Candidate declares area of excellence in research, teaching or service with satisfactory performance in the other two areas. Determination of promotion from one rank to another rank depends on performance in rank, while tenure determinations require consideration of all previous and current performance and potential for future success with an upward performance trajectory. Major criteria are grant funding and publications in the Area of Excellence.

Research

At the School of Dentistry, excellence in research is demonstrated through superior scholarship in research and the achievement of national and/or international recognition for significant contributions to the discipline. This is accomplished by obtaining external grant support from national sources, through peer-review by external evaluators, peer-reviewed publication of outcomes in top tier journals and dissemination of research through other venues such as peer-reviewed presentations at national and/or international meetings, participation in research panels and grant review processes, mentored student research or other recognition. The criteria for excellence for each rank are outlined below to serve as a guide to candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion in research.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure

*Excellence in research is demonstrated by:*

1. An emerging national reputation for contributions to the field through peer-review by external evaluators.
2. Evidence of an independent program of research beyond dissertation work and mentor relationships. This includes serving as principal investigator on funded studies and leadership of the research agenda of his/her lab while obtaining independent funding of this research sufficient to support the research program of the candidate.
3. Although quality is valued over quantity, a growing body of published work must be demonstrated. The majority of the publications should be first, senior or corresponding authorships. Publications are expected in rank at the approximate rate of 1-2 publications per year. Discussion of the impact of publications in the field and recognition of its quality is expected. The majority of the publications should demonstrate a focus of research upon which the faculty member can build in the future. The volume of publications, which is easily quantifiable, cannot be ignored but will not be the only index of excellence and contribution to the disciplines. It is recognized that faculty generally seek to publish as often as possible and in the best possible journals. Still, the stature of the journals in which a candidate publishes is important and can be difficult to assess. Evidence
of high-quality peer-reviewed research publications in top tier journals in the candidate’s area of research must be provided with submission of 2 to 4 of the most significant publications in rank. (See Appendix for additional specific guidelines.)

4. Evidence of peer-reviewed presentations or conference papers at national and/or international conferences, professional meetings, or symposia related to the scholarship of research such as the International/American Association for Dental Research.

5. Significant activity in obtaining internal and external grant support from competitive sources with acquisition of external funding to support the program of research of the candidate. Funding should be independently acquired and not solely dependent on other investigators. (See Appendix for additional specific guidelines.)

6. The impact of research through invited presentations, citations and impact factors, journal quality, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

7. Awards or honors received in recognition of the scholarship of research, research contributions or outcomes. (See Appendix for additional specific guidelines.)

8. Evidence of an action plan for an ongoing program of research and research scholarship.

9. Evidence of intellectual property development at Indiana University by filing patents as applicable. (See Appendix for additional specific guidelines.)

**Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor**

*Excellence in research is demonstrated by:*

1. A sustained national and/or international reputation for expertise in their field and significant ongoing contributions through peer-review by external evaluators.

2. Although quality is valued over quantity, a substantial body of published work must be demonstrated. The majority of the publications should be first, senior or corresponding authorships. Publications are expected in rank at the approximate rate of 3-5 publications per year. Discussion of the impact of publications in the field and recognition of its quality is expected. Evidence of high quality peer-reviewed research publications in top tier journals in the candidate’s area of research must be provided with submission of 3 to 5 of the most significant publications in rank. (See appendix for additional specific guidelines.)

3. Evidence of multiple peer-reviewed presentations or conference papers at national and/or international conferences, professional meetings or symposia related to the scholarship of research.

4. Consistent external grant support from competitive sources including federal funding to support an ongoing independent program of research.

5. The impact of research through invited presentations, citations and impact factors, journal quality, and evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

6. Participation in research panels and grant review processes sponsored by national organizations and like contributions.
7. Evidence of mentored student research with outcomes such as co-authored publications, presentations or other recognition.

8. Awards or honors received in recognition of the scholarship of research, research contributions or outcomes.

9. Evidence of intellectual property development at Indiana University by filing patents as applicable. (See Appendix for additional specific guidelines).

