exceptional cases, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promises excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the university over time. In all cases the candidate’s total record should be assessed by comprehensive and rigorous peer review. Promotion to any higher rank is recognition of achievement in current rank; tenure (or long-term contract for non-tenure track faculty) is a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater responsibilities and accomplishments (see http://vpfaa.indiana.edu/policies/bloomington/tenure-salary/faculty-tenure.shtml).

The evaluations from individuals and from committees must identify the area judged to be excellent. Each of these evaluations should state a general assessment of the category (i.e., unsatisfactory (ineffective in the case of teaching), satisfactory (effective in the case of teaching), very good, or excellent. Each evaluation should also provide the rationale or the basis for the assessment by referring to the evidence presented in the dossier.

Each candidate (and/or his/her delegate) is responsible for uploading documents listed under Sections 1 through 5 below by the specified July deadline, with the exception of item 1d. The IUB Executive Associate will upload all documents listed under Section 6 and some items under Section 5. The IUB Executive Associate Dean will ascertain that the dossier for each promotion/tenure candidate contains the required information, or has discussed any deviations with the candidate, before accepting the candidate’s submission of the eDossier and submitting it for review at the first review level. Please upload documents in pdf format.
eDossier structure

1. **General** (uploaded by candidate except as noted)
   a. Department and School Criteria
   b. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (see Appendix A)
   c. Candidate's Statement on Research, Teaching, and Service Activities
   d. Department (School) List of Prospective Referees (uploaded by the IUB Executive Associate Dean)
   e. Candidate's List of Prospective Referees

2. **Research/Creative Activity** (uploaded by candidate) [*Not available to Lecturers or Clinical faculty*]
   a. Copies of Publications and or Evidence of Creative Work
   b. Reviews of Candidate's Books, Creative Performances and Exhibitions
   c. List of Grants Applied for/Received
   d. Copies of Manuscripts or Creative Works in Progress
   e. Evidence for the Impact/Influence of Publications or Creative Works
   f. Evidence for the Stature/Visibility of Journals, Presses or Artistic Venues
   g. Awards and Honors for Research/Creative Activity
   h. Candidate's Contribution to Collaborative Projects

3. **Teaching** (uploaded by candidate) [*Not available to Scientists*]
   a. List of Courses Taught (see Appendix B)
   b. Sample of Course Materials
   c. Graduate Training
   d. Student Awards, Honors, Collaborative Publications, Achievements
   e. Undergraduate Research Experiences and Mentoring
   f. Student Course Evaluations (see Appendix C)
   g. Unsolicited Letters from Former Students
   h. Evidence of Learning Outcomes
   i. Peer Evaluations [*important – especially for Clinical and Lecturer ranks*]
   j. Curricular Development
   k. Professional Pedagogical Development
   l. Teaching Publications
   m. Teaching Awards, Honors, Grants and Fellowships
   n. [*For Lecturers and Clinical faculty only: “Research in Support of Teaching”*]

4. **Service/Engagement** (uploaded by candidate)
   a. Evidence of Service to the University, School and Department
   b. Evidence of Service to the Profession
   c. Evidence of Engagement with Non Academic Communities and Agencies (Public Service)
   d. [*For lecturers and Clinical faculty only: “Research in Support of Service”*]

5. **Supplemental Items** (additional information uploaded by candidate and/or IUB Executive Associate Dean; this folder is not available until after the Dossier has been submitted).
6. **IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs Items** (uploaded by the IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, except as indicated below)
   a. Faculty Vote Record
   b. Internal Letters (IUB Faculty Chair, Program Director reviews, O’Neill IUB and Core School Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews [uploaded by the committee chair(s)], Dean’s letter)
   c. External Letters (external reviewers)
   d. Solicited Letters
      i. Teaching (letters by current and former students)
      ii. Research (letters by co-authors)
      iii. Service (service confirmation letters)

**eDossier Content**

**ONLY PERTINENT MATERIALS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE DOSSIER. EXTRANEOUS MATERIALS ARE DISTRACTING TO THE READER.**

Although some eDossier items are self-evident, other items may benefit from more detailed descriptions and examples. Items that are required have been flagged as such. For other items, candidates are advised to include the type and detail of information that will permit reviewers to fully assess the scope and quality of contributions in each area of faculty work relevant to the candidate’s type of appointment.

