

REFLECTIONS ON SUCCEEDING IN THE SYSTEM:
SYMPOSIUM ON PROMOTION

Ruth E. Wachtel (Department of Anesthesia) and David C. Baldus (College of Law)
Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure
American Association of University Professors
University of Iowa Chapter
April 4, 2006

I. Where to Find the Written Rules on Procedures

II. Know the Written Rules on Procedures

**III. The Substantive Standards and Unwritten Rules
Under Which You Will be Evaluated**

IV. Keep Your Dossier Up-to-Date

V. Cultivate a National Reputation

Excerpts from <http://www.aaup.org>:


For ninety years the American Association of University Professors has been engaged in developing standards for sound academic practice and in working for the acceptance of these standards by the community of higher education. The Association has long been viewed as the authoritative voice of the academic profession in this regard.

Academic freedom is essential to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject.

The policies published in AAUP's *Policy Documents and Reports*, also known as the "Redbook," have been recognized and accepted by institutions of higher education nationwide.

AAUP remains the leading organization primarily dedicated to protecting the academic freedom of professors.

I. Where to Find the Written Rules on Procedures

For simplicity, references to specific paragraph numbers and sections of official documents have been omitted. To locate the sections within these documents that correspond to words or phrases in this handout, search for specific phrases using the “Edit | Find on this Page” function of your browser for web pages or the  Search function in Adobe Acrobat pdf files.

A. University guidelines

1. University Operations Manual

tenure track <http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Eour/opmanual/iii/10.htm#104>

clinical track <http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Eour/opmanual/iii/10.htm#109>

2. Guidelines for Promotion Decision-Making at the University of Iowa

tenure track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/ptprocedures.pdf>

clinical track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/ctptprocedures.pdf>

3. Faculty Handbook <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/fachandbk/>

B. Collegiate guidelines

1. Carver College of Medicine

<http://www.medicine.uiowa.edu/faculty/facultyaffairs/Promotions/index.html>

2. College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/index.shtml

3. Henry B. Tippie College of Business

<http://www.biz.uiowa.edu/deans/policies/>

4. College of Engineering

<http://www.engineering.uiowa.edu/faculty-staff/P&TCriteriaDocument.pdf>

5. College of Law

<http://www.law.uiowa.edu/faculty-handbook/index.php>

6. College of Nursing

<http://www.nursing.uiowa.edu/facstaff/fachandbook.pdf>

7. College of Education

<http://www.education.uiowa.edu/coedean/fachandbook/review.htm>

8. College of Public Health

<http://www.public-health.uiowa.edu/academics/faculty/handbook/>

II. Know the Written Rules on Procedures

A. Tenure track

1. Operations Manual (excerpted below)

<http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Eour/opmanual/iii/10.htm#104>

a. "Each academic unit is expected to develop detailed ... promotion criteria ..."

b. Qualifications for rank of Full Professor

i. "Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels, including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students to the completion of their degree programs, where applicable.

ii. Continued artistic or scholarly achievement of high quality, accompanied by unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar or creative artist in the chosen field.

iii. The candidate should have a record of significant and effective service to the department, college, and/or the University and, if appropriate, to the profession."

c. Timing

"The question of promotion of faculty may be brought up at any time deemed appropriate, but if not considered earlier, it should be brought up for formal consideration ... [for] associate professors during the seventh year after promotion to that rank. Promotion may take place earlier if the qualifications and promise of the individual concerned warrant such action. Individual faculty members may request review for promotion ... at any time ..."

d. Standards

"A candidate for ... promotion ... shall be evaluated under the relevant, clearly defined standards of the faculty member's academic unit(s) that were 1) in effect at the time of the faculty member's initial appointment or promotion to the rank currently held; 2) any such standards in effect since that time; or 3) any such standards in effect at the time of the evaluation, whichever of these the candidate elects. However, no standards may be applied if they were superseded more years ago than the time specified as normal time at rank (adjusted to account for any extension, family leave, or illness granted to the faculty member). For [associate] professors, the normal time in rank is ... seven years. The candidate shall make an election under this section no later than the end of the academic year prior to the academic year in which the candidate is considered for ..."

promotion ... Absent such election, the standards for evaluation shall be those standards in effect at the end of the academic year before the academic year in which the candidate is considered for ... promotion..."

2. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision Making at the University of Iowa (excerpted and paraphrased below)
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/ptprocedures.pdf>

a. General principles

- i. "Decisions granting or denying tenure or promotion should be based on a written record of achievement.
- ii. The content of the record that will be relied upon should be known by the candidate and the decision makers ...
- iii. Except for variation related to the nature of the candidate's academic activity, the content of the record should be the same for all candidates in the same academic unit.
- iv. The governing procedures should be the same for all candidates across the University, except where conditions or academic cultures justify variation among colleges or among departments within a college.
- v. University and Collegiate Procedures should be applied consistently to all candidates.
- vi. Each faculty member participating in the ... promotion decision-making process may do so at only one level of the process: departmental, collegiate, or provostial. Faculty with collegiate or provostial administrative appointments of 50% or greater shall participate in their administrative office ..."

b. DCG

"The 'Departmental Consulting Group' (DCG) consists of all tenured members of the candidate's department at higher academic ranks ... If there are fewer than four faculty members in a department who are qualified to serve on the DCG, qualified University of Iowa faculty members from outside the department to serve on the DCG must be identified in accordance with the college's written Procedures ..."

c. CCG

"The 'Collegiate Consulting Group' (CCG) consists of faculty selected according to each college's written Procedures governing promotion decision making. The Collegiate Procedures shall establish guidelines for

the membership of the Group and how it will function within the boundaries of these Procedures.”

- d. Points to be determined by collegiate procedures
 - i. Dates and deadlines for each stage of the process
 - ii. Period of time candidate has to review reports, correct errors, and submit responses at each stage of the process
 - iii. How qualified faculty members from outside the department will be identified to serve on the DCG
 - iv. In nondepartmentalized colleges, the role of department-like units and their administrative officers
 - v. Any supplementary material to be included in the dossier
 - vi. Who shall perform the internal peer evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service
 - vii. Details about the process of peer observation of teaching
 - viii. How many external reviewers will be asked to provide assessments of the candidate's scholarship, how the final reviewers will be chosen, and how it will be determined what sample of the candidate's scholarship each will review
 - ix. Details of the DCG's voting procedure (including what constitutes a majority vote), and how the DCG determines which of its members will prepare the summary report of its discussion and document the final vote
 - x. How the CCG is formed and performs its functions, such as voting, making a recommendation for or against promotion (including what constitutes a majority vote), preparing a summary report of its discussion, and documenting the final vote and recommendation
- e. Promotion record
 - i. Cover sheet
 - ii. Collegiate Dean's letter making recommendation to the Provost
 - iii. Recommendation and vote (and report, if any) of CCG
 - iv. DEO letter making recommendation to Dean
 - v. Recommendation, vote, and report of DCG
 - vi. Any letters submitted by the candidate at specified stages of the process to correct errors in the internal peer evaluations of the

candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service, or the DCG's report, or to respond to a letter or report of the DEO, Dean, or CCG

- vii. Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (C.V.) in the college's standard format which documents the candidate's educational and professional history
 - viii. Section on candidate's teaching, including:
 - Candidate's personal statement on teaching
 - Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching
 - ix. Section on candidate's scholarship, including:
 - Candidate's personal statement on scholarship
 - Documentation of internal peer evaluation of scholarship
 - Documentation of external peer evaluation of scholarship
 - x. Section on candidate's service, including:
 - Candidate's personal statement on service
 - Documentation of peer evaluation of service
 - xi. Supplementary material
- f. Candidate assembles promotion dossier
- i. C.V.
 - ii. Record of teaching, including:
 - Personal statement
 - Detailed list of teaching assignments and trainees supervised
 - Course materials
 - Teaching evaluations
 - iii. Record of scholarship, including:
 - Personal statement
 - List of publications or creative works
 - Reviews of scholarship
 - Grants and contracts
 - Invited lectures and conference presentations
 - Pending decisions
 - Inventions and patents
 - iv. Record of service, including:
 - Personal statement
 - List of offices held, editorships, review panels, committees, etc.
 - v. Copies of published works
 - vi. "... work in progress that is not completed by the specified date but that is anticipated to be completed ... early enough for full and deliberate evaluation ... may be identified at the time the dossier is submitted and added to the dossier if and when it is completed."

