



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Standards of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion and Tenure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Scope
Overview
Guidelines
Forms
Definitions
Related Information
History

Effective: 03/01/2007
Last Updated: 5/31/2017

Responsible University Office:
Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Responsible University Administrator
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development

Policy Contact:
Director, Faculty Affairs

Scope

IU School of Medicine:

Faculty members
Department chairs
School and Department Promotion and Tenure Committees
Dean
Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (EAD)
Director, Faculty Affairs
Assistant Director, Faculty Systems

Overview

The standards of excellence in teaching provide guidelines for the evaluation of direct teaching activity as well as broader education activities such as curriculum development, mentoring and advising, and professional development efforts in education. Criteria for satisfactory contributions in teaching are also presented. For those faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure with research or service as the area of excellence, teaching

performance must be satisfactory in both quantity and quality, and candidates must address teaching in their personal statements. Candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure with teaching as the area of excellence also must have a record of high quality and quantity of teaching performance that is supported by appropriate learner and peer evaluation in addition to accepted forms of dissemination of one's contributions to the teaching mission of IUSM.

Guidelines

CRITERIA FOR SATISFACTORY CONTRIBUTIONS IN TEACHING

For those faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure with research or service as the area of excellence, satisfactory teaching performance must be documented for both quantity and quality. Candidates will need to submit compiled, comparative data for both quantity and quality of teaching (see sections 1 and 3 below for details). The department chair, IUSM regional campus director or his/her designated education leader from within the department/campus should include a summary statement about the candidate's contributions to the teaching mission relative to other departmental/regional campus members. Learner ratings of the quality of teaching must be satisfactory with a stable or improved trend in scores across time. The department chair/IUSM regional campus director should include a summary statement about the candidate's teaching responsibilities in his/her dossier review letter. Additionally, the personal statement should include a description of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and learning (see section 1 below for more detail). In addition, a peer review or observation of one's teaching is a campus expectation for satisfactory performance in teaching.

OVERVIEW OF CRITERIA FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

In general, candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure with teaching as the area of excellence must have

1. A record of high quality and quantity of teaching performance that is supported by appropriate learner and peer evaluation;
2. Quality measures (evaluations by learners, peers, and learner outcomes) that have remained stable or improved over time;
3. A record of significant peer-reviewed contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning;
4. Increased levels of responsibility and visibility as an education leader in major education committees, meetings, and societies (generally progressing from local to regional to national or international roles); and
5. Awards or other types of recognition for teaching and/or educational leadership. Candidates are encouraged to include samples of their educational scholarship or clear instructions regarding how the scholarly products can be retrieved.

DETAILED CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

1. Philosophy of Teaching and Learning

The personal statement should include a description of the candidate's philosophy of teaching and learning generally including comments about his/her teaching strengths and style that contribute to trainees' learning. More specifically, the elements in these statements can include: the candidate's personal goals and approach to teaching and learning; a description of the theory(ies) and/or framework(s) that inform the candidate's teaching style/methods; self-assessment of his/her most significant contributions to teaching and learning; educational methodologies employed and why; comment on most significant impact on learners, mentees, or fellow educators; reflective critique of role as medical educator; and long-term goals as an educator. The [IUSM Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development website](#) has more information about and examples of teaching philosophy statements.

2. Quantity of Instruction with Comparative Information

All Indiana University School of Medicine (IUSM) faculty are expected to teach to achieve promotion and tenure. IUSM trainees include medical students, graduate students (including Master of Science in Medical Science (MS MS) students), health professions trainees, residents, fellows, and post-doctoral trainees (PhD and MD). In addition to teaching IUSM trainees, IUSM faculty may teach learners in other schools within or outside the IU system. Faculty teaching assignments must be explained by the department chair/IUSM regional campus director, noting if a faculty member has few opportunities to teach and thus must demonstrate alternative contributions to the teaching mission.