- **Candidate’s Curriculum Vitae** (required): The candidate’s vita should be prepared according to the format in Appendix A. Designate in the left-hand margin of your publications whether the publication is to be evaluated as evidence of teaching, research, or service activities. Also, please indicate which publications are refereed.

- **Candidates Personal Statement** (required): The candidate's declaration of area of excellence and personal statement (not to exceed 15 pages) about teaching, research, and service activities. (Samples of promotion and tenure statements are on file in the Bloomington Office of Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (OVPFAA) and in the office of the Executive Associate Dean.).

- **Substantiation of Research**: *When excellence in research is claimed, full documentation is required.* Tenure dossiers should present an assessment of all post-terminal degree research activities; promotion dossiers consider work done in present rank at Indiana University and elsewhere. If other items are included in promotion dossier, they should be clearly marked to indicate work completed in rank. All tenured, tenure-track, or scientist candidates for tenure and/or promotion must provide the following information:
   a. A list and electronic copies of the candidate's research publications. **Candidates should clearly indicate whether publications are refereed and/or peer-(expert) reviewed.**
   b. If available, electronic copies of reviews of candidate’s book or other publications.

---

¹For additional guidance, see Appendix D on “Measuring Scholarly Performance” developed by the O’Neill public affairs faculty in April 2014.
c. List of grants or contracts received and/or applied for.

d. Electronic copies of publications and/or research under review, including correspondence from publishers concerning articles or books accepted and in press or other explanatory information about publications. This may also include research contract final reports or findings and professional papers presented, but these should be clearly marked as such.

e. Evidence of professional reputation of the faculty member. (Note: some of these indicators of reputation also constitute service activities that are considered in evaluating the faculty member’s professional service.)
   • Presentations at regional, national and international meetings.
   • Invitations to lecture at other universities and at regional, national or international meetings.
   • Invitations to organize symposia or panels at meetings.
   • Memberships on journal editorial boards.
   • Editorships of journals or books.
   • Leadership positions in scholarly societies.

f. Statements and evidence on the stature of journals or publishing outlets in which candidate has published.

g. Awards by regional, national or international organizations.

h. Candidate’s contributions to collaborative work. Consider such dimensions as securing funding, conception of study questions, contribution to data collection/analysis, writing responsibility (e.g., wrote most of text, wrote sections of text, edited text), mentorship.

- **Substantiation of Teaching:** This section of the dossier should contain objective evidence of the candidate’s performance as a teacher in the areas of instruction, mentoring/advising, and contributions to pedagogy. Evidence submitted by the candidate in this section should be selected to present as complete a description as possible of the candidate’s teaching and its quality. *When excellence in teaching is claimed, candidates should include a statement of teaching philosophy or other reflection document and offer a variety of evidence beyond curriculum development and course evaluations.* Please consult with the Teaching and Learning faculty group for more specific information.² Note that some of the items below appear in a different sequence than suggested by the eDossier system.

a. **Instruction**
   - The specific courses taught and the enrollment listed by semester and academic year (required) (use format in Appendix B or something similar). Include also grade point distribution for each course (required). A statement should be included on teaching load in the O’Neill campus program. Please also explain any special circumstances regarding class size.
   - Sample course materials, such as syllabi, assignments, and the like.
   - Summary of student evaluations of teaching (O’Neill only) showing average response for the eleven core questions (see Appendix C) on the student evaluations for each course (by semester). Include all qualitative responses from open-ended questions, but NOT individual student forms; comparisons to other similar courses taught at O’Neill is optional, but recommended (see Appendix C).

² See Appendix E, “Recommendations on Assessing Teaching Effectiveness” from Teaching and Learning Faculty Group to SPEA Policy Committee, March 3, 2015.
If relevant, evidence that students have been recruited as majors through this person's classes and/or what proportion of undergraduate or graduate students take courses on a non-required basis.

