

Evaluating RESEARCH During Annual Review for Faculty on Tenure and Research Tracks

Based on the faculty member's performance, using the rubric below, please provide a **RESEARCH EVALUATION** using the university standard performance rating, which is defined in IU BOT-24:

- Unsatisfactory (This is only used if this year and the prior year do not meet expectations.)*
- Does Not Meet Productivity Expectations*
- Meets Productivity Expectations (Satisfactory)*
- Exceeds Productivity Expectations (Excellence)*

The rubric below supports IU School of Medicine faculty and their leaders in determining an appropriate annual evaluation of **research**. Due to variance in faculty rank, the nature of one's work and disciplinary norms, more specific expectations are defined at the unit level. **Faculty are not expected to complete every listed activity in each category; not all categories or bullets apply to all faculty.** The annual review is intended to be holistic; faculty members' activities may fall into a variety of categories. For example, even if a faculty member demonstrates some behaviors listed under "exceeds expectations," their overall research rating may still be "meets expectations" if most of their activities align with that category.

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations (Satisfactory)	Exceeds Expectations (Excellence)
Disciplinary or professional research and dissemination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks consistent research effort and/or it falls outside the accepted scope of the field, discipline, and/or profession • Does not articulate a research program clearly • Does not disseminate tangible outcomes of research progress, such as conference presentations or peer-reviewed publications • Does not specify individual roles and level of collaborative work • Does not show evidence of pursuit of patents, product development/licensing, copyright, and/or other intellectual property • Does not participate regularly in clinical trials and/or trial accrual • Does not provide evidence of attempts to seek funding and/or extramural support • Does not provide evidence of appropriate responses to reviewer comments/feedback such as manuscript drafts or requests for peer critique • Does not demonstrate progress toward successful grants and/or external support (as evidenced by responses to reviewer scores/comments) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistently conducts research that falls within the accepted scope of the field, discipline, and/or profession • Clearly articulates a research program • Disseminates regularly the results of research in scholarly journals (any authorship), presentations at conferences, and/or other appropriate venues (accounting for budgetary limitations) • Articulates the role played in collaborative work • Documents evidence in pursuit of patents, product development/licensing, copyright, and/or other intellectual property • Participates in recruiting for and/or engagement in local clinical trial accrual • Demonstrates progress toward successful grants and/or external support (as evidenced by responses to reviewer scores/comments) • Regularly takes advantage of institutional resources to improve grantsmanship and/or dissemination efforts (workshops, consultations, mentoring programs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently conducts research at high levels, significant to the field, discipline, and/or profession • Clearly articulates a research program and offers a strategy for continued productivity • Makes significant contributions to the knowledge in the field that demonstrate attributes of scholarly work associated with research, including multiple peer-refereed presentations, publications, and recognition of the quality of research • Documents well the role played in collaborative work and reflects the attributes of successful team science • Successfully obtains patents, product development/licensing, copyright, and/or other intellectual property • Demonstrates evidence of productivity and/or leadership in clinical trials (such as multi-institutional studies, etc.) • Successfully obtains grant and/or external support, and documents continuing efforts and promise for future funding and/or support

	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations (Satisfactory)	Exceeds Expectations (Excellence)
Peer Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not demonstrate evidence of service on national or international peer-reviewed panels, committees, or conferences • Does not participate actively in research mentorship activities such as journal clubs and other local scholarly activities • Does not to participate in grant review activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates evidence of regular engagement in peer review process via participation in conference abstract reviews, grant reviews, and/or manuscript reviews • Participates regularly and actively in department or school-level research mentorship such as participation in journal clubs and other local scholarly activities • Participates regularly in local grant-review activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates evidence of significant engagement and/or leadership in peer review via activities such as journal editor or associate editorships, membership on scientific advisory board(s), national or international working groups, and/or consensus groups for the candidate's field • Provides research mentorship or leads mentoring activities and/or programs at the regional, national or international level • Serves in organizational and/or leadership role(s) in scientific conference(s), including but not limited to elected officer or invited keynote presenter • Participates in national or international grant-review activities
Awards, Recognition and Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not provide evidence of public recognition of research activities • Does not receive invitations to present seminars/keynotes and/or author/edit based on scholarly work • Does not provide evidence of participation in community and/or patient engagement activities relevant to the area of research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applies for and/or seeks out public recognition of research activities, including applications or nominations for awards and recognition, primarily local or regional in scope • Receives invitations at the local or regional level to present seminars/keynotes and/or author/edit based on scholarly work • Participates in local and/or regional community and/or patient engagement activities relevant to the area of research, including but not limited to providing expert testimony, serving on community review/advisory boards, and/or engaging patients in the research process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receives public recognition of research activities, including obtaining award(s) and/or recognition • Receives invitations at the national or international level to present seminars/keynotes and/or author/edit based on scholarly work • Participates in national and/or international community and/or patient engagement activities relevant to the area of research, including but not limited to providing expert testimony, serving on community review/advisory boards, and/or engaging patients in the research process