vii. “Other materials (including updated CVs and personal statements) that could not have been available by the specified date but that are completed early enough for full and deliberate evaluation may be added to the promotion dossier by the candidate at any time ...”

g. Peer evaluation of teaching

i. “It is the candidate’s responsibility to cooperate in obtaining internal peer evaluation of the candidate’s teaching ...”

ii. Collegiate requirements

“The college’s written Procedures governing promotion decision making must specify a method of peer evaluation of teaching—which must include peer observation of teaching if practicable—and must identify those teaching activities and materials that will be evaluated by peers.

With respect to the observation of classroom, laboratory, practicum, or other forms of teaching, the college’s written Procedures governing promotion decision making will specify the number (or range of numbers) of teaching occasions to observe; the number (or range of numbers) of consecutive semesters in which observations will occur; the number (or range of numbers) of observing faculty members; the method of choosing faculty observers; the method of recording, reporting, and informing the candidate of the observation; and any other protocol concerning the observation process.”

iii. Report

- (a) Comparative analysis of the quality of the candidate’s teaching in the context of the candidate’s department or unit
- (b) Summary analysis of the student teaching evaluation data contained in the Promotion Record, including departmental average comparison data where possible
- (c) Description, where appropriate, of the balance between the candidate’s undergraduate and graduate teaching
- (d) Description and assessment of the candidate’s academic advising responsibilities
- (e) Consideration of any special circumstances concerning the faculty member’s teaching performance

h. Evaluation of scholarship

i. Internal evaluation

- (a) “[Report to] include a statement concerning the norms for publication and/or creative activity in the relevant field, a brief description of the quality of journals or other forums in which the candidate’s work has appeared, and a brief description of the norms of authorship and co-authorship in the field.”

ii. External evaluation

- (a) “The college’s written Procedures governing promotion decision making will specify the number of external reviewers (with a recommended range of four to eight) and how it will be determined what sample or portion of the candidate’s work the reviewers are to evaluate.
- (b) The DEO will solicit from the candidate a list of appropriate external reviewers from peer institutions (e.g. AAU, CIC or Big Ten, major public, Carnegie Research I) or institutions in which the corresponding department or individual evaluator is of peer quality.”
- (c) The DEO will add suggestions to the list and give it to those faculty members who have been assigned to complete an internal peer review of the candidate’s scholarship; those faculty will add other potential external reviewers ...
- (d) The DEO will share the completed list of potential external reviewers with the candidate. The candidate shall identify any potential external reviewers with whom s/he has worked in any capacity and describe the nature of the relationship. If the candidate feels that any potential external reviewer on the list might be unfairly biased, the candidate may prepare a written objection and give it to the DEO, who will take the objection into consideration when selecting external reviewers.
- (e) In identifying potential external 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 is such that it could undermine the reviewer’s apparent impartiality.

- (f) The DEO will determine, in accordance with the college's Procedures governing promotion decision making, which of the potential external reviewers will be asked to provide a letter of review."
- (g) "All letters received from external reviewers will be entered by the DEO into the Promotion Record ... Letters from external reviewers shall not be placed in the Promotion Record until after the internal peer evaluations have been completed and entered into the Promotion Record."
- i. Peer evaluation of service
- j. After all internal reports entered into the Promotion Record
 - i. Copy of internal reports sent to candidate
 - ii. Candidate has opportunity to correct errors
- k. Departmental Consulting Group (DCG)
 - i. Votes by secret ballot
 - ii. Prepares summary report of discussion

Collegiate procedures determine "details of the DCG's voting procedure, and how the DCG determines which of its members will prepare the summary report of its discussion ..." Collegiate procedures also determine "the criterion vote (e.g., simple majority, two-thirds majority) that defines a positive recommendation for promotion. Departmentalized colleges may allow departments to make this determination."