IUSM faculty may teach IUSM trainees in any of a variety of venues. Typical teaching venues include: classroom, small group sessions, laboratories, simulation center, clinics and other outpatient settings, inpatient settings, operating rooms, emergency department, procedure suites, and one-on-one or small group tutoring.

All IUSM faculty will be expected to submit summary reports of the quantity of their teaching. Comparative data for each teaching venue and each type of learner will help support the candidate's contribution to the education mission. The department chair/IUSM regional campus director, or his/her designee, will be responsible for providing a clear and detailed summary of the candidate's teaching load relative to colleagues within the section, division, department, and/or campus.

3. Quality of Instruction with Comparative Measures

a. Learner Ratings of Teaching Quality

Ratings of teaching completed anonymously by learners using the highest quality instruments relevant for the teaching venue will provide the strongest data. Open-ended comments are important to include to help in the interpretation of learners' ratings of teaching effectiveness.

The candidate and/or department chair or campus director (or designee) should address negative comments about teaching performance or poor learner ratings by explaining any relevant context regarding the teaching issue and how improvements were made.

The Office of Medical Student Education (MSE) uses internally developed and validated teaching effectiveness assessment instruments for instructor evaluations by medical students. Instructor evaluations are distributed and collected electronically across the state. Response rates are included to assure adequate sampling. Reports can be viewed on the web real-time and summary reports include individual teaching scores for the current year, past year, and cumulative scores with standard deviations. These reports also include comparative data for individuals within a department as well as across IUSM regional campuses and departments for broader comparison. If the reports are not available to the candidates, they should contact their chair/regional campus director, or clerkship coordinator to obtain medical student teaching evaluation summaries.

The national residency review committees (RRC) require residency and fellowship programs to collect data on GME faculty teaching quality. The candidate should include summarized data from resident and/or fellow teaching evaluations in the dossier if involved in teaching at the GME level. Inclusion of raw data or teaching evaluation forms in the dossier will not be considered adequate documentation of teaching quality. Candidates should contact their program director and/or vice chair of education to obtain GME teaching evaluation summaries.

For teachers of graduate students, graduate program directors will be expected to systematically collect teaching effectiveness evaluations for classroom and/or small group teaching sessions employing similar methods of collecting and reporting information as outlined above for medical student and resident teaching. Candidates should contact the appropriate graduate program director for teaching evaluation summaries.

For teachers of Health Professions students, the health professions program directors will be expected to systematically collect teaching effectiveness evaluations employing the same rigorous methods of collecting and reporting information as outlined above for medical student and resident teaching.

For faculty engaged in CME, quality data regarding teaching effectiveness for CME-level teaching and for non-IUSM trainees should be included in the dossier.

b. Learner Outcomes

When possible candidates should supply data that demonstrate the association between effective teaching and learner outcomes. The IUSM P&T committee does recognize that multi- instructor courses and complex integrated training programs can make the direct linkage of a learner's outcome with one teacher difficult at best.

c. Peer Evaluation of Teaching Quality

The IUPUI Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), the IUSM Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development (OFAPD), and some departments in IUSM provide peer review and observation of teaching upon request. Inclusion of peer assessment of teaching in any education venue and/or of education products provides strong supporting evidence of teaching quality. Candidates should consider including reviews of written curriculum, education modules, educational websites, or other innovative education materials conducted by peers trained to provide such reviews. Inclusion of repeat, follow-up peer assessments with clear documentation of how the faculty member modified or improved their teaching or curricular products based on peer assessment provides substantially stronger evidence of teaching quality than inclusion of one-time peer assessment.

Peer reviews are especially important in documenting emerging or established recognition at the national or international level. They should address the quality of the candidate's teaching and related scholarship as well as the impact of the candidate's work. Independent peer reviews of scholarship should address the significance of the academic contribution to the overall advancement of knowledge in the area or discipline. Whether a peer reviewer is from within or outside the candidate's institution or department, the candidate must include a clear description of his/her relationship with the peer reviewer and why this person was chosen (e.g. content or process expert). The stature within the discipline or field of the peer reviewer contributes to the weight accorded the review. Reviews from colleagues, collaborators or individuals in some way connected to the candidate and thus may be less objective, are not appropriate.

