Policies on Research Scientist, Clinical, and Lecturer Faculty

Formerly: 99.18R- Clinical Faculty Ranks, 05.14R- Long-Term Contract and Promotion Criteria for Clinical Faculty, 02.34- Clinical Appointments, 11.22R - Clinical Faculty - Third Year Review, 18.45- Lecturer Rank Appointments, 17.46- Lecturer Promotion and Long Term Contracts, 16.46R & 08.29- Promotion Criteria for Research Scientist Ranks

I. RESEARCH SCIENTIST, CLINICAL, AND LECTURERE FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, TITLE/RANK, RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES, AND OTHER MATTERS

IU Policies govern the appointment, rank/title, and contract matters around NTT appointments. The relevant university level policies include:

ACA-12, General Provisions Regarding Academic Appointments: https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-12-general-provisions-academic-appointments/index.html

ACA-14, Classification of Academic Appointments: https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-14-classification-academic-appointments/index.html


ACA-20, Regulation of Research Appointments: https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-20-regulation-research-appointments/index.html


II. APPOINTMENT

A. Research Scientist Appointment

Research scientist appointments are appropriate for individuals with research responsibilities, which include those carried out in the service of the assigned center or laboratory overseen by the School of Education. A research scientist may do some teaching, but research responsibilities are their primary responsibility; they will be evaluated on their research.

1. Criteria for Appointment

- Superior research skills in the focus areas of the center or laboratory where the assignment is made.
- Qualifications in education and/or experience relevant to the service activities critical to execution of the research mission of the center or laboratory where the assignment is made.

2. Levels of Appointment for Research Scientists

The research scientist or scholar appointment category is a three-rank system that is regarded as a career ladder framework, with appropriate policies and procedures for appointment, annual review, and promotion.

- Appointment will be made at the rank of Assistant Research Scientist or Scholar for
individuals who have completed the terminal degree in the candidate’s discipline and at least one year of successful postdoctoral research experience.

- Appointment will be made at the rank of Associate Research Scientist or Scholar for individuals who have achieved a minimum of five years of successful research as reflected in published work in refereed sources.

- Appointment will be made at the rank of Senior Research Scientist for individuals who have shown a career of continued growth in scholarship which has brought a national or international reputation as a first-class researcher who has made substantial contributions to the individual’s discipline.

3. **Term of Appointment for Research Scientist**

   - Research Scientists do not face an up-or-out promotion decision. Promotion to Associate Research Scientist is normally considered after a minimum of five years.

   - On request, Research Scientists may be reviewed for promotion at any time, and may request review the next year and as many times as necessary should the promotion be denied. Research Scientists who have been in rank seven years or more must be reviewed for promotion to upper ranks each year.

   - In the event of non-reappointment for reasons of financial exigency, Research Scientists must be notified of a timeline for the ending of contract period.

4. **Clinical Appointment**

   Clinical appointments are appropriate for individuals whose primary role will focus on the teaching, supervision, and service missions of the School of Education. Individuals appointed to clinical ranks will carry a greater teaching load than tenured/tenure-probationary faculty academic ranks. The maximum teaching assignment shall be 18 credits per academic year. In exceptional circumstances, units may petition the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs, on a year-by-year basis, for a waiver to allow a seventh course. Likewise, it is expected that they will carry a heavier student service load and will be assigned to teach courses that include field experiences, practica, and internships.

1. **Criteria for Appointment**

   - Superior clinical skills and specialized expertise in an area central to one of the School of Education’s undergraduate, graduate, or continuing professional development programs. The expectation is that the clinical appointee will bring a rich set of practice experiences to the program/department where the appointee will be placed.

   - The appointment (to probationary status or with long-term contract) of clinical rank faculty shall follow the same procedures as appointment of tenured and tenure-probationary faculty in the School of Education. As with tenured and tenure-probationary faculty, the initial appointment in the clinical ranks shall be at the level of rank appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual. For example, an individual may
be hired as a Clinical Professor and immediately be granted a long-term contract with no probationary period. Individuals who are hired as beginning Clinical Assistant Professors shall receive an appointment that is comparable to tenure-probationary faculty (i.e., a one-year renewable contract), go through a probationary period of not more than seven years that includes annual reviews and a third-year review. This process is comparable to the probationary period for tenure-track faculty.

2. **Levels of Appointment for Clinical Ranks**
   - Appointment will be made at the level of Clinical Lecturer for individuals who have completed a master’s degree.
   - Appointment will be made at the level of Clinical Assistant Professor for individuals who have completed the doctoral or terminal degree.
   - Appointment will be made at the level of Clinical Associate Professor for individuals who have completed the doctoral or terminal degree and have five years of successful teaching experience as a clinical assistant professor or an adjunct instructor.
   - Appointment will be made at the level of Clinical Professor for individuals who have completed the doctoral or terminal degree and have at least five years of successful, full-time teaching beyond promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.

3. **Term of Appointment for Assistant Clinical Professors and Lecturers**
   - Initial appointment for assistant clinical or lecturer is for a five-year period with annual reappointment based on satisfactory performance, funding, and programmatic need. Promotion with long-term contract decision will be made during year six.
   - In the event of non-reappointment, faculty in their first year of service must be given notice not later than February 1st.
   - During the second year of service, notice must be given not later than November 15.
   - During the third and subsequent years of the probationary period, at least twelve months of notice must be provided.

C. **Lecturer Appointment**

Appointments to the instructional category of lecturer are appropriate for individuals who will play an integral role in the teaching mission of the School of Education. Individuals appointed to the non-research, academic ranks of lecturer, senior lecturer and teaching professor will teach the equivalence of a three-three course load. Individuals in these ranks must also provide service to support the teaching mission of the school.

1. **Criteria for Appointment**
   - A record of superior classroom teaching skills and specialized expertise in an area central to one of the School of Education’s undergraduate, graduate, or continuing professional development programs
   - A record of creating inclusive and equitable learning environments

2. **Levels of Appointment for Lecturer Ranks**
   - Appointment will be made at the level of Lecturer for individuals who have completed
the doctoral or terminal degree.