- Unsolicited letters from former students.
- Evidence of Learning Outcomes (likely to be expected at the IUB campus)
- Peer evaluation by colleagues based upon a planned program for improving teaching performance (expected at the IUB campus-level).

b. Mentoring and Advising. This includes academic advising and mentoring: supervision of internships, laboratory work, and field work; supervision of independent study; and advising masters and doctoral students concerning their research and theses. Products such as theses, papers, presentations, joint-publications, and reports that have emerged out of the interaction with the faculty member should be noted.

- Graduate training, including the number of Ph.D., M.A., or similar committees chaired or served on listed by academic year. Include titles (and abstracts where relevant). Include also independent study courses.
- Student awards, honors, collaborative publications, and achievements. This includes awards and honors received by the candidate’s students as well as collaborative publications of the candidate with his/her students.
- Undergraduate research experiences and mentoring. This should include also independent studies and honor's theses directed (include title and abstract where relevant) by academic year.

c. Contributions to pedagogy. This includes course development, curriculum development, and the development of teaching materials and techniques. When excellence in teaching is claimed, special contributions to teaching such as the development of innovative techniques, participation in workshops, symposia, conferences, teaching-related publications etc., should be clearly described. Include information on:

- Curriculum development, including:
  - Descriptions of innovative teaching methods, new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them. Include electronic copies of relevant syllabi and other course-related documents.
  - Leadership and/or major contributions to development of new degrees, programs of study, certificates and areas of study.
- Professional Pedagogical Development:
  - Grants to develop new courses or revise old ones.
  - Workshops, learning communities, master classes attended (or created/presented); presentations at conferences about curricular development, new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them.

d. Teaching Publications, including electronic copies of textbooks, other publications which are pedagogical in nature. Candidates should clearly indicate whether publications are refereed and/or peer-(expert) reviewed.
e. Teaching awards, honors, grants, fellowships and other recognition attributable to teaching and curriculum development. Please provide all pertinent information on the nature of the award, whether it is local or national, name of awarding agency, etc.

- **Substantiation of Service**: The service mission of the University consists of the application of the special expertise of its faculty to the solution of problems outside the walls of the institution, as well as service to the institution. Particularly, in O’Neill, service generally consists in the application of fundamental knowledge or assumptions with the intent of achieving an effect upon society. Service activities may be rendered to the School, University, to professional organizations, to governmental bodies or other institutions external to the university and profession. Service may occur at local, state or national levels. Where excellence in service is claimed, evaluations by professional colleagues at IU or by associates in the service activity who can confirm the value of the professional and/or public service the candidate has provided to external organization or on policy issues are of particular importance. The candidate should provide documentation of all:

a. **School and University service.**
   - **Committee Service.** This includes particularly committees that are essential for the management or functioning of the School or University, such as those involved with curricular policy, student recruitment, admission and placement, accreditation, teaching/learning evaluation, search and screen, promotion and tenure, and task forces dealing with important issues.
   - **Administrative Service**: taking a leadership role in the management of the school or university, including directing programs, directing faculties or committees, directing institutes or centers, or serving as an elected representative in faculty governance.

b. **Service to the Profession**: activities that enhance the quality of disciplinary or professional organizations or activities, including the following categories:
   - **Professional Development**: service that is essential for development of one’s profession.
   - Reviews of manuscripts for professional journals or proposals for funding agencies.
   - Moderating sessions or serving as a discussant at professional conferences.
   - Serving on professional society/association committees, participating in professional societies or organizations, participating in accreditation, and/or establishing professional or academic standards.
   - **Professional Leadership**: assuming a leadership role in advancement of one’s profession through activities such as editing a journal, serving on an editorial board, organizing symposia, conferences or workshops, editing proceedings, or serving as an officer of a professional society.
   - Copies of professionally relevant publications (including professional papers presented).

c. **Public Service.** Service to the community involves activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the academic community and call upon the faculty member’s expertise as a scholar, teacher, administrator or practitioner. Consistent with the School’s public affairs orientation, service activities may be in the public, nonprofit and/or private sectors and may either be paid or unpaid. The professional nature of the activity is the critical aspect.
• Advising or consulting with private, public and nonprofit organizations.
• Providing public policy analysis or technical expertise for local, state, regional, national or international agencies or entities.
• Service-related publications, such as technical reports, contract or consulting reports, and similar documents.
• Serving as an expert witness or providing legislative testimony.
• Serving on boards, commissions or review panels.
• Evaluating policies, programs, or personnel for agencies.
• Assisting agencies with development activities.
• Communicating in popular, non-academic publications and other media such as TV, radio, or electronic media.