- iii. Candidate has opportunity to correct errors
- l. DEO writes letter to Dean recommending for or against promotion
 - i. If recommendation is against promotion, candidate:
 - Receives copy of letter
 - Has access to redacted external reviews of scholarship
 - May submit written response
 - May add materials to Promotion Record
- m. Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG)
 - i. Votes
 - ii. Prepares summary report of discussion if recommendation is contrary to that of the DCG or DEO, or if such a report is required by the college

- iii. If recommendation is negative and contrary to that of DCG or DEO, candidate:

- Receives copy of vote and summary report
- May submit written response

Collegiate procedures determine “how the CCG is formed and performs its functions; the procedure according to which the CCG will vote and make a recommendation for or against the granting of promotion (including the criterion vote [e.g., simple majority, two-thirds majority] that defines a positive recommendation for promotion, ... whether a summary report of the CCG’s discussion is required (when it is not required by these Procedures), and how the CCG will determine which of its members will prepare the summary report of its discussion (if any) ...”

- n. Dean writes letter to Provost recommending for or against promotion

- i. Dean informs DEO of recommendation
- ii. DEO informs DCG
- iii. Candidate informed if recommendation is positive
- iv. If recommendation is negative, candidate:
 - Receives copy of letter
 - May submit written response
 - May add materials to Promotion Record

- o. Provost makes recommendation to Board of Regents

- i. Provost informs Dean
- ii. Dean informs candidate, DEO

B. Clinical track

- 1. Operations Manual (excerpted below)

<http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Eour/opmanual/iii/10.htm#109>

- a. “Clinical faculty hold service positions through which they contribute to the service, teaching, and/or outreach missions of the University ... All clinical faculty must devote a significant portion of their time to providing or overseeing the delivery of professional services to individual patients or clients. In addition, teaching students, residents, or fellows of the University at the undergraduate, graduate, professional, or postgraduate level is an essential job function for all faculty ... Thus, clinical faculty are expected to integrate the delivery of their professional services with their teaching ... The use of clinical faculty largely to perform administrative functions with little or no teaching obligations is inconsistent with this policy.”

- b. Qualifications for rank of Full Professor
 - i. “Acknowledged record of service and teaching success.
 - ii. An established record of professional productivity beyond clinical service, as defined by the college.
 - iii. Unmistakable evidence of recognition by peers, as defined by the college.”
 - c. “Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement shall not be a requirement for reappointment or promotion of clinical track faculty.”
 - d. Timing

“The question of promotion of clinical faculty may be brought up during any regular promotions cycle.”
2. Procedures for Clinical-Track Promotion Decision Making at the University of Iowa (excerpted and paraphrased below)
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/ctptprocedures.pdf>
- a. Professional productivity includes:
 - Invited lectures and conference presentations
 - Organizing of symposia or workshops at conferences
 - Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a journal
 - Publications or creative works
 - Grants and contracts
 - Any other products and activities as defined by the college
 - b. “The ‘Departmental Consulting Group’ (DCG) consists of all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical-track faculty at or above the rank being sought by the candidate.”

III. The Substantive Standards and Unwritten Rules Under Which You Will be Evaluated

- A. Although formal, written statements of standards should be available, some colleges provide more guidance than others
- B. Substantive standards vary by college and department
 - 1. Carver College of Medicine is used as an example below because its standards are the most detailed of all colleges. Consult documents pertinent to your own college to determine the substantive standards that apply to you.

http://www.medicine.uiowa.edu/faculty/facultyaffairs/documents/PoliciesDocument-102105-indexed_000.pdf

a. Tenure track

i. Operational definition of scholarship

- (a) "Scholarship requires the use of innovative ideas in the pursuit of knowledge. The quality of such an activity is best determined by critical review by one's peers and, to have an impact, the information must be disseminated. This is best accomplished by publication in appropriate journals, monographs, or books, and by presenting scientific papers and exhibits at scholarly meetings. Such activities provide the most compelling evidence of scholarship."
- (b) "Publication of articles in professional journals. Greater importance will be attributed to publications in journals that require a critical review, but all publications will be evaluated."
- (c) Publication of books, monographs, manuals, on paper or in electronic media. Material in these formats should advance the field in order to be considered scholarship; materials produced primarily for student teaching should be listed under teaching.
- (d) Invited or submitted presentations of original scientific data at major national or international meetings, or at major institutions or research organizations.
- (e) Demonstration of a sustained, externally funded, independent research program.
- (f) Leadership and/or organization of clinical trials.
- (g) Academic creativity (scholarship) may also manifest itself in teaching and professional activities (see Appendix I and IV), and for these activities to be considered evidence of scholarly activity, they must be innovative and/or published or presented."

