

REFLECTIONS ON SUCCEEDING IN THE SYSTEM:
SYMPOSIUM ON PROMOTION AND TENURE

David C. Baldus (College of Law) and Ruth E. Wachtel (Department of Anesthesia)
Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure
American Association of University Professors
University of Iowa Chapter
April 19, 2006

Statement on Tenure and Academic Vitality at The University of Iowa
University Operations Manual III.10.1a(2)

Tenure is not a very well understood concept. If a university is to perform its function effectively, it is essential that faculty members in their teaching and research feel free to express new ideas and divergent viewpoints. In the process of teaching and research, accepted "truths" often must be challenged and questioned. A good university must create an atmosphere which, in a positive way, encourages faculty members to express new ideas and divergent viewpoints and to make inquiries unbounded by present norms. Such an atmosphere currently exists at The University of Iowa; and tenure has contributed substantially to the creation of this atmosphere and to its continuance. Put simply, free inquiry and expression are essential to the maintenance of excellence; tenure is essential to free inquiry and expression; The University of Iowa's consistent goal is excellence; and the tenure system must continue if the University is to recruit and maintain a distinguished faculty. While tenure would be an integral part of the University's relationship with the faculty without regard to the competitive situation, it also is important to note that the outstanding universities throughout the country have tenure systems and that The University of Iowa's competitive position as it attempts to recruit and to retain outstanding faculty members would be damaged beyond repair if tenure were abandoned or seriously weakened.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. LEARNING THE SYSTEM - THE WRITTEN RULES	1
A. Where to find the written rules	
B. Know the written rules – standards for each rank	
C. Know the written rules - written standards	
C. Know the written rules - procedures	
II. LEARNING THE SYSTEM - THE UNWRITTEN RULES	14
A. Formal, written statements of standards vary between colleges	
B. Standards that may be applied	
C. Determine the standards actually applied	
D. Consider that performance standards may have been raised	
E. Mitigating factors	

III. SETTING GOALS AND TIMETABLES	17
A. Set goals to ensure that yours is not a "close" case	
B. Find out what is important, then do it	
C. Importance of quality teaching	
D. Find a niche for yourself	
E. Set concrete timetables and share them	
F. Be aware of threats to meeting your goals	
IV. MAINTAINING PROPER DOCUMENTATION	18
A. Keep a file of all correspondence	
B. Listen carefully	
C. Maintain a diary	
D. Consider writing a "Dear DEO" letter	
E. Keep your dossier up to date	
F. Personal file	
V. OBTAINING SUPPORT AND ADVICE	20
A. Communication is vital	
B. Learn the culture of your department	
C. Find a mentor	
D. Don't rely on only one person	
E. Solicit help from your colleagues	
F. Form a supportive network	
G. Learn the culture of your field	
H. Cultivate professional relationships	
I. Avoid controversy	
J. Avoid making enemies	
VI. HANDLING SETBACKS	22
A. Don't ignore red flags	
B. Annual evaluations are important, especially for probationary faculty	
C. Try to resolve problems as early as possible	
D. Examples of common setbacks	
E. Reducing the adverse consequences of setbacks.	
F. Try to deal with setbacks within your department.	
G. Possible outside sources of counsel and advice	
H. Departure	
VII. FORMAL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES	24
A. You need a lawyer	
B. Is it really worth it?	
C. Tenure track – denial of tenure, promotion, or reappointment	
D. Clinical track - denial of reappointment or promotion, or termination	
DETAILED OUTLINE AND SUMMARY	28

REFLECTIONS ON SUCCEEDING IN THE SYSTEM:
SYMPOSIUM ON PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE
David C. Baldus (College of Law) and Ruth E. Wachtel (Department of Anesthesia)
Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure
American Association of University Professors
University of Iowa Chapter
April 30, 2003

I. Learning the System - the Written Rules

A. Where to find the written rules

1. University guidelines

- a. University Operations Manual (excerpted and paraphrased below)
tenure track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~Our/opmanual/iii/10.htm>
clinical track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~Our/opmanual/iii/10.htm#109>
- b. Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Decision-Making
at the University of Iowa (excerpted and paraphrased below)
tenure track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/ptprocedures.pdf>
clinical track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/ctptprocedures.pdf>
- c. Faculty Handbook <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/fachandbk/>

2. Collegiate guidelines

- a. Carver College of Medicine
<http://www.medicine.uiowa.edu/faculty/facultyaffairs/Promotions/index.html>
- b. College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/faculty/promotion_tenure/index.shtml
- c. Henry B. Tippie College of Business
<http://www.biz.uiowa.edu/deans/policies/>
- d. College of Engineering
<http://www.engineering.uiowa.edu/faculty-staff/P&TCriteriaDocument.pdf>
- e. College of Law
<http://www.law.uiowa.edu/faculty-handbook/index.php>
- f. College of Nursing
<http://www.nursing.uiowa.edu/facstaff/fachandbook.pdf>
- g. College of Education
<http://www.education.uiowa.edu/coedean/fachandbook/review.htm>
- h. College of Public Health
<http://www.public-health.uiowa.edu/academics/faculty/handbook/>

3. Departmental guidelines?

B. Know the written rules – standards for each rank

1. Tenure track

tenure track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~Our/opmanual/iii/10.htm#104>

a. University

i. Assistant Professor

(a) Promise of ability as a teacher.