• Supplementary Items: [only visible after the eDossier has been submitted]

  a. Updates: Include new information since the original eDossier was submitted on items related to research, teaching or service, such as new publications, acceptance of articles for publication, new professional service, etc. Supplementary items may be added by the candidate until the file goes to the Board of Trustees; however, only accomplishments completed prior to the decision by the Executive level of review at the campus level (e.g., Provost’s office) may be included. If submitted, all prior review levels will be informed of the update and provided an opportunity to comment.

  b. Rebuttals: Candidates may file a rebuttal of a review/recommendation at any level. If candidates chose to file a rebuttal, the rebuttal itself and responses to the rebuttal by all prior review levels should be uploaded here.

  c. Faculty Annual Reviews: Faculty annual reviews are optional. If included, the candidate may upload these under the “Supplementary Items” section of the dossier. However, candidates can only do so after the Dossier has been submitted.

  d. Solicited Colleague Letters: Candidates may solicit letters from colleagues. If included, these should be clearly indicated as solicited by the candidates and uploaded the “Supplementary Items” section of the dossier. However, candidates can only do so after the Dossier has been submitted.

• Vote Records

  a. The exact votes of the O’Neill-IUB Promotion and Tenure Committee (uploaded by the Chair of the O’Neill-IUB Promotion and Tenure Committee).
  b. The exact votes of the voting eligible faculty members (Uploaded by the IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs)
  c. O’Neill Core School Phase: the exact votes of the Core School Promotion and Tenure Committee (uploaded by the Chair of the O’Neill Core School Promotion and Tenure Committee).
• **Internal Letters**

  a. The recommendation of the chair(s) of the substantive faculty groups in which the candidate holds membership (where applicable) with reference to the candidate’s research.
  
b. The recommendation of graduate and undergraduate program directors and chair of the Teaching & Learning faculty group (where applicable) with reference to the candidate’s teaching.
  
c. The O’Neill-IUB Promotion and Tenure Committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, research, and/or service activities and its overall recommendation of the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion (uploaded by the Chair of the O’Neill-IUB Promotion and Tenure Committee).
  
d. **O’Neill Core School Phase:** The Core School Promotion and Tenure Committee’s evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, research, and/or service activities and its overall recommendation of the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion (uploaded by the Chair of the O’Neill Core School Promotion and Tenure Committee).
  
e. **O’Neill Core School Phase:** The Dean’s personal recommendation and summary evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, research, and service activities.

• **External Letters (uploaded by IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs):**

  University guidelines require six outside referee evaluations in the candidate’s area of excellence. The dossier must therefore contain the following items.

  a. A list of twelve outside reviewers in the candidate’s declared area of excellence and brief statements of their qualifications supplied by the candidate. Candidates for promotion to senior lecturer should supply a list of twelve reviewers, and at least six of these must be external to IU.
  
b. A list of twelve additional outside reviewers and brief statements of their qualifications compiled independently by the IUB Executive Associate Dean in consultation with faculty chairs and senior faculty and uploaded by him/her.
  
c. A copy of the letters soliciting outside evaluations, uploaded by the IUB Executive Associate Dean.
  
d. Letters from all outside reviewers, uploaded by the IUB Executive Associate Dean.