- Appointment will be made at the level of Senior Lecturer for individuals who have completed the doctoral or terminal degree and have five years of successful teaching experience as a lecturer, clinical assistant professor, or an adjunct instructor.
- Appointment will be made at the level of Teaching Professor for individuals who have completed the doctoral or terminal degree and have a recommended five years of successful, full-time teaching beyond promotion to Senior Lecturer.

3. Term of Appointment for Assistant Clinical Professors and Lecturers

- Initial appointment for assistant clinical or lecturer is for a five-year period with annual reappointment based on satisfactory performance, funding, and programmatic need. Promotion with long-term contract decision will be made during year six.
- In the event of non-reappointment, faculty in their first year of service must be given notice not later than February 1st.
- During the second year of service, notice must be given not later than November 15. During the third and subsequent years of the probationary period, at least twelve months of notice must be provided.

III. ANNUAL REVIEW

Research scientists, lecturer and clinical faculty will be reviewed using the same procedures as those for tenured/tenure-track faculty. The exception is that lecturer faculty will only be reviewed in the domain of teaching while clinical faculty will be reviewed in the domains of teaching and service, which could include scholarship in these domains. Research scientists will only be reviewed in the domains of research and service (specifically as it pertains to service to the Research Center).

IV. THIRD YEAR REVIEW FOR LECTURER AND CLINICAL FACULTY

The third year review is an opportunity for the lecturer and clinical faculty member to obtain feedback on progress toward promotion. Research scientists are not mandated to receive a third-year review, but periodic feedback from research center directors is recommended. For the purpose of the third-year review, a dossier must be submitted to the department chair by January 15 of the candidate's third year. The department chair, in consultation with the executive associate dean, will identify a three-person review committee to provide a written formative evaluation of the candidate's progress. The evaluation will also recommend specific activities to enhance the candidate's progress toward promotion. After the committee review, the chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the committee evaluation and to provide the chair’s own evaluation and recommendations.

The candidate, in discussions with the chair and mentor(s), will consider how best to put forward the case for promotion.
The candidate should submit a dossier that is divided into three sections: General, Teaching, and Service. Lecturers should provide any evidence of service related to teaching in the teaching section of the dossier, rather than in a service section.

A. General

The candidate's personal statement about teaching (Lecturers) or teaching and service (Clinical faculty) that indicates the proposed case for promotion, that is, excellence in one area or a balanced case. The statement should address the candidate’s approach to teaching and service and the factors that have influenced that approach. Personal reflections on the candidate’s growth and change as a teacher and service-provider should be included.

A vita that outlines the candidate's professional accomplishments, including a list of all scholarship (e.g., publications and grants) designating (e.g., in vita left-hand margin) whether the scholarship is evidence of teaching or service.

B. Teaching

This section of the dossier should contain objective evidence of the candidate's performance as a teacher. Evidence submitted in this section should present the characteristics and the quality of the candidate’s teaching. The dossier may include service oriented toward teaching as evidence of teaching excellence.

The teaching section must contain:
1. A list of the specific courses taught and the enrollments listed by semester and academic year, along with the most recent syllabus of each course taught.
2. Examples of course material and subsequent modifications that were made to accommodate previous colleague evaluations, student feedback, or student needs.
3. Evidence of the nature and quality of the materials developed by the candidate (e.g., curriculum development, textbooks, websites, and other pedagogical activities).
4. Evidence of the quality of teaching, such as student and colleague evaluations, as well as unsolicited email, letters, or notes from present or former students. Any other available and relevant evidence on the quality of teaching should be included. It should be kept in mind that the primary purpose of the evidence presented in this portion of the dossier is to document the quality of the teaching.
5. A description of the candidate’s efforts to improve teaching (e.g., participating in seminars and workshops, reading journals on teaching, reviewing new teaching materials for possible application, pursuing a line of scholarship that contributes directly to teaching, using instructional support services, or contributing to a professional journal of teaching).

Other evidence may be included to explain the candidate’s teaching assignments and accomplishments, for example:
1. Memberships on graduate students’ program or research committees.
2. Publications relevant to teaching.
C. Service

This portion of the dossier must contain a list of the candidate's service activities and evidence that supports the effectiveness of the service. Evidence should explain the candidate’s service assignments and accomplishments. The candidate should collect and include documentation of the effectiveness of their service. Service activities may be rendered to the Department, to the University, to professional organizations, to governmental bodies or to other similar institutions. Service may occur at local, state, national or international levels. Scholarly efforts may also be included, with an explanation of how they contribute to the candidate’s service.

Note: For lecturers, the dossier may include service oriented toward teaching as evidence of teaching excellence.

V. PROMOTION AND LONG-TERM CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH SCIENTISTS

Research centers affiliated with Indiana University’s School of Education conduct sustained and focused research in areas outside the boundaries of traditional academic departments. They directly contribute to the School’s national and international reputation for excellence and to its long tradition of service to education communities in the State of Indiana and to the US (e.g., governmental agencies, PK-12 and higher education systems). The centers’ capacity for service, productivity and success depends on being able to maintain facilities and organizations staffed by stable, well-qualified non-tenure track researchers with richly diversified and specialized competencies. Although research scientists traditionally have been employed as part of a center, there may be instances where a research scientist is employed directly by a funded research project at an academic department within the School. In such instances, the criteria delineated in this document may be used by substituting “project” or “department” for “center.”

Indiana University instituted the three-tier system of research ranks (i.e., Assistant Scientist, Associate Scientist, and Senior Scientist) in 1981 to enhance the competitive recruitment and retention of doctoral level researchers. Effectively using this career ladder framework to recruit and retain high-quality research scientists necessitates transparent, appropriate, and well-defined criteria and procedures for their annual review and promotion. Supplementing the University’s policy statements on qualifications for research ranks (see below), this document provides the details and context needed to ensure the validity and fairness of the promotion process, and provides well-defined criteria for promotion suited to the roles, responsibilities and expectations of research scientist positions within the School.