(b) Promise of scholarly productivity, supported by publications or the equivalent.

ii. Associate Professor

(a) Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students.

(b) Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications or equivalent artistic creations or performances, of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s).

(c) Departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service will be expected at an appropriate level.

(d) The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly/artistic accomplishment, and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.

iii. Professor

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

b. Collegiate?

c. Departmental?

2. Clinical track

tenure track <http://www.uiowa.edu/~Our/opmanual/iii/10.htm> #109

a. University

- i. 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. Clinical faculty are expected to integrate the delivery of their professional services with their teaching.
- ii. Assistant Professor
 - (a) Evidence of ability in service, to include but not be limited to clinical service.
 - (b) Evidence of ability to contribute to teaching.
- iii. Associate Professor
 - (a) Acknowledged record of service and teaching success.
 - (b) Evidence of progress toward a record of professional productivity beyond clinical service, as defined by the college.
- iv. Full Professor
 - (a) Acknowledged record of service and teaching success.
 - (b) An established record of professional productivity beyond clinical service, as defined by the college.
 - (c) Unmistakable evidence of recognition by peers, as defined by the college.
- v. Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement shall not be a requirement for reappointment or promotion of clinical track faculty.

b. Collegiate?

c. Departmental?

C. Know the written rules – written standards

1. Tenure track

<http://www.uiowa.edu/~Our/opmanual/iii/10.htm#102>

a. University

- i. The length of service, whether long or short, does not constitute, of itself, a qualification for promotion nor the sole justification for the

denial of same. It is also the policy of the University that promotions shall not be dependent upon offers of positions from other institutions

- ii. Each academic unit is expected to develop and distribute to all departmental faculty members and to all persons under serious consideration for appointment to the faculty a written and particularized statement of expectations to guide departmental deliberations concerning the granting of tenure, the statement to serve as a guide to the department in its deliberations, and to the faculty member whose tenure status is being considered.
- iii. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion or reappointment 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...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 tenure and/or promotion or reappointment. 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 tenure and/or promotion or reappointment.
- iv. The criteria for promotions include teaching, research, and other professional contributions. Since teaching and research are the central functions of the faculty, other professional contributions are considered subsidiary to these fundamental tasks.
 - (a) Teaching. The prime requisites for an effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, and independence; a willingness to consider suggestions and to cooperate in teaching activities; a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads to the development and strengthening of course content in the light of developments in the area of interest, as well as to improve methods of presenting material; a vital interest in teaching and working with students and, above all, the ability to stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate. This evaluation is so important, however, that recommendations for promotion should include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students, of student counselors and of colleagues who have visited the individual classes or who have been closely associated with the person's teaching as supervisor or in some other capacity, or who have taught the same students in subsequent courses. Academic

counseling or advising of students should be recognized as an important component of the teaching process, and due credit should be given to faculty members who exert an unusual effort in this function.

- (b) Research. In most of the fields represented in the programs of the University, publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction. An original contribution of a creative nature is as significant or as deserving as the publication of a scholarly book or article. Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either in a single work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a general program of worthwhile research. The candidate should pursue a definite, continuing program of studies, investigations or creative works.
- (c) Other Professional Contributions. From time to time, a faculty member is called upon to render major professional services to the University or to society in general. Such contributions should be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University and its effect on the development of the individual.

- b. Collegiate?
 - c. Departmental?
2. Clinical track
- a. University
 - i. Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement shall not be a requirement for reappointment or promotion of clinical track faculty.
 - ii. Promotion is based partly on professional productivity, which 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. Collegiate?
 - c. Departmental?

D. 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, and for these activities to be considered evidence of scholarly activity, they must be innovative and/or published or presented."

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."

E. Know the written rules - procedures

1. Tenure track

<http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/10.htm>

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. Initial appointment

- i. Usually for 3 years
- ii. Presumption that performance will warrant an affirmative tenure decision six years later

b. Annual reviews

- i. Responsibility of the Departmental Executive Officer (DEO)
- ii. In consultation with faculty member

c. 3rd year review

- i. Full-scale departmental-collegiate review
- ii. Consider candidate's proven teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and potential
- iii. Evaluate role of the faculty member in achieving Departmental, Collegiate, and University educational goals
- iv. Reappoint candidate only if institutional need is likely to exist and record is deemed of such quality that affirmative tenure decision is likely in 3 years

d. Your tenure clock

- i. Tenure review begins in summer or fall before end of 6th year
 - (a) Time spent at rank of Assistant Professor ordinarily limited to 6 years
 - (b) Shorter probationary periods possible but uncommon
 - (c) Special situations may affect the commencement of your clock or suspend it temporarily