• **Solicited Letters (uploaded by IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs)**

  a. Letters solicited by the IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs of a random sample of students from the candidate’s classes with reference to the candidate’s teaching.
  
b. Letters solicited by the IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs of the candidate’s co-authors with reference to the candidate’s contributions to co-authored work. In cases where the co-author is a student of the candidate, such letters will not be requested in order to avoid conflict of interest.
  
c. Letters solicited by the IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs of persons/institutions identified by the candidate with reference to the candidate’s claim of significant contributions to public service (in some cases, this may include also professional service if of an unusual character).
APPENDIX A
O’NEILL SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
RECOMMENDED FORMAT FOR VITA PREPARATION

NAME: (Last) (First) (Middle)

EDUCATION: UNDERGRADUATE
GRADUATE (Please Include Dissertation Title)
POST-DOCTORAL

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (Inclusive Dates):

OTHER APPOINTMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTSHIPS: LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION:

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES (Including offices held and committee memberships):

ACADEMIC AWARDS/HONORS/FELLOWSHIPS:

PUBLICATIONS:

Summarize here total number of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and/or books. Clarify authorship convention for your discipline (first author vs last author, lead vs. corresponding author, etc.), and summarize your contributions as first author, second author, corresponding author, etc. Define notation indicating student coauthors (undergraduate, graduate, etc.), source of impact factor, source of citations (ISI, Google Scholar). Number each publication. Provide links to on-line versions.

PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES


Summarize here your contribution/role to this article


Summarize here your contribution/role to this article

19…

18…

MANUSCRIPTS UNDER REVIEW
Yourself, A., Author2, B., Author3, C., et al. Title of the Article, Journal Name, Volume, page numbers, Year, doi number. Impact Factor, number of citations.

Summarize here your contribution/role to this article

MANUSCRIPTS IN PROGRESS


Summarize here your contribution/role to this article


Summarize here your contribution/role to this article

BOOKS

1. Yourself, A., Title of Book, Publisher, Year

2. Author1, A. Yourself, A., Title of Book, Publisher, Year

Summarize here your contribution/role

REFEREED BOOK CHAPTERS

1. Yourself, A., Title of Chapter, in Title of Book, Author1, A., Author2., B., eds., Publisher, year

2. Author1, A., Yourself, A., Title of Chapter, in Title of Book, Editor1, A., Editor2., B., eds., Publisher, year

Summarize here your contribution/role

REFEREED CONFERENCE PAPERS

Note presentations and co-authorship of students, indicate whether invited. Provide link to abstract/paper if available.

21. Yourself, A., Author2, B., Author3, C., et al. Title of the paper/presentation, Conference Name, Location, Year, Acceptance rate, number of citations.

Summarize here your contribution/role to this article
20. Author1, A. **Yourself, A.**, Author, B., Author3, C. Title of the paper/presentation, *Conference Name, Location, Year*, Acceptance rate, number of citations.

*Summarize here your contribution/role to this article*

19…

18…

**CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS**

Note presentations and co-authorship of students, indicate whether invited, oral, or poster. Provide link to abstract, if available.

21. **Yourself, A.**, Author2, B., Author3, C., et al. Title of presentation, *Conference Name, Location, Year*

20. Author1, A. **Yourself, A.**, Author, B., Author3, C. Title of the presentation, *Conference Name, Location, Year*

19…

18…

**INVITED SEMINARS**

**Yourself, A.**, Title of presentation, Department of XXX, University of XXX, date

**GRANTS, FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS:**

Indicate the name of granting agency, title of project, amount, and duration of all grants, fellowships and awards. Indicate funded and pending grants, as well as unfunded proposals.

**COURSES TAUGHT**

*List courses taught each semester, including number of students.*

**STUDENT MENTORING**

*List undergraduate and graduate student mentored research, including title of thesis, and dates of mentoring. For Ph.D. students, indicate whether you are the chair of the dissertation committee.*

**SERVICE:**

*Distinguish carefully between the following categories of University and public service and record your service*
activities as follows: (1) School or university administrative service (administrative unit, position/role, duration), (2) School or university committee service (name of committee, nature of participation, duration), (3) Student service (student group, position/role, duration, formal-informal counseling), (4) Public service (a) State and Regional (b) National (public offices, committees, organizations), (c) International, (5) Professional Service (Reviewer for journal articles, grant proposals, conference sessions/panels chaired/organized).