Several factors must be taken into consideration in the definition of valid and meaningful criteria for research scientist promotion, including the following:

Diverse missions and contexts. Each research center and institute has a distinct mission, purpose, and set of goals. The criteria for promotion must recognize the diversity of the missions and the individual’s contribution to that mission.

Funding sources and scholarly products. Research centers at the School are funded by external contracts, grants, user fees, and other revenue sources that must be taken into consideration in research scientist promotion cases. The funding base for the centers has two significant implications:

(1) The research scientists’ commitment to promoting the mission of the center, above and
beyond their individual research interests, is critical to the success and sustainability of the center. The responsibilities and expectations of research scientists whose positions are funded by external sources are limited by the conditions of the external funding, decreasing the research scientists’ flexibility in pursuing individual research interests and/or devoting time to other (unfunded) endeavors. Dedication to the respective center and meeting the obligations of the funding sources, then, greatly influence many aspects of research scientists’ work, including their research products and how they devote their time.

**Diverse responsibilities and expectations.** Promotion criteria must take into account the significant and substantive differences in responsibilities and expectations both within and between centers. The specific position responsibilities and expectations of research scientists vary greatly, even within the same research rank.

**Research scientist service to the center.** Promotion criteria must also take into account the critical role of research scientists’ service to the center. The long-term sustainability of centers is directly dependent on the center’s reputation, visibility, and ability to continue to attract new (and returning) funding sources. This requires research scientists to invest substantial time and effort into the productivity and sustainability of the center and to uphold a commitment to the center and its welfare.

**A. University Criteria**

The School criteria for research scientist promotion are guided by the Indiana University policy statement on research ranks (Regulation of Research Appointments ACA-20, effective 2-07-1981, last updated 12-07-20; [https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-20-regulation-research-appointments/index.html](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-20-regulation-research-appointments/index.html)).

Research rank appointments are appropriate for individuals who hold the terminal degree in their field, who have some postdoctoral experience (or its equivalent), and whose primary responsibilities will be research and service. University policy outlines the following general qualifications for each of the three research ranks, stating that these qualifications are roughly equivalent to those set forth in the area of research for members of the faculty:

**Assistant Scientist:** Typically has completed the terminal degree in his or her discipline and, in some fields, has at least one year of successful postdoctoral research experience; is capable of original, independent research and scholarship under the direction of a senior faculty member or an Associate Scientist or a Senior Scientist.

**Associate Scientist:** Typically has completed a minimum of five years postdoctoral research; has begun to establish a national reputation through published work and has responsibility for carrying out independently, as principal investigator, projects of his or her own devising.

**Senior Scientist:** Typically has demonstrated a career of continued growth in scholarship that has brought a national or international reputation as a first-class researcher or scholar who has made substantial contributions to his or her discipline.

**B. Research and Creative Activities Definitions, Evaluation Areas, and Evidence**

Research scientist responsibilities focus on research and creative activities. Their work divides across (1) scholarship and (2) service to the center. The following sections define each of these, describe its evaluation areas, and outline types of evidence useful in making evaluative judgments.
The appropriateness and importance of the types of scholarship and level (or type) of service vary with the expectations of a given research scientist position. Therefore, it is critical that judgments about research scientists’ scholarship, as well as their center service, be made taking the nature of the individual’s position (i.e., that center’s mission, research scientist’s allocation of effort, and the specific responsibilities and expectations of the position) into account. The following sections illustrate that there is considerable flexibility in how a research scientist can meet the criteria outlined in Section A.

1. Scholarship

B.1.a. Scholarship Definition
Scholarship includes original inquiry and systematic analysis of problems (both practical and theoretical) contributing to the field of education through scholarship and creative effort. To align with the roles and responsibilities of research scientists in its centers, the School’s definition of research and creative activities recognizes and values research scientists’ diverse forms of scholarship, relying on three of the four types of scholarship defined by Boyer (1990).1

Scholarship of discovery. This includes all activities that extend knowledge through the discovery or collection of new information. The scholarship of discovery includes, but is not limited to, the typical label of basic or original research (e.g., primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis).

Scholarship of application. This includes all activities that relate knowledge in academic disciplines to communities outside academia, including the discovery, evaluation and communication of research findings. The scholarship of application focuses on using research findings and innovations to address real world, societal problems.

Scholarship of integration. This includes all activities that are primarily interdisciplinary and interpretive, focusing on making connections across disciplines, across topics within a discipline, or across time. The scholarship of integration includes the interpretation of one’s own research so that it is useful beyond one’s disciplinary boundaries and can be integrated into a larger body of knowledge.

B.1.b. Scholarship Evaluation Areas
The evaluation of research and creative activity involves the examination of a number of areas, including, but not limited to, the following:

Productivity. Research scientists may demonstrate productivity in one or more areas of scholarship (i.e., scholarship of discovery, application, or integration) depending on the responsibilities and expectations of the position. Productivity occurs in the activities themselves (e.g., number, size and/or scope of research projects completed by the research scientist) and/or the products of these activities (e.g., reports, publications, presentations). The amount of mentoring and/or advising graduate students and other academic staff (e.g., research associates, more junior research scientists) on components of the research process (e.g., skill development training, developing reports and/or papers, and other creative activities) may also be considered to the extent that such activity is an expectation or
responsibility of the research scientist position.

**Quality.** The quality of a candidate’s scholarship (including the conceptualization, design, implementation, analyses, findings, implications, and/or writing) is an important component of the assessment of scholarly contribution. Quality includes the extent to which the activity’s purposes, goals and objectives are clear; the activity reveals a high level of relevant knowledge, discipline-related expertise/skills and reflective understanding; and appropriate use of methods for the research activity including demonstrating integrity in the research process. Quality may also include the extent to which the activity and outcomes are presented appropriately and effectively to various audiences. Discipline-specific or professional standards in a given field should also be considered in judging quality.