ii. Qualifications for the rank of Professor

- (a) "He or she must be recognized as having a continued record of effective teaching success, including a record of successful direction of the work of doctoral candidates, fellows, or residents where applicable."
- (b) He or she must have an established record of productive scholarship supported by substantial publication or the equivalent,

with unmistakable evidence of recognition by peers at either the national level, international level, or both.

- (c) Departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service will be expected at an appropriate level
- (d) If the faculty member is responsible for the medical care of patients, he or she must have a license to practice medicine in Iowa and must demonstrate competence as a physician. Competence as a physician will be established by the hospital staff process of reviewing clinical credentials and granting hospital privileges. Individuals other than physicians involved in the care of patients should meet the criteria established by hospital bylaws and any relevant state licensure requirements.
- (e) The rank of Professor will not be considered to be a reward for long and acceptable service.”

b. Clinical track

i. Professional productivity

- (a) “Promotion in this track is based on accomplishments in three areas: the direct provision of clinical service, teaching in the context of clinical service, and professional productivity.
- (b) Professional productivity encompasses activities utilizing the faculty member’s professional expertise, and that are in addition to the direct provision of clinical service and teaching in that context.”
- (c) “•While written scholarship may help satisfy this requirement, it is not required for promotion in this track. The type of written scholarship that will be considered as evidence for promotion in this track is broad. In addition to peer reviewed research reports, it includes, for example, high quality review articles, case reports, clinical commentaries, textbook chapters, and policy documents prepared for the institution, the faculty member’s discipline, or government bodies.
- (d) Promotion can be supported by a variety of professional productivity profiles. For example, some faculty will primarily be involved in a single area, such as education, clinical scholarship, or clinical administration. Other faculty will pursue activities in several of these areas. In all cases, a recommendation for promotion should be based on the quality of the activities, not just the quantity.
- (e) Although most faculty members in this track will continue to spend the majority of their effort throughout their career in direct clinical service and teaching, some individuals may not. These faculty

members, by mutual decision with the institution, will focus their effort in a specific sphere of professional productivity (for example, as a clinical department, hospital or collegiate administrator, curriculum director, funded clinical investigator, etc). When such individuals are considered for promotion, these activities should be the primary focus of the evaluation as long as there has been demonstration of the appropriate level of expertise in direct clinical service and teaching since the original appointment.”

ii. Operational criteria for professional service

- (a) “Members of either the tenure track or the non-tenure clinical track may contribute significantly in professional service. Activities in this category are used as one kind of evidence of professional productivity for salaried clinical track members...
- (b) Development and evaluation of new forms of treatment, new surgical procedures or innovative diagnostic techniques.
- (c) Organization of a new, or reorganization of an existing, clinical service. Specific examples might include the development of a new inpatient referral service or treatment facility, reorganization of a critical care unit, or reorganization of an outpatient department.
- (d) Innovation or improvement of an existing clinical service, as evidenced by addition of new services, significant increase in the volume of patients, better patient outcomes, increased revenue production.
- (e) Effective participation and/or leadership in professional organizations.
- (f) Effective participation on and leadership of hospital committees.
- (g) Public or government service.
- (h) Presentations at professional meetings related to any aspect of the faculty member’s professional productivity.”

iii. Operational guidelines

- (a) “. . . rank will not be considered merely as a reward for long and acceptable service\
- (b) Promotion is not a requirement of continued employment, and the faculty member may remain at the initial rank indefinitely. Time in rank cannot be the primary factor related to any promotion decision...
- (c) Recognition. One of the qualifications for promotion to Professor is unmistakable evidence of recognition by peers at the state,

regional, national, or international level. Such evidence can be derived from: invitations to organize, chair or participate in panels, symposia or conferences; invitations to serve as an editor or on an editorial board of a scholarly journal; election to membership in societies stipulating meritorious professional achievement; election to offices in state, regional, national or international societies; letters written by peers outside the University, including from referring physicians; successful competition for awards, prizes, grants, or contracts; invited lectureships; or invitations to be a visiting professor outside the Carver College of Medicine.

