Promotion Process

A how-to for DEOs
How is a promotion review initiated?

- **First Promotion Required** in the final probationary year of a tenure track appointment (year 6 or 8)

- In all other cases:
  - The Department recommends
  - OR
  - The faculty member asks to be reviewed

- There is no time frame for promotion to full professor, although 6 years is the norm
Promotion Criteria

- Teaching
- Scholarship/Professional Productivity
- Service
- Potential for promotion to Professor (if coming up to associate professor)
Teaching

- This is required for any promotion – we all need to be teaching
- Some overall assessment compared to peers – quantify
  - Review of internal evaluations from learners
  - Review of peer evaluations – departments should have a process for getting these regularly
Promotion (Tenure Track)

- To associate professor
  - Developed independence/group leadership
  - Effectiveness as a teacher
  - Developing an external presence
- Should not be used as a vehicle for retention
- Early promotion (4 years/6 years) should be carefully assessed as a standard is then set
Scholarship (Tenure Track)

- Quality and Quantity for the field
  - Appropriate journals
  - Adequate number
- Progressive independence in the area
  - Move from first to senior author
- Doctoral students trained
  - Particularly important for PhD researchers
  - Minimum a student post comps
Scholarship (Tenure Track)

- Role in collaborative research
  - Documentation of leadership within larger group
- Funding – assessment of effort and success
  - NIH/NSF/VA the gold standards
  - Peer reviewed; competitive; prestigious
- External evaluation of scholarship
External Letters
(tenure track)

- Need at least 4 letters
- Should be from prominent individuals in the field with biosketch or CV
- Should not have any connection to the candidate (post doc mentor, collaborator)
- Not shared with the internal committee nor the candidate unless decision is negative
- Needs to be at or above the rank to which individual is being promoted
Averages for all faculty at time of tenure (2006-2013)

Ranges:
Year in rank – 5-8
Total publications – 9-57
Publications at Iowa 5-29
FA/SA – 2-14
Averages for BS faculty

Ranges
Years in rank 5-8
Publications 14-36
Publications at Iowa 2-29
FA/SA 1-14
Ranges for Surgical Faculty

Ranges:
Years in rank 3-9
Publications 19-57
Publications at Iowa 9-37
FA/SA 2-23
Averages for Medical Departments

Ranges
Years in rank 3-9
Publications 9-44
Publications at Iowa 5-28
FA/SA 2-26
Promotion (Tenure Track)

- To full professor
  - National and/or international reputation
  - Study sections, editorships, invited lectures
  - Ongoing research productivity
  - Clearly training the next generation – completed PhDs, other trainees
  - Continued teaching effectiveness
Promotion to Tenured Professor

Ranges
Years in rank 2-15
Total publications 15-119
Publications since last promotion 8-46

Promotion to Professor 2006-13

- Years in current rank: 5.77
- Total publications: 49
- Publications since last promotion: 22
Promotion (Clinical Track)

- To associate professor
  - Teaching success in context of clinical service, with quantitation where possible
  - There has been evidence of progress towards professional productivity
  - Excellent clinical service
Professional Productivity

- This list is not exhaustive!!!!
  - Program development – this can be clinical, academic or research related
  - Education leadership – through the medical student, resident or fellow curriculum
  - Administrative achievements (program leadership that may not be educational)
  - Be creative with creativity!
Professional Productivity

- Expectations are changing
- If we split the track, written scholarship will be required for the clinician educations, while the “straight” clinician can reach promotion through service (more to come)
- Expectations going forward: clinical track as it currently stands will need to have more written scholarship for promotion
Professional Productivity

- Publications that will be considered (required) going forward:
  - Traditional articles
  - Case reports
  - Reviews
  - Book chapters
  - Educational scholarship
  - Middle author as part of larger collaborative research group
Clinical track promotion averages