**Impact.** Impact includes the influence of a research scientist’s scholarship on the field or discipline, and/or the effect on key stakeholders or environments (e.g., changing teachers’ practices; influencing education policy; informing key education decisions and improvement initiatives; guiding the development of best practices). Assessment of impact may include the breadth and reach of the impact, the extent to which the work can affect and be accessed by diverse stakeholders (both academic and/or practical), and/or the ways in which the scholarship has influenced and/or informed education policies and practices. Impact on the scholarly development of graduate students and other academic staff (e.g., research associates, more junior research scientists) resulting from mentoring and/or advising may also be considered to the extent that this type of research activity is an expectation or responsibility of the research scientist position.

**Creativity/Innovation.** Innovative and creative activities include the development and/or application of knowledge to develop new methodologies, instruments, analyses and/or research products. Examples of innovative and creative scholarly activities include, but are not limited to, developing survey items and measurement instruments, designing methodology, designing new reports, innovative contributions to analyses or report production, and new uses of statistics or methodology.

**Intellectual Independence/Research Autonomy.** Intellectual independence or research autonomy is the degree to which a research scientist independently directs the research and its processes (e.g., research design/methodology, data collection, data analyses, report writing and dissemination). Although this can take the form of serving as a principal or co-principal investigator or project director of funded research, intellectual independence and research autonomy may also be demonstrated for specific components of the research project process without official leadership designation. Intellectual independence and research autonomy does not preclude collaborations and/or consultations with colleagues and peers (which are common and encouraged), but does entail the research scientist having the authority to make critical decisions related to the research design and implementation with only routine communication with a senior staff member (e.g., Senior Scientist, center director). This may also entail the candidate having the autonomy to communicate directly with funders, clients, and key stakeholders (as appropriate) and independently to resolve problems or issues that may arise during the research process. At its highest levels, intellectual independence also includes providing intellectual leadership at the center, School, or University in their research and scholarly endeavors (including teaching and mentoring graduate students when this is an expectation of a given position).
B:1.c. Scholarship Evidence

Evidence will vary depending on the type of scholarship and the responsibilities and expectations of the position. The scope, size, and nature of the candidate’s scholarly activity (or portfolio of research activities) provide evidence of scholarship. Candidates must summarize in writing the scholarship (this can be done as part of the personal statement or in a separate document), along with relevant accompanying documentation, that specifically addresses how each research activity meets relevant evaluation areas (e.g., quality, impact). As needed and appropriate, the center director, clients and/or relevant colleagues may provide documentation that validates evidence provided by the candidate regarding research and creative activities. Scholarly activities include research design and implementation; development of survey items/measurement tools, methodologies, or designs; report design; report production processes; creation of resources and tools to advance the application of research; data collection or management; and analytic contributions. Scholarly activities may also include substantive mentoring or advising of graduate students and other academic staff, to the extent that this type of research activity is an expectation or responsibility of the research scientist position.

Evidence may also include:

**Scholarly products.** In many instances, scholarship may result in products of many forms, including but not limited to: articles, books or chapters, publication of agency or government reports; special analysis reports; technical reports; the development of new technology or tools; web-based publications or reports; webinars; and/or presentations, demonstrations or invited speeches. Although a publication in a peer-reviewed journal, for example, is evidence of scholarship, the expectation of this form of evidence should be limited to instances where publications of that type are an explicit expectation of a given position and/or is an allowable expenditure for the research funding of a given position. To varying degrees by center and position, research scientists work on and lead projects where certain types of products or dissemination methods are extremely unlikely or expressly prohibited due to, for example, the funding conditions or the research scientist’s role/time allocation. Assessment of scholarly products should take into consideration the purposes and context of the research project, as well as the intended audience.

**Grant proposals submitted and/or awarded.** In some positions, seeking competitive grants and contracts are an essential responsibility, and success in this endeavor—particularly when the grants are highly competitive and peer-reviewed—shows achievement in scholarship. In these instances, the same evaluation areas (e.g., productivity, quality, intellectual independence) should be considered in assessing grant proposals submitted and/or awarded. Submitted proposals that are not awarded, but are high quality and/or serve a longer-term strategic purpose, should be recognized and rewarded in addition to funded proposals.

**Other Evidence.** Other evidence may be appropriate based on the allocation of effort of the candidate, and the specific expectations of the research scientist position. Examples of other evidence include documentation of mentoring and/or advising graduate students, recognition of the candidate’s expertise and scholarship by others (e.g., awards and honors), and research consultation. Solicited and unsolicited letters, as appropriate, may also be included as evidence of research and creative activity, such as letters from mentees or groups who have benefitted from the applied scholarship of the candidate.
2. Center Service

B:2:a. Center Service Definition
Service to the center and its central mission/purpose is a primary responsibility of all research scientists. The School recognizes that the reputation, stature, and long-term sustainability of its centers are highly dependent upon the broad array of services performed by research scientists.

A research scientist’s service to the center can take a variety of forms and directions, such as participation (or leadership of) a center committee, working group or task force; substantive involvement in a center initiative or project that contributes to the mission of the center (e.g., self-study of the center; developing a strategic plan; developing new organizational infrastructure); substantive project management roles (e.g., project design, project recruitment, report production, supervision of project staff, management of the project budget); performing integral administrative functions of the center (e.g., budget management; recruitment of personnel; personnel supervision and management of graduate students, academic staff, professional and support staff); personnel allocation/appointments; and grant and contract oversight. Service to the center may also include external activities that directly support the mission of the center, such as representing the center at School and/or University meetings, committees and/or events; representing the center at non-University events, meetings, conferences for the purposes of promoting the center and/or developing new business; outreach to relevant organizations and agencies; informing the needs of member organizations; and developing and/or maintaining projects and/or relationships with funders, clients, and key stakeholders. These efforts and other center service activities are considered in promotion decisions to the extent that they contribute to the mission of the center.

Where demonstrably useful to the center, research scientists may include service to the School, University, profession and/or public in their dossiers. This additional service may include teaching or contributing to the instructional program of the School or University as appropriate.

B:2:b. Center Service Evaluation Areas
The evaluation of service involves the examination of a number of areas, including, but not limited to, the following:

Quantity, diversity and/or quality. Assessing service to the center includes judging the quantity, diversity and/or quality of service activities the research scientist engages in related to the mission of the center (e.g., number of service activities, scope of activities, range and diversity of activities). The number of service activities needs to be considered alongside the individual’s depth of involvement and the quality of the service. This category includes the level of professional competence and/or expertise demonstrated for the performance of the service. The extent to which a candidate works collaboratively with others in pursuit of the center’s mission and the flexibility demonstrated by the candidate in engaging in diverse service activities that meet the needs of the center should also be considered.