4. Course/Curriculum Development/Retrievable Education Products

Descriptive summaries of any course or curriculum development can be included in the dossier. Such summaries can include: a clear statement about the faculty member's role in the development of the product; the purpose, rationale, or needs assessment leading to the development of the product; the targeted audience(s); how/where/when the curriculum has been implemented; an evaluation of the curriculum (by students or other targeted audience(s) and

peers); and any linked learner outcomes attributable to the new curriculum. Highlighted elements of a written curriculum, curriculum module, or web-product can be included as an appendix in the dossier as supplemental to the descriptive summary.

It is expected that the highest quality education products will be retrievable from national education repositories employing rigorous peer review (e.g., AAMC MedEdPORTAL, Society of Teachers of Family Medicine Family Medicine Digital Resource Library, End of Life/Palliative Education Resource Center, Association of Pediatric Program Directors, Alliance for Academic Internal Medicine e-learning resources). For purposes of promotion with teaching as the area of excellence, the candidate must include peer assessment of the education products ideally posted on any of the above mentioned or other similar repositories as evidence of the quality of the product.

5. Mentoring and Advising

Candidates must document their mentoring and advising roles. Faculty who declare teaching as their area of excellence tend to mentor/advise a load of students larger than many others in their department. Further, faculty will want to document the impact of their mentoring/advising on learner outcomes. For example, a faculty member has close one-on-one mentoring relationships whereby student's test scores, presentations, publications, grants, or creative products such as video, art, or creative writing, etc. can be clearly linked to the guidance or mentoring provided by a candidate. A candidate can include a list of learner outcomes with a clear description of their contribution to the learner's achievements in their dossier. Advising a group of learners should also be documented (e.g., UME special interest groups - SIG, women in emergency medicine).

For those seeking promotion with teaching as the area of excellence, letters from former medical students, residents, fellows, graduate students, or post-doctoral trainees clearly describing how the candidate contributed to their personal development also could be included in the dossier. The candidate can include unsolicited letters and/or the candidate's department chair/regional center director can solicit and collate letters from learners for inclusion in the dossier. Finally, the chair/regional center director will provide a written appraisal addressing a faculty members mentoring and advising contributions.

6. Scholarly Activities

Scholarship in education is necessary in order to meet the criteria for excellence. Educational scholarship can include educational textbooks, book chapters, and products included in education clearing houses, MedEd Portal, web modules, stand-alone electronic education modules, videos, national web postings of clinical cases and associated education materials (e.g., readiness assurance tests, self-study materials, application exercises, assessment checklists, standardized patient scenarios) for problem based learning, team

based learning, and/or objective structured clinical examinations for shared use. In addition, more traditional venues such as journal articles, conference presentations, abstracts, and posters are also examples of educational scholarship.

The scholarship of teaching can be defined by meeting the following criteria: the work is public; must be peer reviewed and critiqued according to accepted standards; and must be reproducible and/or built upon by other scholars.

In the vast majority of cases, the education material/scholarship will be retrievable (publications, web products, written curriculum, new assessment instruments, syllabi and hand outs from local/national presentations).

7. Teaching and Education Grants

All local, regional, or national teaching, curriculum, training, mentoring, education- related faculty development grants should be listed and described. The description must include: a clear statement about the faculty member's role in securing the grant; the funding amount (including direct and indirect amounts, when appropriate); the purpose, rationale, or needs assessment leading to the development of the grant; the targeted audience(s) for grant implementation; how/where/when the grant was implemented; an evaluation of the grant outcomes as assessed by learners, other target audience(s) and peers.

8. Teaching Awards

All local, regional, or national teaching, advising or mentoring awards should be listed and described (e.g., SGIM Clinician Educator of the Year, ACGME Parker Palmer Courage to Teach Award, "IU Trustee Teaching Award," IUSM Excellence in Faculty Mentoring Award). The description must include the nature and significance of the award. Awards for teaching and/or educational leadership are an important component for demonstrating excellence in teaching.