**Teaching**

At the School of Dentistry, excellence in teaching is demonstrated through superior scholarship in teaching, advising and/or mentoring and the achievement of national and/or international recognition for significant contributions to the discipline. This is documented through peer-review by external evaluators, peer-reviewed publication in top tier journals and other forms of scholarly work, dissemination through venues such as peer-reviewed presentations at national and/or international meetings, participation in panels on best practices, evidence that teaching innovations or products are adopted by others, peer and student evaluation that demonstrate impact and learning outcomes, awards and recognitions for teaching excellence and internal and/or external grant funding for teaching innovations and/or best practices. The criteria for excellence for each rank are outlined below to serve as a guide to candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion.

**Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure**

*Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:*

1. An emerging national reputation for contributions to the field through peer-review by external evaluators. The relative teaching load will be considered and is expected to meet the expectations of the department.

2. Evidence of an evolving philosophy of teaching, curricular development and course improvement and/or innovation as related to the scholarship of teaching.

3. Although quality is valued over quantity, a growing body of published work must be demonstrated. Other forms of publication such as books on pedagogy, textbooks, laboratory manuals, workbooks, book chapters, software, or other instructional materials provide additional evidence of scholarship in teaching. The majority of the publications should be first, senior or corresponding authorships. The combined body of published work in rank is expected at the approximate rate of 1-2 publications per year. Discussion of the impact of publications in the field and recognition of its quality is expected. Demonstration of a focus to the research in pedagogy is expected. Evidence of quality peer-reviewed publications in the scholarship of teaching and learning in top tier journals must be provided with submission of 2 to 4 of the most significant publications in rank.
4. Evidence of peer-reviewed presentations or conference papers at national and/or international conferences, professional meetings or symposia related to discipline-based pedagogy, research or best practices.

5. The impact of teaching through invited presentations, adoption of work products by others, journal quality, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base in the field that has improved the work of others.

6. Evidence of teaching, advising or mentoring outcomes documented by peer and student evaluations over time and/or collaborative presentations or publications with students.

7. Teaching awards and other honors received in recognition of the scholarship of teaching, advising or mentoring contributions or outcomes.

8. Internal and/or external grant support to fund innovations or experimentation in teaching pedagogy is recommended.

9. Evidence of an action plan for continued professional development and an ongoing program of scholarship in teaching, advising or mentoring.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

**Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by:**

1. A sustained national and/or international reputation for expertise in the field and significant ongoing contributions through peer-review by external evaluators.

2. Development of a sophisticated teaching philosophy, continued curricular development and course improvement and/or innovation as related to the scholarship of teaching.

3. Although quality is valued over quantity, a substantial body of published work must be demonstrated. Other forms of publication such as books on pedagogy, textbooks, laboratory manuals, workbooks, book chapters, software, or other instructional materials provide additional evidence of scholarship in teaching. The majority of the publications should be first, senior or corresponding authorships. The combined body of published work is expected in rank at the approximate rate of 3-5 publications per year. Discussion of the impact of publications in the field and recognition of its quality is expected. Evidence of quality peer-reviewed publications in the scholarship of teaching and learning in top tier journals must be provided with submission of 3 to 5 of the most significant publications in rank.

4. Evidence of multiple peer-reviewed presentations or conference papers at national and/or international conferences, professional meetings or symposia related to discipline-based pedagogy, research or best practices.

5. Demonstrate the impact of teaching through invited presentations, adoption of work products by others, journal quality, and evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base that has improved the work of others.

6. Participation in teaching or best practice panels, conferences or projects sponsored by national organizations.
7. Evidence of superior teaching, advising or mentoring outcomes documented by peer and student evaluations over time and/or collaborative presentations or publications with students or other objective means (percentage of students passing National Boards, etc.). Evidence of mentored student research (or other accomplishments) with outcomes such as co-authored publications, presentations or other recognition.
8. Internal and/or external grant support to fund innovations or experimentation in teaching pedagogy is expected.
9. Teaching awards and other honors received in recognition of the scholarship of teaching, advising or mentoring contributions or outcomes.