Effectiveness/impact of service. Assessing service to the center also includes an examination of the effectiveness of the service, the overall impact of service, and the significance of the service to the welfare, productivity and sustainability of the center.

Leadership and initiative. At the promotion to Senior Scientist level, assessing service to the center also includes the research scientist’s initiative in taking on, creating, or designing new service activities to meet the needs of the center. Assessment also include
the candidate’s independent administrative leadership for the center, as well as leadership on service activities both within (e.g., serving as chair of a committee; spearheading a new initiative) and outside the center (e.g., sustaining projects over time, maintaining relationships with funders and clients, developing new funding streams and/or successfully leading funded proposals, informing the needs of member organizations, and formally representing the center to external entities).

Other service. Additional activities external to the center may also be considered in evaluating service. Service to the School, University, profession and/or public may be considered, such as: administration within the School, University, or to professional organizations; service on School or University committees and faculty governance boards, commissions, task forces, and councils; service to any level of public or private educational institutions or professional organizations; service to government or public interest groups; teaching, training and development endeavors; reviewing proposals and papers for conferences, funding competitions, and other professional organizations. To count toward promotion, a case should be made for such service benefiting the center.

B:2:c. Center Service Evidence
Evidence will vary depending on both the type of center service and the responsibilities and expectations of the position. The scope, size and nature of the service activities provide evidence of service to the center. Candidates must summarize in writing the service activities (this can be done as part of the personal statement or in a separate document), along with any relevant accompanying documentation, that specifically addresses the nature of the service activity, effectiveness/impact of the service, and for promotion to Senior Scientist, the leadership and initiative demonstrated in the delivery of the service. A procedure for validation of the service activities by the center director, peers and/or others may be used as appropriate.

Evidence may also include:

Service products. Depending on the type of service activity, products may be developed such as reports, articles, tools or other materials. For example, service products may include strategic plans, self-study documents, committee reports, website tools, promotional materials, etc. To the extent that a research scientist’s service results in physical products, these may also be included as evidence.

Other evidence. External letters, awards or recognitions, and other documents demonstrating service activity and quality, may also be included as evidence of service.

C. Promotion Criteria

1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Scientist
For successful promotion to Associate Scientist, a candidate must be rated excellent in research and creative activity (inclusive of scholarship and service to the center). Excellence in research and creative activity for promotion to Associate Scientist includes evidence of the following:

C:1.a. The candidate is beginning to establish himself or herself as an expert in his or her respective discipline, field or area of practice through sustained productivity and high quality work in one or more areas of scholarship (i.e., scholarship of discovery, application, or integration). The productivity and quality of competitive contracts and grants and/or mentoring graduate students
and other academic positions should also be considered as part of this criteria category in instances where these types of scholarship are a responsibility or expectation of the position.

C:1:b. The candidate is beginning to show intellectual independence and research autonomy through leadership in designing and implementing substantive research projects and, if appropriate, being designated as a principal investigator/project director or co-principal investigator/co-project director. The candidate increasingly provides intellectual leadership and shows research autonomy for one or more aspects of the research process (e.g., design, data collection, data analyses, report writing, dissemination of findings). The candidate increasingly demonstrates the capability to independently and effectively interface with external audiences (e.g., clients, funders) and deal with research problems and/or issues that may arise during the research process. The intellectual independence/research autonomy in designing, writing and submitting competitive contracts and grants also should be considered in instances where this type of scholarship is an expectation of the position.

C:1:c. There should also be clear evidence that the candidate is contributing to the scholarship of discovery, application, and/or integration with work that has significant impact and/or work that shows noteworthy creativity/innovation.

C:1:d. The candidate demonstrates commitment to the center, as evidenced by the quantity, diversity, and quality of service activities the research scientist engages in related to the mission of the center (e.g., number of service activities, scope of activities, range and diversity of activities). The number of service activities needs to be considered alongside the individual’s depth of involvement and the quality of the service activity. The research scientist demonstrates a high level of professional competence and/or expertise in the performance of the service to the center.

C:1:e. The research scientist’s service to the center is effective, and has a positive impact on the development and/or sustainability of the center. There is evidence that the service contributes to the welfare, productivity and/or sustainability of the center.

2. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Scientist

For successful promotion to Senior Scientist, a candidate must be rated excellent in research and creative activity (inclusive of scholarship and service to the center). Excellence in research and creative activity for promotion to Senior Scientist should include evidence of the following:

C:2:a. The candidate is an established expert in a discipline, field, or area of practice through consistent and sustained productivity and high quality work in one or more areas of scholarship (i.e., scholarship of discovery, application, or integration). There is evidence of the research scientist having a national and/or international reputation in his or her respective discipline, field, or area of practice resulting from strong productivity and high quality work and/or evidence that the research scientist contributes through their productivity and high quality work to the national and/or international reputation of the projects the research scientist works on or leads. The productivity and quality of competitive contracts and grants, and/or mentoring graduate students and other academic positions, also should be considered as part of this criteria category in instances where these types of scholarship are a responsibility or expectation of the position.

C:2:b. The candidate consistently demonstrates intellectual independence/research autonomy, and regularly provides intellectual leadership for multiple aspects of the research process (e.g., methodology design, data collection, data analyses, and dissemination of findings). The candidate independently designs and implements substantive research projects as a principal
investigator/project director or co-principal investigator/co-project director, and provides intellectual leadership and/or mentoring of others at the center, School, or University in their research and scholarship endeavors.

C:2:c. There should also be clear evidence that the candidate has a sustained and distinguished record of contribution to the scholarship of discovery, application, and/or integration with work that has significant impact and/or work that shows noteworthy creativity/innovation. There should be evidence of major accomplishments, substantive contributions, and/or leadership over a period of years to at least one area of scholarship.