Ranges
Years in rank 1-11
Papers 0-38
Chapters 0-34

Other activities:
Course direction
Clinic development
Educational modules
Community engagement/outreach
Redesign of program
External Letters (clinical track)

- To associate professor
  - Can all be internal, but preferable to have some outside the department
  - Should speak to the impact of the individual

- To full professor
  - Half should be outside the institution
  - Should speak to the regional/national impact

- Same guidelines apply to getting these letters
Promotion (Clinical Track)

- To full professor
  - Needs an external presence (regional or national)
  - Exemplary Clinical service
  - continued teaching success
  - Established record of professional productivity
  - Is leading programs in the college or hospital
  - Can be granted for administrative activities
Departmental Process

- Put together an internal review committee – needs to be composed of individuals higher in rank
- If not enough in the department (4), put together ad hoc committee for review
- The DEO cannot be part of the internal review
Departmental Process

- The department requests documents for review from candidate (next slide)
- The candidate also supplies a list of possible reviewers
- The department can add to this list
- The candidate gets to see the list and file any objections
- The candidate DOES NOT choose or contact the external reviewers
Documents

- CV in CCOM format
- Personal statement
- Copies of teaching materials (5 examples)
- Learner evaluations if not kept centrally
- Peer evaluations if not kept centrally
- Copies of all publications/evidence of professional productivity for EC need to be available, but submit top 5
Departmental Process

- The internal review committee makes an assessment of the three missions – teaching, service and research/professional productivity.
- A report is written that can be reviewed by the faculty member.
- The faculty member can correct any FACTUAL errors and potentially dispute any of the documentation but cannot change the report.
Departmental Process

- Faculty at higher rank meet to discuss the internal review (DCG) and has access to outside reviews
- All faculty can vote on CT promotion
- Tenured faculty vote on TT promotion
- Minutes need to be kept and forwarded with the numerical vote. Redact as needed
- DEO can be there as a silent spectator
- Vote can be by secret ballot
Departmental Process

- Role of the Department Head
  - Write an independent assessment of the candidate for promotion
  - Assure that the appropriate processes are followed
  - Explain perception of negative votes (if any)
  - This letter is meant to carry weight independent of the DCG – make it effective!
Secondary Department

- Many faculty have secondary appointments
- Secondary department has a limited but necessary role in promotion consideration
- Need a faculty vote and a letter from the DEO of secondary department
- Should be part of the DCG consideration
Scenarios

- Positive DCG vote, positive DEO assessment - notify faculty member and send on to the college
- Positive DCG, negative DEO – DEO letter needs to address the reasons and provide information. Faculty member notified and send to college
  - Gets to review DEO letter and put forth a rebuttal
- Negative DCG, positive DEO – as above, faculty member still needs to know, send to college
  - Gets to see negative internal review and put forth rebuttal
Scenarios

- Negative DCG, negative DEO – notify the faculty member and can still move on to the college
- Faculty member informed during the process and can see the redacted letters
- In the event of negative vote(s) the faculty member can:
  - withdraw from the process IF this is not an up or out year
  - have the process continue to see what the EC decision will be
Once it leaves the Department

- The dossier along with external letters and DCG reports moves to the EC
- The EC meets to discuss. Additional information may be requested
- EC is advisory to the dean
- DEOs are notified of negative EC decisions and the rationale
- The dean is the final arbiter
The Next Level

- The recommendations are forwarded to the provost.
- The faculty member receives notification of this.
- The provost office then notifies the candidate of the decision.
- The Board of Regents is the final approving body.
Final Step

- New promotions are effective as of July 1 of the following academic year
- The process takes almost the entire academic year
Areas for Improvement

- DEO letters need to be effective support/lack of support for the faculty member
- Outside letters need to speak to the issues and not be personal support letters
- Professional productivity should be clearly demonstrated
- Think carefully about early promotion
Communicate

- With us
- With the faculty member
- With the chair of the promotions committee
- Use the web site for information