Service

At the School of Dentistry, excellence in service is demonstrated through superior scholarship in service and the achievement of national and/or international recognition for significant contributions to the field. This is documented through peer-review by external evaluators, peer-reviewed publication of outcomes in top tier journals and dissemination through other venues such as peer-reviewed presentations at national and/or international meetings, evidence that service innovations or approaches are adopted by others, documentation of the impact and outcomes of the service activities, awards and recognitions for service excellence and internal and/or external grant funding for service innovations and/or best practices. The criteria for excellence for each rank are outlined below to serve as a guide to candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure

**Excellence in service is demonstrated by:**
1. An emerging national reputation for contributions to the field through peer-review by external evaluators.
2. Evidence of a reflective, scholarly approach to service activities and contribution.
3. Although quality is valued over quantity, a growing body of published work must be demonstrated. Other forms of publication such as textbooks, book chapters, best practice guidelines or web documents provide additional evidence of scholarship in service. The majority of the publications should be first, senior or corresponding authorships. The combined body of published work in rank is expected at the approximate rate of 1-2 publications per year. Discussion of the impact of publications in the field and recognition of its quality is expected. Evidence of quality peer-reviewed publications on service-related topics in top tier journals must be provided with submission of 2 to 4 of the most significant publications in rank.
4. Evidence of peer-reviewed presentations or conference papers at national and/or international conferences, professional meetings or symposia related to the scholarship of service.
5. The impact of service through invited presentations, adoption of approach by others, journal quality, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base that has improved the work of others.

6. Evidence of high-quality service outcomes documented by publication, presentation, treatment success or data that demonstrates the impact of the service.

7. Participation in professional and University service with discussion of the quality and impact of the service as related to the scholarship of service. Professional and University may include patient, client and/or community service; involvement in professional societies or organizations; as well as departmental, school or campus committee, task force and other service work.

8. Service awards and other honors received in recognition for the scholarship of service, significant service contributions or outcomes.

9. Evidence of internal and/or external grant support to fund service innovations or ongoing program of service.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

**Excellence in service is demonstrated by:**

1. A sustained national reputation for contributions to the field through peer-review by external evaluators and appointment to committees, advisory bodies and/or commissions in the relevant field.

2. Evidence of a reflective, sophisticated scholarly approach to service activities and contribution. Although quality is valued over quantity, a substantial body of published work must be demonstrated. The majority of the publications should be first, senior or corresponding authorships. Other forms of publication such as textbooks, book chapters, best practice guidelines or web documents provide additional evidence of scholarship in service. The combined body of published works in rank should be at the approximate rate of 3-5 publications per year. Discussion of the impact of publications in the field and recognition of its quality is expected. Evidence of quality peer-reviewed publications on service-related topics in top tier journals must be provided with submission of 3 to 5 of the most significant publications in rank.

3. Evidence of peer-reviewed presentations or conference papers at national and/or international conferences, professional meetings or symposia related to the scholarship of service.

4. Demonstrate the impact of service through invited presentations, adoption of approach by others, journal quality, and/or evidence of significant contributions to the knowledge base that has improved the work of others.

5. Evidence of high-quality service outcomes documented by publication, presentation, treatment success or data that demonstrates the impact of the service.

6. Participation in professional and University service with discussion of the quality and impact of the service, leadership role or nature of significant contribution as related to the scholarship of service. Professional and University may include patient, client and/or community service; involvement in professional societies or organizations; as well as departmental, school or campus committee, task force and other service work.
7. Service awards and other honors received in recognition for the scholarship of service, significant service contributions or outcomes.

8. Evidence of external grant support to fund service innovations or program of service.

**Balanced Case**

Faculty members determine their area of excellence within the academic norms and context of their primary unit. Faculty should select just one area of excellence unless presenting a balanced case. In some circumstances, faculty may present a record of *highly satisfactory performance across all three areas (research, teaching, service)* sufficient to demonstrate comparable long-term benefits to the University. Balanced case expectations are defined by the *Indiana University Academic Handbook* as: “balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit [to excellence in one area and satisfactory in the others] to the University.” This category is to be used when a faculty member’s work is highly integrated with documented scholarship in all three areas of endeavor. Letters of solicitation to external reviewers for candidates choosing to present a balanced case must include an explanation of Indiana University’s policy on the balanced case.