C:2:d. The candidate demonstrates a consistent commitment to the center, as evidenced by the quantity, diversity, and quality of service activities the research scientist engages in related to the mission of the center (e.g., number of service activities, scope of activities, range and diversity of activities). The breadth, depth and quality of service activities demonstrates professional competence and/or expertise in the performance of the service. The candidate has lead one or more complex, special assignments critical to center operations.

C:2:e. The candidate’s service to the center is consistently effective, and regularly has a positive impact on the development and/or sustainability of the center. There is strong evidence that the research scientist’s service activities have resulted in substantive contributions over a period of years to the welfare, productivity and/or sustainability of the center.

The research scientist regularly demonstrates leadership and initiative in his or her service to the center. The research scientist regularly identifies opportunities for furthering the mission of the center, and takes the initiative to develop solutions to operational and/or organizational problems. The candidate has a history of providing independent administrative leadership for the center.

3. Sequential Levels of Review and External Letters

C:3:a. Sequential Levels of Review
Promotion dossiers for Associate Research Scientist and Senior Scientist are prepared by the scientist and are informed by these School of Education Research Scientist Promotion Criteria. The candidate’s promotion dossier is reviewed at three levels to ensure comprehensive and rigorous peer review of achievements and promise. At each level, the appropriate review committee writes a substantive report evaluating the candidate’s performance in Research/Creative Activity and Service/Engagement, votes for a recommendation, and submits the report and vote to the appropriate administrator (Center Director, Dean, Vice Provost). Then the appropriate administrator provides a separate substantive evaluation and recommendation.

**Center Level.** The candidate’s center will conduct the initial level of review. The Center Promotion Advisory Committee (CPAC) will be appointed by the Center Director, with approval from the Executive Associate Dean, and should include at least five members. At least 60% of the committee should be comprised of tenured faculty members familiar with research scientist roles and responsibilities in the respective center and the remaining members should be rank-eligible research scientists (i.e., at the rank the candidate is seeking or higher). Given the wide variation in the representation of research scientists in the centers, some latitude is provided in the nature and make-up of the CPAC. It is expected that the CPAC include rank eligible research scientists from the candidate’s center (except those serving on promotion committees at the School or University levels) and rank eligible research scientists from other centers as needed. Only in instances where there are fewer than two rank eligible
research scientists from across the School’s centers would tenured faculty members familiar with research scientist roles and responsibilities in the respective center make up significantly more than 60% of the CPAC membership. If the research scientist is employed outside of a Center then the research scientist’s supervisor would work with the Executive Associate Dean to form a CPAC following the guidelines listed herein.

School of Education Level. The second level of review will be conducted at the School level by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) and the Dean.

Campus Level. The third level of review will be conducted by the Bloomington Campus Promotions Advisory Committee and the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

Committee members at each level of review are only eligible to vote if they have been “materially engaged” in the review process, as evidenced (for example) by their familiarity with the candidate’s dossier or attendance at meetings where the case is discussed. No proxy voting is allowed. Voting is by secret ballot (secrecy should be maintained to the extent allowable by law). Votes must be reported in the candidate’s dossier.

C:3:b. External Letters
Promotion dossiers should contain six external review letters from qualified individuals. The purpose of the external review is to provide an objective, peer review of a candidate’s claim to Excellence.

Whether the reviews come from inside or outside IU (a minimum of three must come from individuals not employed by Indiana University and internal letters must be from individuals outside the candidate’s unit), faculty serving as external referees are expected to provide a full review of the promotion packet they received, and their letters should be expressly evaluative and not be confused with solicited “colleague” or “promotion support” letters. External reviewers should be a balanced mix from a list of potential reviewers submitted by the candidate and a list prepared by the Center Director. Given the diversity of center purposes, and the varied roles and expectations of research scientists, external reviewers can be research scientists, tenured faculty, and reputable scholars/researchers at peer institutions or organizations (e.g., state and federal agencies, non-profit foundations, and other education, evaluation, or policy organizations that are similar in size, scope, and responsibilities to the candidate’s center). Note, the use of tenured faculty members should occur only when they understand the role of the research scientist and center. External reviewers for research scientists should not have a significant, ongoing relationship—scholarly, commercial, personal, familial, or financial—with the candidate. Determinations related to qualifications and appropriateness of external evaluators will be made by the Center Director, with approval from the Executive Associate Dean.

External referees must be sent: (a) the candidate’s job description and center description, (b) the Research Scientist Promotion Criteria, (c) the candidate’s c.v., (d) the candidate’s statement, and (e) no more than 4 artifacts that provide evidence of the candidate’s research and creative activity.

4. Reapplication for Promotion
Unsuccessful candidates for promotion may reapply in a subsequent year.
VI. PROMOTION AND LONG TERM CONTRACTS FOR LECTURERS AND CLINICAL FACULTY

University Policy summarizes recommendations for timeline and promotion process here: https://vpfaa.indiana.edu/faculty-resources/tenure-promotion/non-tenure-track/index.html

No later than in the sixth year of the probationary period, a lecturer or an assistant clinical professor must apply for promotion and long term contract. Procedures and criteria for promotion and long term contracts in the areas of teaching (lecturer) and teaching and service (assistant clinical) shall be the same as for tenured and tenure-probationary faculty. A candidate for promotion in lecturer ranks must excel in teaching. A candidate in clinical ranks must excel in either teaching or service, and be at least effective/satisfactory in the other. An alternative is for the clinical rank candidate to submit a "balanced case" that presents evidence of Very Good performance in both areas that demonstrates balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance or comparable benefit to the university. The balanced case is not a default option when a candidate fails to reach excellence in teaching or service. Rather the balanced case is planned to reflect integration across both areas. The candidate’s scholarship may be used to support the case in either teaching or service, or both.