9. Service to Education Mission

Candidates should list and describe all educational administrative and leadership roles held locally, regionally, nationally, and/or internationally. Roles might include education leadership positions within IUSM (e.g. clerkship or course director; residency/fellowship program director), at the national level (e.g. peer reviewer for the MedEdPORTAL education repository, reviewer for education themed journals such as Academic Medicine), education committees (e.g. chair of IUSM Curriculum Council; secretary of a regional society such as the Central Group on Educational Affairs), or serving as a CME course director or instructor. Descriptions should describe the candidate's role, accomplishments attained, and overall impact while holding each post. Letters of support from supervisors or peers further describing the candidate's role, accomplishments, and impact can be included

in the dossier.

10. Evidence of Participation in Professional Development Focused on Teaching

Candidate should list and briefly describe the professional development events in which they have participated (e.g., Michigan State Primary Care Faculty Development Fellowship, McMaster Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Workshops, IUSM Academy of Teaching Scholars) in order to improve their teaching and education excellence. The description can include programs attended and examples of applications of new educational methodologies, uses of technology, or approaches to the learner that were tried as a result of participation in the faculty development program, along with any outcomes.

Forms

IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Performance

Definitions

FSC – Faculty Steering Committee

SEC – School Executive Committee

Related Information

[IUSM Promotion & Tenure Website](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Research for Promotion and Tenure](#)

[Standards of Excellence in Service for Promotion and Tenure](#)

[IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#)

History

Reviewed	Approved
5/2006	5/10/2007 FSC; 5/21/2007 SEC; 5/2007 IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties
1/2017	2/21/2017 FSC; 5/1/2017 SEC

The initiative to develop School of Medicine-specific standards of excellence first began in 2003. A task force was appointed with Dr. Aśok Antony (then Chair of the School of Medicine Promotion and Tenure and Contract Committees) appointed as Chair of the task

force. Three subcommittees were appointed, one for each mission area: Research, chaired by Peter J. Roach; Service, chaired by Thomas G. Luerssen from 2003-2006 and Sharon P. Andreoli from 2006-2007; and Teaching, chaired by Debra K. Litzelman. Dr. Antony and Deborah Cowley, Director of Academic Administration, were members of all three subcommittees. A preliminary version of the standards of excellence were disseminated for review in May 2006. The final document was approved on May 10, 2007 by the IUSM Faculty Steering Committee and May 21, 2007 by the IUSM Executive Committee, and was then subsequently approved by then IUPUI Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean of the Faculties, Dr. Uday Sukhatme.

In fall 2012, the IUSM received a national award from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and American Council on Education to accelerate faculty career flexibility. As part of the award, a committee was appointed to review IUSM faculty appointment types and promotion and tenure criteria. This committee identified the need to update the standards of excellence in research to better reflect current criteria used by the school committee and to articulate how collaborative research or “team science” would be evaluated. The revised standards were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 20, 2014, presented at the School Executive Committee on April 7, 2014, and approved on May 12, 2014. Similarly, subcommittees were appointed to revise the standards of excellence in teaching and service, which were approved by the Faculty Steering Committee on February 16, 2017 and by the School Executive Committee on May 1, 2017.

IUSM Rubric for Evaluating Teaching Performance

Please note that one does NOT need to engage in all of the listed contributions or have all of the evidence listed within each category.