- (d) Leadership. A highly desirable qualification for promotion to Professor is evidence of leadership in one or more spheres of professional productivity. The term "leadership" is to be interpreted broadly, and is specifically not confined to formally defined administrative positions such as division director, clerkship director, etc, but to include the broader meaning of "having commanding authority or influence." Evidence of leadership can be derived from: serving as chair of committees and task forces for the institution, in disciplinary groups, or relevant governmental or private groups; leading specific time limited projects to a successful outcome in any of the spheres of professional productivity; serving as principal investigator of research projects; receipt of leadership awards, etc. Evidence of leadership in the faculty member's clinical discipline could include selection to a prestigious board for a state, regional or national society or organization; frequent requests to make CME presentations outside the local area, etc.
- (e) The quality and importance of professional productivity should be considered more important than the number of activities."

iv. Qualifications for the rank of Professor

- (a) "He or she must hold the doctorate or its equivalent except in the Division of Associated Medical Sciences, where the master's degree or its equivalent is the minimum degree required.
- (b) He or she must have an acknowledged record of exemplary clinical service, as judged by peers.
- (c) He or she must have an acknowledged record of continued teaching success, including a record of successful direction of the work of students, fellows, or residents where applicable.
- (d) He or she must have an established record of professional productivity as demonstrated by clear documentation of the quantity and quality of activities, and as judged by peers. Evidence of successful leadership in one or more spheres of professional productivity is highly desirable. Finally, there must be unmistakable

evidence of recognition by peers at the state, regional, national, or international level.

- (e) If the faculty member is responsible for the medical care of patients, he or she must have a license to practice medicine in Iowa and must demonstrate competence as a physician. Competence as a physician will be established by the hospital staff process of reviewing clinical credentials and granting hospital privileges. Individuals other than physicians involved in the care of patients must meet the criteria established by hospital bylaws and any relevant state licensure requirements.
- (f) At the rank of Professor, the term of appointment is 1-3 years if the initial appointment was to this rank, or 3 to 7 years following reappointment or promotion... If the performance requirements are not met, the department may recommend non-renewal.
- (g) Termination during the term of the appointment must be for failure to meet written standards of competence and performance ... A decision not to renew an appointment may be for failure to meet the written standards of competence and performance, or for changed economic circumstances or program needs such that the position itself is terminated. Non-renewal may only occur at the conclusion of an appointment. Notice of non-renewal must carry appropriate notice ...”

C. Determine the standards actually applied on the basis of:

- 1. Consultation with colleagues
- 2. Official evaluations of prior candidates who were successful and unsuccessful
- 3. Your evaluation of the records of prior candidates

D. Relative weights placed on teaching, research, and service

E. Consistent record of productivity, need to explain any hiatus in record

F. Scholarship

- 1. What types of scholarship are most important? What is and what is not considered scholarship (or professional productivity) in your department?
- 2. Area of expertise
 - a. Whether it is generally recognized as meritorious and worthy of academic pursuit

- b. Whether it is unique, indicating you have created a “niche” for yourself and are the expert on a specific topic
3. Publications and creative works
 - a. Quantitative requirements
 - b. Value of various types of publications and creative works
 - i. Reports of original research
 - ii. Original compositions
 - iii. Books
 - iv. Book chapters
 - v. Edited books
 - vi. Textbooks
 - vii. Review articles
 - viii. Reviews of others' works
 - ix. Letters to the editor
 - x. Articles in the lay press
 - xi. Non peer-reviewed publications
 - c. Other weighting factors
 - i. Length
 - ii. Prestige of journal, publisher
 - iii. Centrality to the field
 - iv. Number of citations
 - v. Published reviews
 - vi. Refereed or not
 - vii. Solicited or not
 - viii. Methodology - historical, narrative, quantitative, technical
 - ix. Number of co-authors
 - (a) Documentation of your contribution
 - (b) Order in which authors' names are listed