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Record professional activities which you consider significant and which are not covered elsewhere in the curriculum vita.
**APPENDIX B**

**SUMMARY OF TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Name &amp; AY</th>
<th>Semester &amp; AY</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Grade Point</th>
<th>Lecture/Reading Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Undergraduate*

*Graduate*
APPENDIX C
SUMMARY OF STUDENT COURSE EVALUATIONS

Average response for core questions from the student course evaluations for each course (by semester).

Old course evaluation format (prior to summer 2015). All questions may be included, but the following 11 questions are considered core.

Course items
5. Course was rigorous.
8. Tests/other activities reflected subject matter.

Instructor items
12. Instructor prepared for class.
13. Instructor explained material clearly.
15. Instructor made material interesting.
17. Instructor clearly articulated course goals.
21. Instructor's grading system clearly defined.
28. Instructor kept the announced office hours.

Overall items
30. I learned a lot in this course.
31. Overall I would rate the quality of instruction as outstanding.

New course evaluation format (summer 2015 and later). All questions should be included. The IUB campus core questions use a 4-point scale for questions 1 through 7, a 5-point scale for question 8 (amount of time required) and a 7-point scale for question 9 (number of hours devoted to the course). The six O’Neill-core questions (questions 10 through 15) use a 5-point scale. Candidates are responsible for insuring that they apply the appropriate scales when summarizing their course evaluation scores.

Note: the IUB Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will make available an “anonymized” spreadsheet with accumulated comparison data for O’Neill-IUB courses for 2009-2015 period for the old course evaluation form and for the period since summer 2015 for the new online course form.
APPENDIX D

STATEMENT ON MEASURING SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE AND RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY

SPEA Public Affairs Faculty Groups
(Governance & Management; Policy Analysis and Public Finance)

Final Document: Adopted by the PA Faculty, April 11, 2014

Preamble: At the SPEA-IUB faculty meeting on April 13, 2012, Dean Graham asked each of the three substantive faculty groups to develop shared measures of “research productivity” with the expectation that these measures would serve to (a) establish individual annual goals as part of the annual report to be shared with faculty mentor(s) and faculty chair(s), (b) measure individual performance against specified goals, and (c) allow the Dean's Office to track progress at individual and group levels. In subsequent communications, Dean Graham noted that such measures would be useful in communicating SPEA’s publication record to audiences external to SPEA, but that he and David Reingold (SPEA IUB Executive Associate Dean) do not “expect that a SPEA faculty assessment of publication outlets will have much utility in the evaluation of any particular candidate's dossier for promotion or tenure, or in annual reviews or salary adjustment processes.”

The Governance & Management and the Policy Analysis & Public Finance faculty groups have each devoted a great deal of time and effort to discuss this request and various alternatives for delineating research productivity and scholarly performances. At a joint meeting of the G&M and PAPF faculty on February 21, 2014, the tenured and tenure-track faculty by a near unanimous vote endorsed a general statement of research expectations (below) along with a more detailed set of guidelines for mentoring and advising purposes (Appendix A), but no list of preferred publication outlets.

Statement of the research-active SPEA public affairs faculty: As faculty in a top-quality public policy program, SPEA colleagues are expected to maintain an active research agenda. They are expected to present their research in a wide array of venues and to make these presentations in the venues that afford the most rigorous tests of their scholarship and in venues that provide the possibility of greatest practical impact of their work. SPEA colleagues do research in a wide array of pressing public issues and individuals even change direction of their own research as public issues change. The best outlets should differ according to the nature of the problem being researched but should always contribute to the objective of making SPEA the undisputed premier public affairs school in the world.

As part of the process of discussing research performance measurement, the PAPF and G&M groups developed a set of metrics that may be useful for mentoring and advising purposes. These are listed below.

