

## Carver College of Medicine

Responsibilities of Faculty Member in review and promotion processes.

The following document outlines the responsibilities of the faculty member in the compilation and accuracy of the dossier considered for review and promotion in the Carver College of Medicine. The full College of Medicine policies are available on the Carver College of Medicine website at [Promotions: Office of Faculty Affairs: UI Carver College of Medicine](#).

- I. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROVISION OF MATERIALS AND INFORMATION
  - A. **It is the candidate's responsibility, with the advice of the DEO, to compile and submit substantive material for inclusion in the promotion dossier (the core of the Promotion Record) on or before September 6th of the academic year in which the promotion decision is to be made unless an earlier deadline is established by the department. Materials should be placed on the website: <https://webapps1.healthcare.uiowa.edu/PromotionTenure/Account/Logon>**

The dossier submitted by the faculty member to the Department Chair will contain the following:

1. A current curriculum vita in College of Medicine format, with annotation of published works.
2. the candidate's personal statement on teaching (consisting of a summary and explanation--normally not to exceed three pages---of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning teaching, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to teaching);  
  
copies of up to 5 examples of course materials, including syllabi, instructional Web pages, computer laboratory materials, etc.;;  
  
and, as an appendix to the dossier, copies of teaching evaluations by learners for each course taught (the candidate will include all learner teaching evaluations in her or his custody for each course taught);
- 3a. for tenure track faculty a record of the candidate's scholarship, including:  
  
the candidate's personal statement on scholarship (consisting of a summary and explanation--normally not to exceed three pages---of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning scholarship, and comments on

these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to scholarship);

and, as an appendix to the dossier, copies of up to 5 of the candidate's published work;

- 3b. for clinical track faculty members a record of the candidate's professional productivity and, if applicable, scholarship including

the candidate's personal statement on professional productivity/scholarship (consisting of a summary and explanation--normally not to exceed three pages---of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning professional productivity, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to professional productivity/scholarship);

and if applicable, as an appendix to the dossier, copies of the materials documenting the candidate's professional productivity;

4. a record of the candidate's service to the department, college, university, profession, and community, including:

In the College of Medicine, the term "service" will include the provision of clinical service for those faculty members who provide such service. However, clinical service alone will not be sufficient to fulfill this criteria for promotion.

- a. for tenure track faculty, the candidate's personal statement on service consisting of a summary and explanation--normally not to exceed two pages--of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning service, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to service; and
- b. for clinical track faculty, the candidate's personal statement on service consisting of a summary and explanation--normally not to exceed three pages--of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning service, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to clinical and other service
5. Within the appropriate section(s) of the dossier as listed above, other information relevant to the candidate's record in teaching, scholarship, or service that is deemed to be important in the candidate's judgment.

**B. It is the candidate's responsibility to cooperate in obtaining peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching by participating in the following process:**

The range of teaching activities conducted by faculty in the College of Medicine, and hence subject to this evaluation is broad, and includes, but is not limited to: lectures,

small group facilitation in the non-clinical setting, clinical teaching in the ward, clinic, or operating room, and graduate student advising. Teaching performed outside the institution (for example, at national meetings, or as part of continuing medical education events) may be included, but these activities may not constitute the sole source of teaching activities for evaluation. Peer evaluations must be obtained on at least two separate teaching events and by at least two different reviewers within two years prior to the promotion consideration.

**C. It is the candidate's responsibility to cooperate in obtaining peer evaluation of the candidate's scholarship and/or professional productivity by participating in the following process:**

Selection of reviewers will begin during September of the academic year in which the promotion decision will be made, unless an earlier deadline has been established by the Department.

The candidate will provide to the Departmental Executive Officer when solicited a list of appropriate reviewers from peer institutions (e.g. AA.U, Big Ten, major public, Carnegie Research I) or institutions in which the corresponding department or individual evaluator is of peer quality, and add suggestions to the list. After consultation with the internal peer review group and the possible addition of names of other potential external reviewers, the DEO will provide the total list to the faculty candidate.

For **clinical track faculty** members being promoted to Professor, at least half of the letters must be obtained from individuals external to the institution; for promotion to Associate Professor, letters from individuals external to the institution may be included, but are not required.

The candidate will identify any potential reviewer on the list who may be unfairly biased, and may prepare a written objection to be given to the Departmental Executive Officer.<sup>1</sup>

The DEO, after the consultation described above, will select the final list to be invited.<sup>2</sup>

**II. CANDIDATE RESPONSIBILITIES DURING THE REVIEW PROCESS:**

---

<sup>1</sup> In identifying potential reviewers, all participants in the selection process will take into account the standing of the prospective reviewer in the discipline, the likely knowledge of the reviewer of the material to be reviewed, the apparent impartiality of the reviewer, and the contribution of the reviewer to achieving an overall "balanced" review among the reviewers on any criterion for which there might be a range of perspectives. It is critical to avoid any situation in which a personal and/or professional relationship (including advising, mentoring, co-authoring, etc.) between the candidate and a prospective reviewer could undermine the reviewer's apparent impartiality.

<sup>2</sup> After or in anticipation of an invitation to an external reviewer to evaluate the candidate's published work, neither the candidate nor any other faculty member other than the Departmental Executive Office or Dean will communicate with the reviewer concerning the subject of the review or the review process.

**A. The candidate will be given an opportunity to respond to the internal peer evaluations as follows**

The Departmental Executive Officer will send to the candidate a copy of the internal **peer evaluations** of the candidate's teaching, scholarship and/or professional productivity, and service that have been entered into the appropriate sections of the Promotion Record. The candidate will be allowed 10 working days to submit in writing any corrections to errors in the internal peer evaluations.

The results of the **Departmental Consulting Group's** vote and the summary report of its discussion will be provided to the candidate, redacted as needed by those who prepared the summary report to protect the confidentiality of any individual contributions, whether from students, reviewers, or University of Iowa faculty members. The candidate will be allowed 10 working days to submit in writing any corrections to errors in the DCG report. This response accompanies the dossier to the Dean's office.

**B. The candidate will be given the opportunity to respond to recommendation against promotion by the DEO as follows**

The DEO writes an independent assessment of the candidate as part of the promotion process. In the event of a negative review by the DEO and at the same time that the Promotion Record is submitted to the Dean, the DEO will provide the candidate with a copy of the DEO's letter to the Dean. The candidate, upon request, will have access to the Promotion Record, providing the reviews of the candidate's scholarship are redacted as appropriate to protect the confidentiality of the reviewers; that any comments referring to reviews be redacted to protect the confidentiality of reviewers; and that the student evaluations of the candidate's teaching which were added to the Promotion Record by the DEO be redacted to protect the confidentiality of student.

The candidate will be allowed 10 working days to submit a letter of response and additional information to be included in the Promotion Record. The letter of response is sent to the Departmental Executive Officer who will forward it to the Dean for inclusion in the Promotion Record.