A. Procedure
1. The candidate will prepare a dossier with a candidate’s statement and sections on teaching (lecturer) or teaching and service (clinical). Directions for the preparation of materials are outlined in the teaching and service sections of the School of Education’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. In promotions for lecturers and clinical faculty, consideration will be given to:
   - Multi-source documentation of high quality teaching. Examples may include, but are not limited to: student evaluations, colleague evaluations of classroom performance, participation in workshops and conferences, and syllabi. Other forms of evidence that may be provided include web pages, video, assessment tools, teaching awards, and mentoring of associate instructors.
   - Participation in the intellectual life of the University, evidenced by involvement with the Center for Innovation Teaching and Learning (CITL) and other campus programs promoting teaching.
   - Participation in appropriate service that relates to the program to which they are assigned, as well as to the department, school, and/or university level (Clinical) or participation in teaching-oriented service (Lecturer).
2. The promotion dossier will be submitted to the department chair and a vote of the department faculty will be conducted and reported to the School of Education Promotion, Tenure and Contracts Committee.
3. The Promotion, Tenure and Contracts Committee will vote and communicate a recommendation with the recorded vote to the Dean of the School of Education.
4. The Dean of the School of Education will forward a recommendation to the Vice-Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs (VPFAA).
B. Protection of Academic Freedom
Lecturers and Clinical faculty are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as full-time lecturers or clinical rank faculty will go through the promotion process after a probationary period of not more than five years. After promotion, lecturers and clinical faculty will be appointed with 3 or 5 year rolling or renewable terms, as determined by the dean and faculty governance body within the School of Education.

C. Categories and criteria of evaluation for long-term contracts and promotion
In the School of Education, lecturer faculty will be awarded long-term contracts and/or promotion if they meet the criteria for excellent performance in teaching, while clinical faculty will be awarded long-term contracts and/or promotion if they meet the criteria for excellent performance in teaching and satisfactory performance in service, for satisfactory performance in teaching and excellent performance in service, or for very good performance in both teaching and service. The latter category is most appropriate when teaching and service are characterized by thoughtful and careful integration of the two areas. Note that while research is not a category in which clinical faculty are rated, in accordance with Bloomington Faculty Council (BFC) policy, appropriate research and scholarly activity may be used to meet criteria for teaching and service.

C:1. Teaching
The teaching category includes all forms of university-level instructional activity on or off campus. It includes preparation for, and teaching of, a variety of types of courses, seminars, and other academic learning experiences. It also includes, for example, non-credit workshops and informal instructional activities involved in working with in-service teachers or community groups. Further, it includes those instructional activities conducted to develop competencies of practitioners which extend beyond the university campus, such as supervising student teachers, guiding field-based practice in counseling and school psychology, and the like. This category includes course and program development, academic counseling, supervision of student research and service on graduate student program and research committees. It also includes production of course materials, textbooks, Web pages, and other electronic aids to learning and perfection of instructional techniques and techniques for evaluating student outcomes. Advising and mentoring undergraduate, graduate, and early career clinical faculty also constitute teaching.

Teaching encompasses contributions to an academic community of scholars through the presentation of successful instructional innovations, insights, or experiences with teaching. Publications that disseminate scholarly discourse about teaching or otherwise communicate pedagogical strategies are included in this category of teaching activity.

If a candidate for a long-term contract and/or promotion seeks to demonstrate excellence or Very Good performance in teaching, the candidate is encouraged to identify two to four exemplars of his or her best work. Teaching is a complex process that encompasses multiple components, and multiple forms of evidence are needed to assess teaching effectiveness comprehensively. No one form of evidence (e.g., student evaluations of teaching) should carry disproportionately more weight.
than any other. Appropriate teaching materials may include evidence from the instructor (e.g., philosophy of teaching, teaching goals, syllabi, instructional materials, reflections on efforts to evaluate and improve teaching, and presentations and articles on one's teaching), evidence from others (e.g., colleague evaluations of student outcomes, observations by colleagues trained to evaluate teaching, and invitations to share one's teaching expertise), and evidence from students (e.g., solicited and unsolicited feedback from students, course-related student products, evidence of student achievement, and student-selected teaching awards). These categories of evidence may be interrelated. For example, a colleague may write an evaluation of the links among an instructor's philosophy, goals, course design, instructional strategies, and outcomes based on direct observation, instructor-provided documents, and student products and evaluations. Evidence will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

**Effective.** Evidence of effective teaching should include an assessment on the dimensions of the (a) substantive and (b) pedagogical aspects of teaching indicating that there are no uncorrected serious faults or deficiencies. Efforts toward continuous teaching improvement and development of instructional innovations should also be included as evidence, regardless of immediate outcomes.

**Very Good.** Appreciably better than effective, but less than excellent.

**Excellent.** Documentation of excellent performance in teaching should include outstanding performance in classroom teaching, advising, and mentoring. Evidence of more widespread impact of scholarship about teaching is helpful, but given that the primary role of many clinical faculty is classroom teaching, outstanding classroom teaching can be sufficient for a rating of excellent. Evidence relating to outstanding performance as a classroom teacher should come from a variety of the areas mentioned earlier in this section. Evidence of movement toward national visibility can also contribute toward an excellent rating in teaching and should include documentation of an active role in communicating instructional efforts and innovations nationally and internationally. This documentation may include scholarly publications about teaching. Other forms of evidence may include documentation of widespread impact of instructional materials and activities created by the candidate (textbooks, videos, Web pages, publications, conference presentations). Teaching awards may also provide evidence of teaching excellence.

**C:2. Service**

This category includes all forms of professional service performed for the benefit of the University, the profession, and the public. The faculty of the School of Education recognizes a continuous obligation to provide service to the University, the profession and the community through its talent, its technical competence, and its professional skills. Indeed, it is the case that increasingly greater demands for service are being made on the School as society's educational needs become ever more complex.

If a candidate for promotion seeks to demonstrate excellence or very good performance in service,
the candidate is encouraged to identify two to four exemplars of his or her best work. In general, a faculty member's service can be classified as internal or external to the University and can take a variety of forms and directions. It includes, for example, all of the following:

- Administration, at any level appropriate for clinical faculty, within the University, and administrative service to learned or professional organizations.
- Service on or for departmental, School, or University committees, and faculty governance boards, commissions, task forces, and councils.
- Service to student organizations or groups.
- Consultative or other service to any level of public or private educational institutions or professional organizations.
- Efforts to promote partnerships and engagement with public schools and communities.
- Consultative or other service to government or public interest groups.
- Publications and other materials developed as part of professional service activities.