**Tenure**

The criteria for promotion and tenure are closely related, but they are not identical. While both are based on performance commensurate with rank, tenure requires documented evidence of the promise of continued achievement with distinction. While promotion and tenure recommendations are made separately, most tenure-probationary faculty are considered for both at the same time *unless they already hold a rank of associate or full professor*. Tenure is based on a documented record of achievement that meets defined standards for the department, school, and campus, together with evidence and a plan that demonstrates that the level of achievement is likely to continue and grow. Tenure acknowledges achievement in light of its promise for the future. As with a promotion dossier, the candidate for tenure declares an area of excellence with satisfactory performance in the other two areas except in the instance of a balanced case. The documentation for tenure includes the entire body of the candidate’s academic work to date rather than only work in rank.
APPENDIX

Indiana University School of Dentistry

Minimal Advancement Expectations While in Rank for Declared Area of Excellence

Tenure Track Faculty

Area of Excellence - Research

- Evidence of high-quality peer-reviewed research publications in top tier journals in the candidate’s area of research.
  - Publication in the premier peer-reviewed, high impact general science, dental or medical journals (for example, Science, Nature, Journal of Dental Research, Archives of Oral Biology, Caries Research, Journal of Periodontal Research, Cell, New England Journal of Medicine, Lancet) is a clear demonstration of peer appreciation of the published work. More commonly, publication in the “top tier” journals of a candidate’s discipline, such as major society journals, is a significant indicator of the quality of a candidate’s work and an expectation of IUSD. It is also appreciated that valid and significant publications will appear in what are generally viewed as less important journals and credit will be accorded; however, publication in lesser journals will count less in the evaluation of the candidate’s publication record. For some departments and disciplines, there may be several top tier journals and it is important to appreciate that any given journal’s reputation and importance may change with time.
  - Published abstracts are not generally accorded the weight of peer-reviewed papers. Nonetheless, it is acknowledged that having abstracts accepted to certain large meetings is through a competitive process and is subject to significant peer review. Examples are the International/American Association for Dental Research meetings. The candidate should document whether any abstracts listed fall into this category. The candidate should also highlight abstracts in their curriculum vitae selected for oral or selected poster presentations at national or international meetings, as these are generally considered more prestigious.
  - Being senior or lead author is important. It is essential for establishing excellence in research to be the senior or lead author on a number of publications; yet it is understood that the relative importance of the position in the list of authors in multi-author papers may depend on the discipline. For example, in many clinical investigations, being first author is most important; although sometimes being last author also has significance. In the basic sciences, a mature researcher will often place students or post-doctoral fellows as first author, placing his or her name last or as corresponding author.
  - The value of middle authorship is often hard to evaluate. A key principle is that the candidate and the division chief or department chair should document the candidate’s role in important publications. This is particularly important in team science; thus candidates are advised to describe their role in such collaborative projects in the dossier in such places as annotations on their CV, descriptions in the personal statement, etc.
Including letters from collaborators, co-authors, or senior research team members can further clarify and strengthen the candidate’s role.

- Clear documentation of one’s role is essential for faculty whose research portfolio is mostly team science based. Junior faculty seeking to establish independence from senior faculty or mentors with whom they continue to publish should also document their specific role in the research project using similar letters.

- **Demonstrate significant activity in obtaining internal and external grant support from competitive sources.**
  - Peer-reviewed grants from national agencies (e.g. National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of Defense) have the greatest prestige. Individual projects that are components of large center or program project grants to these agencies are considered essentially equivalent to investigator-initiated grants, provided that the individual project has been funded (it is recognized that individual projects within the larger center/program projects are sometimes not funded, even though the center/program project is funded on the merits of other projects).
  - Grant support from national societies that offer a competitive grant program (such as the American Association of Endodontists, American Diabetes Association, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, American Heart Association, American Cancer Society) is viewed very positively. Similarly, securing competitive grants from major foundations, Associations and Trusts are also noteworthy achievements.
  - For young investigators, career development awards represent a significant achievement.
  - Investigator-initiated awards from pharmaceutical companies are acknowledged as being significant although they do not rise to the level of prestige of peer-reviewed grants.
  - Playing a leading role as a coordinator of a multi-center trial is also viewed very positively.
  - A faculty member achieving excellence in research has historically been Principal Investigator (PI) on a substantial part of the candidate's funding. A possible exception is the case of center or program project grants, as noted in the preceding paragraph. Team science is important and the role of the candidate in the success of the team will be considered. Being a Co-PI in a NIH multiple PD/PI model grant would be considered equivalent. Some credit will also be accorded for a role as co-investigator.
  - If funding from grants on which the candidate is not PI is to be considered in making the case for excellence in research (for example, if the candidate is an essential member of a collaborative research team), it is imperative that the nature and significance of the candidate’s contribution be carefully documented by the candidate, collaborators and other evaluators.
As it is a service function, being the leader of a Core facility in a center or program project grant is meritorious but ordinarily not weighed heavily in establishing research excellence.