- x. Stage in the publication process - submitted, accepted, in press
- 4. Grant requirements
 - a. Number
 - b. Dollar amount, percent of salary supported
 - c. Source
 - d. Number of students and personnel supported
 - e. Length of continuous support
 - f. Co-investigators
- 5. Patents, licenses, inventions
- 6. Collaborators, their reputations and their institutions
- G. Other professional contributions
 - 1. Service to University
 - 2. Participation in professional organizations
 - 3. Membership on editorial board of journals
 - 4. Membership on review panels for grant applications
 - 5. Administrative responsibilities
 - 6. Clinical skills

IV. Keep Your Dossier Up-to-Date

Add materials to your promotion record as you obtain them.

Do you want to go back through years of records to determine what lectures you gave or the exact date your grant funding began?

A. Curriculum vitae

Update regularly. Maintain complete and exact records, with full dates, of all teaching, research, and service activities.

B. Teaching portfolio

Keep a record all teaching activities

- a. Record of courses taught
- b. List of lectures or classes from others' courses
- c. Syllabi and class materials, handouts, web pages
- d. Student evaluations
- e. Outside lectures and evaluations
- f. Formal study to improve teaching
- g. Publications related to teaching
- h. Awards

C. Scholarship

Keep a record of all activities.

- a. Publications and creative works
- b. Grants and contracts, any and all funding
- c. Patents, licenses, inventions
- d. Awards

D. Service

Keep a record of all Committees, including roles played and accomplishments.

- a. University
- b. Journals
- c. Professional organizations
- d. Relevant community organizations

E. Personal file

Keep a record of everything you might possibly need later on.

1. Publications
2. Grant applications (both funded and unfunded, with reviews)
3. Unpublished scholarship

4. Teaching notes
5. Presentations
6. External correspondence
7. Newspaper clippings

V. Cultivate a National Reputation

A. Create a niche for yourself

1. Become a valuable asset in your discipline
2. Be *the* expert on a particular topic

B. Build professional relationships, especially at national meetings

1. Attend national meetings regularly
2. Present your work to others
3. Sell and promote yourself to your colleagues
4. Take advantage of informal opportunities
5. Collaborate with researchers at other institutions
6. Email potential collaborators, stay in contact
7. Treat suspected critics as advisors, mentors, or potential collaborators
8. Establish name recognition and ensure that others associate your name with a face

C. Think ahead about developing professional relationships with potential external reviewers

D. Evidence of a national reputation

1. Visiting professorships, invitations to other universities
2. Invitations to speak at national meetings
3. Invitations to chair workshops at national meetings
4. Organizing national meetings
5. Serving as editor or member of editorial board of professional journals
6. Membership on panels to review grant applications
7. Prominent role in professional organization

8. Leadership role in professional activities
 9. Requests by journals to act as ad hoc reviewer of manuscripts
 10. Requests by review panels to act as ad hoc reviewer of grant applications
 11. Requests for letters of recommendation regarding candidates for promotion at other institutions
 12. Requests to write reviews of others' scholarship (e.g., book reviews)
 13. Collaboration with well-known figures in field
 14. Collaboration with others from prestigious institutions
 15. Publication in high profile journals
 16. Frequent citations of scholarship by others
 17. Reports or testimony as expert witness
 18. Articles highlighting your work
 19. Appearances or interviews in national media
 20. Awards
- E. External reviews of scholarship
1. Extremely important in establishing your role in the profession
 2. Evaluation of your career
 3. Strong foundation based on written record
 4. Written by well-known figures in your field
 5. From prestigious institutions
 6. Not written by friends and collaborators
 7. Should clearly delineate:
 - Importance of your area of research
 - Your reputation
 - Your strengths
 - Quality of your work
 - Contributions you have made to the field

END