1. **Publication volume**, including refereed or law journal articles, books, book chapters, and other manuscript-length reports (either peer reviewed or expert reviewed).
2. **Information on the publication outlet**, as evidenced by reputational rankings by experts in the field, academic and scholarly publishing outlets (for books), rankings in journal databases (if
relevant and available) including but not limited to ISI/Reuters, and impact factor (e.g., as measured by 5-year average citation counts per article or other relevant indicators), and selectivity of the publication outlet (e.g., percent accepted articles), or other relevant factors to SPEA.

3. **Citations for scholarly work**, including but not limited to ISI Web of Science citation counts; working paper citation counts (e.g., from the Social Science Research Network, the National Bureau of Economic Research, Lexis-Nexis); Google Scholar citation counts; self-collected citation counts; citations in practitioner publications; citations by academic agencies and think tanks; citations in judicial opinions and legislative and regulatory findings; citations in documents used to inform public policy or practice (e.g., in government reports, in congressional testimony, by consumer advocacy groups or other nonprofit organizations); citations in public scholarship outlets including the popular press and social media (e.g., blogs and Twitter), H-index numbers, and working paper downloads (e.g., the Social Science Research Network’s rankings and number of downloads).

4. **Authorship.** This may include (but is not limited to) indications of sole- versus co-authorship, and whether the scholar served as first author (or in publication conventions following a laboratory tradition, last or anchor author).

5. **Grant and contract applications and funded awards**, from organizations including but not limited to government agencies, foundations, educational institutions, private research firms, and nonprofit organizations. These applications and funded awards may be either internal (awarded by Indiana University) or external. Appropriate indicators of research performance along this dimension may include (but are not limited to): number of submitted grant applications, reputation of the granting agency, competitiveness of the award (percent funded), amount of funding, grant status of the researcher (as Principal Investigator or otherwise), level of indirect costs, and whether the grant is internal versus external.

6. **Participation in scholarly and practitioner conferences.** Appropriate indicators of research performance along this dimension may include (but are not limited to): number of competitive panel, paper, or symposium submissions to conferences; conference proposal acceptances; participation in invited talks and presentations and whether these talks are keynote addresses; and other evidence of the quality of the conference participation (e.g., reputation of the co-panelists or discussants, number of attendees, perceived prestige among experts in the field, etc.).

7. **Invited talks**, including academic research seminars (both internal and external to Indiana University), seminars at think tanks and other public policy institutions, seminars at government agencies, legislative/executive/judicial testimony, seminars for practitioner audiences (e.g., professional organizations and for-profit or nonprofit organizations), and invitations to contribute to public dialogue or policy making due to the faculty member’s research reputation (e.g., invitations to provide expert testimony).

8. **Awards** from professional associations, academic research outlets (including journals and presses), government agencies, and private and nonprofit organizations.

9. **Evidence of research influence among practitioners.** Appropriate indicators of research performance along this dimension may include (but are not limited to): evidence that practitioners apply the faculty member’s research to influence policy or practice; authoring professionally-orientated policy briefs and reports; awards from practitioner organizations; and service on the boards of practitioner organizations.

10. **Evidence of research influence on teaching.** Appropriate indicators of research performance along this dimension may include (but are not limited to): use of publications on syllabi; co-authorship with students; and the job placement and publication records of advisees.

11. **Engagement in the field of research.** Appropriate indicators of research performance along
this dimension may include (but are not limited to): invited paper or conference submissions; requests for referee service; service on review panels for grant-giving organizations; presence on editorial boards; service as an Editor, Co-Editor, or Associate Editor of an appropriate publication outlet; leadership positions in scholarly societies; and service on the program committee for academic or practitioner conferences.

12. Other measures demonstrating the research performance of individual faculty members, including research relevance, productivity, application to policy and practice, reputation, prestige and impact on the field.