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching students, residents, and/or fellows (e.g., workshops, small groups, simulations, lectures, tutoring, clinical teaching) • Invited presentations, visiting professor • Peer reviewed workshops • Peer reviewed publications related to education (e.g., journal articles, MedEd Portal) • Book, book chapters • Other publications (e.g., blog, podcast, newsletter, perspective pieces) • Development or improvements of learning sessions (e.g., lecture, workshop, team based learning, simulation) • Participation in curricular development or education program development team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete lists of formal instruction • Incomplete information about roles in and goals of instruction • Incomplete or only raw learner data with no interpretation of their meaning, either absolute or comparative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative and qualitative information from the candidate, learners, and peers indicating that instruction has been satisfactory in fostering appropriate learning outcomes • Unsolicited letters from learners • List of formal instruction (including role and goals) • Peer review of teaching • Satisfactory internal and external letters • Evidence of new or revised approach to teaching a particular topic (e.g., use of technology, new case based approach, team based learning) • Clear identification of contributions to curriculum development • Teaching philosophy statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative and qualitative information on teaching and learning outcomes that make the case for effective, innovative, and reflective instruction • Peer review of teaching • Outstanding internal and external letters • Well developed and evidenced based teaching philosophy statement • Effective service as an education leader (e.g., clerkship director, course director, committee chair, fellowship director) • Evidence of regular and significant local/regional peer reviewed dissemination of good practice • Peer review supporting the quality of the publications, presentations, or other dissemination methods • Effective course and curricular products with notable outcomes/impact • Evidence that the work has been adopted by others (locally, regionally, and/or nationally) indicates excellence • Grant funding to support curriculum development

Category	Possible Contributions	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
Mentoring and Advising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring and/or advising students, residents, fellows, post-docs, research associates, and/or faculty • Advising student, resident or other learner groups • Serving on mentoring committee or panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of learners mentored or advised and details of interaction not provided • Information on impact of mentoring and advising not presented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring and advising load is clearly documented and contextualized • Impact on learner achievement is clear (e.g., advisee success in match; mentees successfully reach professional goals; publish abstract, publication or grant) • Unsolicited learner letters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplishments of learners mentored or advised consistently linked to influence of mentor • Scholarly and reflective approach to mentoring and advising is documented in teaching philosophy • Scholarly work associated with mentoring or advising including presentations and publications • Recognition of the quality of mentoring/advising work • Achievements of mentees such as publications, presentations, and awards
Professional Development Efforts in Teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at professional development activities related to teaching and learning • Faculty development presentations and workshops related to teaching and learning • Evidence of mentoring of others in education projects • Engagement in faculty learning communities or committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information about teaching development efforts given • Poor record of performance in pursuing growth in teaching expertise • No mentoring of colleagues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of some activity, such as conference or workshop attendance or personal experimentation • Reflective commentary on candidate's own teaching within teaching philosophy statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of mentoring other educators • High level of activity in examining practice, seeking new ideas, obtaining feedback, and engaging in dialogue on teaching with campus or disciplinary peers • Membership in education related committees (department, campus, local, regional, national) • Peer review of efforts and impact of candidate's work in this area

TEACHING

Instruction

- Inclusive teaching practices (e.g., pedagogy, DEI content, multicultural courses, global perspectives)
- Organizing, directing, teaching, or participating as an instructor in courses, modules and/or workshops designed for historically marginalized students and trainees
- Curriculum development and/or revision related to DEI topics
- Faculty for DEI presentations/workshops for (students, residents, fellows, peers etc.) on a local, regional, national level
- Sponsoring fellowships and training awards designed to support career development for historically marginalized students, residents, fellows, or faculty
- Grants scholarly projects that include objectives related to DEI or that serve communities of color or other historically marginalized communities
- Scholarship in the form of publications, invited lectures, conference or other presentations describing research or activities that relate to DEI educational objectives and/or inclusive pedagogies
- National, international, local, and/or community-based awards and/or recognitions for DEI work
- Faculty Academy on Excellence in Teaching (FACET) and/or Academy of Teaching Scholars membership based on DEI work

Mentoring

- Intentional advising and/or mentoring underrepresented and/or international learners (including undergraduate, medical and graduate students, residents, and fellows)
- Serving as an advisor to a student organization related to underrepresented and/or historically marginalized groups
- Mentoring faculty and staff from underrepresented groups
- Mentoring faculty engaged in community-based research
- Mentoring students, trainees, faculty and/or staff on work related to DEI