Service will be evaluated along the following dimensions:

- The level of professional competence or expertise required for its performance,
- The effectiveness of the service,
- The significance of the service to the welfare of the University, the profession or the public, and
- Its effect on the development of the individual.

Evidence of Service will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

**Satisfactory.** A record of acceptance, in a spirit of willing cooperation, of a normal number of committee assignments, some participation in professional organizations or service to other outside groups, and a record of involvement in the outreach efforts of the School of Education to its various constituencies.

**Very Good.** Falling between effective and excellent ratings.

**Excellent.** Evidence of more than a routine amount, range, or depth of involvement in service, and an assessment of the outstanding quality or effectiveness of that involvement. Evidence of a developing reputation for excellence in professional service beyond the local level should be presented. A distinction should be drawn between routine service, or citizenship, and service that is tied directly to one's field of knowledge and that relates this knowledge to professional activity for the betterment of the School or the field of education in general. Examples might include developing and running field-based programs for students, shaping public policy, serving clients in counseling psychology in some exceptional way, working with public schools to bring about substantial and significant change--in all of these instances practice and theory may inform each other. Scholarly service both applies and contributes to human knowledge.
D. Promotion to Senior Lecturer or Associate Clinical Professor with Long Term Contract

In regards to the criteria described above, promotion to Senior Lecturer with long term contract requires appropriate dissemination and impact in teaching. For Associate Clinical Professor this requires appropriate dissemination and impact in teaching or service. Examples of dissemination and impact include publications, presentations at professional meetings and conventions, workshop presentations, instructional technology applications, books, and software and video development. Dissemination materials related to teaching or service are expected to be of high quality. Evidence of impact should focus on breadth, thematic and coherent content, and be related to professional goals. Promotion and long-term contract recommendations should be based on a prognosis of the candidate's future achievements, as determined by dependability, growth, originality, potential and versatility of the candidate's work in relation to the mission of the School of Education and of the particular unit within the School to which the faculty member is assigned. That is, careful consideration should be given to the individual faculty member's potential contribution to the unit and School missions.

E. Promotion to Teaching Professor or Full Clinical Professor

As is the case with promotion to the ranks of senior lecturer and associate clinical professor, promotion in rank to those of teaching professor or full clinical professor assumes the same type of scholarship in teaching (teaching professor) or teaching and service (full clinical professor) as is expected for tenured faculty. Expectations for quantity of such scholarship, however, must be moderated by the teaching load of the candidate.

E:1. Teaching

Effective. Evidence should include an assessment on each of the teaching dimensions emphasized under promotion to associate clinical professor, indicating that there are no uncorrected serious faults or deficiencies. Evidence should be provided of continuing growth as a teacher beyond the level attained upon promotion to associate clinical professor.

Very Good. Appreciably better than effective, but less than excellent.

Excellent. National visibility for contributions to teaching should have been attained in order to earn a rating of excellence in teaching for promotion to full clinical professor. Appropriate evidence may include dissemination of scholarly publications about teaching. Other forms of evidence may include:

- Versatility – that is, excellence in teaching at more than one level (undergraduate, masters, advanced graduate) and in more than one form (e.g. lecturing to large groups, conducting discussion groups and seminars, directing laboratory or clinical experiences, guiding independent study or research);
- Excellence in course or program development;
- Exemplary and unique student achievement;
- Impact of dissemination on teaching, including published materials, conference presentations, and related activities (e.g., textbooks,
videos, Web pages);

- Widespread reputation for excellence in teaching (e.g., testimony from former students, colleagues, and client groups; data; and various awards or other recognition relevant to this category);
- Concerted effort to engage colleagues, locally and nationally, in conversations about teaching and learning (e.g., organizing or leading teaching workshops, teaching-related conference presentations); and
- Advising, mentoring, and nurturing students and early career faculty.

E:2. Service

Satisfactory. A record of a greater range of service than is considered satisfactory for promotion to associate clinical professor is expected. The evidence shall also include assessment of the quality of service.

Very Good. Falling between effective and excellent ratings.

Excellence. Evidence of outstanding performance over a period of years and of a national or international reputation for leadership and innovation in professional service. There must be clear evidence of the exceptional nature of service far above and beyond routine expectations of professional educators.


All promotion dossiers should contain six external review letters from qualified individuals. The purpose of the external review is to provide an objective, peer review of a candidate's claim to Excellence. Whether the reviews come from inside or outside IU (a minimum of three must come from individuals not employed by Indiana University and internal letters must be from individuals outside the candidate’s unit), faculty serving as external referees are expected to provide a full review of the promotion packet they received, and their letters should be expressly evaluative and not be confused with solicited “colleague” or “promotion support” letters.

VII. NON-REAPPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL

A. Research Scientists

Dismissal of an individual with a research appointment holding a long-term appointment which has not expired may occur because of loss of research funding, closure or permanent downsizing of the program in which the faculty member serves, or loss of other outside funding on which the appointment was based; otherwise, dismissal of such faculty shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious personal or professional misconduct, or university financial exigency. Non-reappointment of research faculty to a new appointment term may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the program. The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance processes shall include cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of research faculty.
B. Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

Lecturers and clinical faculty during the probationary period shall be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during the probationary period. Procedures and criteria for non-renewal of probationary lecturer and clinical faculty shall be the same as for tenure-probationary faculty. During the second and subsequent years, at least twelve months notice of non-reappointment must be given. Non-reappointment decisions regarding clinical faculty holding a longer term contract after the probationary period must be made with faculty consultation through processes established by the school’s faculty governance institutions.

Dismissal of a lecturer or clinical rank faculty member holding a long-term contract may occur because of closure or permanent down-sizing of the clinical program in which the faculty member teaches and serves; otherwise, dismissal of such clinical faculty shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, or financial exigency. Non-renewal of the long-term contracts of these faculty may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the program.

The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance institutions include cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of lecturers and clinical faculty.

Reference