Clearly, tenured and tenure-track faculty MUST produce high quality scholarly work and disseminate it in venues that make it available to other scholars and policy makers. The indicators listed above are evidence that scholarly activities are taking place and are important metrics in their own right.
APPENDIX E
RECOMMENDATIONS ON ASSESSING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

TO: Policy Committee (Kosali Simon and Deanna Malatesta, Co-Chairs); Kirsten Grønbjerg, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs; All SPEA Program Directors
FROM: Teaching and Learning Faculty Group (Beth Gazley, Chair)
DATE: Tuesday, March 3, 2015 FINAL
SUBJ: Recommendations on assessing teaching effectiveness

The T&L Faculty Group’s founding mission includes policy recommendations. The Faculty Group has devoted its Nov. 2014, Jan. 2015, and Feb. 2015 monthly meetings to the question: What should either Faculty Annual Reports or Promotion dossiers be able to demonstrate with respect to teaching effectiveness, and what does that content look like? Specifically, for promotion, what teaching-related content should be expected in the dossier of a faculty member claiming Excellence in Teaching? How does that content compare to the content expected for “Effective” teaching, and what is “Ineffective” teaching? The same questions apply for annual reviews. Faculty members have asked for more clarity, most especially because the growth of faculty development opportunities within SPEA offers more high-quality options that could be included in an assessment of teaching effectiveness.

The goal, therefore, is to offer these committees (1) an updated set of teaching-related activities to consider when assessing “excellence”, “satisfactory/effective”, etc. in teaching, and (2) a set of recommendations from the Teaching & Learning Faculty Group (which did not exist when some of these guidelines were last updated) about their potential role in the assessment process. We also plan to share this list with SPEA faculty members and to encourage them to consider the value in including this information in FARs.

Most of this memo’s content addresses the assessment needs of both full-time and part-time faculty, so we also recommend that it be shared with degree program directors. We observe, for example, that some part-time faculty participate in the school’s teaching development activities and that all non-tenure-line faculty, part-time and full-time, are assessed foremost on teaching effectiveness.

What activities can be considered in assessing teaching effectiveness?

A. In SPEA Promotion and Tenure guidelines (currently being updated), teaching is evaluated on Instructional Quality, Student Mentoring, and Contributions to Pedagogy. IUB Campus Promotion and Tenure guidelines also require: a candidate’s Statement, evidence of Assessment of Learning Outcomes, Student Course Evaluations, and Peer Assessments of Teaching.

B. In the Faculty Annual Report or Promotion dossier (conforming to updated campus and SPEA promotion guidelines), a faculty member might include any of the following to demonstrate effective or excellent teaching. No single measure should predominate and assessments should be holistic.

● A faculty member’s articulation of a conscious and reflective teaching strategy, teaching goals, and efforts to develop pedagogical skills
- Development of effective teaching materials and techniques, including course development, improvement, or course innovation efforts. (Note that a faculty member may also wish to account for its impact on students; experimentation should be rewarded even if it temporarily lowers student course evaluation numbers.) Effective teaching techniques are defined as those that demonstrate an understanding of high impact pedagogical practices (HIPs).
- Grants and awards for course development and evidence of implementation in courses.
- Student, peer, and external recognition of teaching excellence, when holistically assessed and not based entirely on numerical course evaluations.
- Publications related to the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL).
- Conference/workshop/meeting presentations related to SOTL.
- Evidence of grading strategies that effectively challenge students.
- The quality of the written portions of student course evaluations, and evidence of a conscious effort to use feedback received. Note that the faculty member should have achieved a high rate of student response.
- Achieving and/or maintaining relevant professional certifications and/or licensure, which require demonstration of ongoing professional development and currency in the subject areas being taught.
- Evidence of student mentoring, recommendation/reference/award nomination letters, etc.
- Numerical portions of student course evaluations (again, with appropriate rate of response).
- Participation in SPEA’s peer assessment of teaching activities, including evidence of a conscious effort to incorporate the feedback received.
- For non-tenure-line faculty, evidence of peer mentoring, leadership, and other teaching-related service to faculty development.
- Attendance at IU Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning workshops and evidence of implementation in courses.
- Other formal outside training or professional development (e.g., FACET) in teaching and student learning and evidence of implementation in courses.
- Number of students taught and sizes of course sections.
- Attendance at SPEA Teaching and Learning Faculty Group meetings, workshops, etc. and evidence of implementation in courses.
- Range and variety of courses taught; range and variety of student cohorts taught.
- Evidence that all courses have articulated the expected student learning outcomes, per IUB guidelines.