A listing of specific funding that was awarded to the candidate on grants that the candidate is not the PI should be provided.

As a principle, the School does not evaluate success in attracting external funding strictly in terms of the monetary value. It is also recognized that different types of research demand different levels of funding. Nonetheless, it is appreciated that small grants do not weigh as much as, for example, an NIH R01 grant.

**Intellectual property considerations:**

A patent award is recognized as evidence of creative activity and the development of new knowledge. A patent has undergone stringent external review by the US patent office and is a form of retrievable output that requires a substantial investment of intellectual effort. A patent is therefore a potential indicator of a successful research program though it is recognized that, like publications, not all patents have equal weight. Some are never licensed and effectively used whereas others may generate revenue for the university, school and department. Also, as with traditional publications, an individual’s role in a patent application is important and the onus is placed on the applicant to document, if necessary through letters from co-inventors, his or her contribution. Minimally, the candidate must be listed as a co-inventor.

Licensing/Royalties - Intellectual resources deriving from a faculty member’s research, though not patentable, may be marketable. Included might be the licensing of materials available from the research program in exchange for a flat fee or for royalties based on sales. Another example would be royalties or professional acclaim from a successful textbook. Licensing of products or the award of royalties does not have the weight of peer reviewed appreciation of a research program, but does indicate recognition and value. Together with publications and external funding, however, licensing and royalties can support the cohesiveness of a research program.

**Awards or honors received in recognition of the scholarship of research, research contributions or outcomes:**

Editorial boards and manuscript review: It is likely that a faculty member with a mature and successful research program would be asked to review a significant number of manuscripts for journals. To be or to have been a member of editorial board(s) is considered very positively, obviously the more important the journal(s) the better. In some instances, documentation of meritorious editorial service in the form of a certificate, published list of the number of papers reviewed, or letter from senior editors can be used for documentation.
Study sections and grant review: Similar to requests for manuscript review, solicitations to review grant applications are viewed positively. Such activity can range from requests to review individual grants, through acting as an ad hoc reviewer on a study section or review panel, to full membership or chairing such review groups. Full membership of National Institutes of Health study sections is deemed especially meritorious. Participation in national society or association review boards (e.g., American Heart Association, American Cancer Society, or American Diabetes Association) is highly valued.

Invited authorships: Invitations to contribute reviews, editorials, commentaries, or perspectives in significant journals or chapters in important books or textbooks are recognition of an individual's stature and visibility in the field.

Invited speaking engagements: Invitations to speak at symposia, congresses or scientific meetings are additional measures of the success of a research program. More prominent lectures at meetings carry more weight. For example, a plenary lecture at a major society meeting is more significant than having an abstract selected for a 15-minute oral presentation, but both have value. Presentation at a large national meeting has more weight than speaking at a small specialist meeting, though both are important. Chairing a session, organizing a session or organizing a meeting are further indicators of recognition. Invitations to present seminars or grand rounds at other major research institutions or universities are another index of scientific reputation.

Participation in affairs of professional societies: Appointments to office and committees in national professional societies, particularly if by election, are viewed positively. In some cases, election to membership of elite societies itself carries prestige (e.g., American Society of Clinical Investigation).

Honors and awards: Accolades for research achievement may also come in the form of honors, awards or prizes. These vary in prestige, depending on the scope, local versus national, and the stature of the awarding body. Included would be MERIT awards from the National Institutes of Health which represent high level peer recognition of an individual's research program.

Consultancies: In some research areas, consultancies for companies or other organizations may represent a positive judgment of an individual's reputation.

The Appendix was partially adapted from the Indiana University School of Medicine’s Standards of Excellence in Research document dated May 2014.