1. Prior service at a faculty rank
 2. Family or medical leave, personal illness
 3. Child care responsibilities
 4. Appointments beginning in January instead of July
 5. Part-time appointments
- e. Tenure decision
- i. General principles
 - (a) Decisions granting or denying tenure or promotion should be based on a written record of achievement.
 - (b) The content of the record that will be relied upon should be known by the candidate and the decision makers ...
 - (c) 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.
 - (d) 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.
 - (e) University and Collegiate Procedures should be applied consistently to all candidates.
 - (f) Each faculty member participating in the ... promotion decision-making process may do so at only one level of the process
 - ii. Departmental Consulting Group (DCG) consists of all tenured members of the candidate's department at higher academic ranks
 - iii. Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG) consists of faculty selected according to each college's written Procedures governing promotion decision making
 - iv. Points to be determined by collegiate procedures
 - (a) Dates and deadlines for each stage of the process
 - (b) Period of time candidate has to review reports, correct errors, and submit responses at each stage of the process
 - (c) How qualified faculty members from outside the department will be identified to serve on the DCG
 - (d) In nondepartmentalized colleges, the role of department-like units and their administrative officers
 - (e) Any supplementary material to be included in the dossier

- (f) Who shall perform the internal peer evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service
 - (g) Details about the process of peer observation of teaching
 - (h) 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
 - (i) 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
 - (j) 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
- v. Promotion record
- (a) Cover sheet
 - (b) Collegiate Dean's letter making recommendation to the Provost
 - (c) Recommendation and vote (and report, if any) of CCG
 - (d) DEO letter making recommendation to Dean
 - (e) Recommendation, vote, and report of DCG
 - (f) Any letters submitted by the candidate 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
 - (g) Candidate's Curriculum Vitae (C.V.) in the standard format
 - (h) Section on candidate's teaching, including:
 - Candidate's personal statement on teaching
 - Documentation of peer evaluation of teaching
 - (i) 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
 - (j) Section on candidate's service, including:
 - Candidate's personal statement on service
 - Documentation of peer evaluation of service
 - (k) Supplementary material

Candidate assembles promotion dossier

- (l) C.V.
- (m) Record of teaching, including:
 - Personal statement
 - Detailed list of teaching assignments and trainees supervised
 - Course materials
 - Teaching evaluations
- (n) 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
- (o) Record of service, including:
 - Personal statement
 - List of offices held, editorships, review panels, committees, etc.
- (p) Copies of published works
- (q) Work in progress may be added to the dossier if and when it is completed.

vi. Peer evaluation of teaching

- (a) Candidate must cooperate in obtaining internal peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching
- (b) Colleges 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
- (c) Report
 1. Comparative analysis of the quality of the candidate's teaching in the context of the candidate's department or unit
 2. Summary analysis of the student teaching evaluation data contained in the Promotion Record, including departmental average comparison data where possible
 3. Description, where appropriate, of the balance between the candidate's undergraduate and graduate teaching
 4. Description and assessment of the candidate's academic advising responsibilities

5. Consideration of any special circumstances concerning the faculty member's teaching performance

vii. Evaluation of scholarship

(a) Internal evaluation

1. Report to include 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

(b) External evaluation

1. Colleges must 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
2. DEO will solicit list of appropriate external reviewers from candidate
3. DEO will add to list and give it to those faculty members who have been assigned to complete an internal peer review of the candidate's scholarship
4. those faculty will add other potential external reviewers
5. DEO will share completed list of potential external reviewers with the candidate, candidate may prepare a written objection if any reviewers might be unfairly biased
6. DEO will determine which of the potential external reviewers will be asked to provide a letter of review
7. Consider 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
8. Evaluators should be from peer institutions, like Big Ten/CIC
9. Evaluators should not be former advisers or collaborators

viii. Peer evaluation of service

ix. After all internal reports entered into the Promotion Record

- (a) Copy of internal reports sent to candidate
- (b) Candidate has opportunity to correct errors

x. Departmental Consulting Group (DCG)

- (a) Votes by secret ballot

- (b) Prepares summary report of discussion
- (c) Candidate has opportunity to correct errors
- xi. DEO writes letter to Dean recommending for or against promotion
 - (a) 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
- xii. Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG)
 - (a) Votes
 - (b) 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
 - (c) If recommendation is negative and contrary to that of DCG or DEO, candidate:
 - Receives copy of vote and summary report
 - May submit written response
- xiii. Dean writes letter to Provost recommending for or against promotion
 - (a) Dean informs DEO of recommendation
 - (b) DEO informs DCG
 - (c) Candidate informed if recommendation is positive
 - (d) If recommendation is negative, candidate:
 - Receives copy of letter
 - May submit written response
 - May add materials to Promotion Record
- xiv. Provost makes recommendation to Board of Regents
 - (a) Provost informs Dean
 - (b) Dean informs candidate, DEO

2. Clinical track

<http://www.uiowa.edu/~Our/opmanual/iii/10.htm#109>

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. Initial appointment is for 1-3 years
- b. Initial review

- i. After 3 years, or sooner if promotion is contemplated
 - ii. Full-scale, departmental-collegiate review
 - iii. Candidate's effectiveness in fulfilling teaching and service missions
 - iv. Role of the faculty member in achieving Departmental, Collegiate, and University educational and service goals
 - v. Likely role of the faculty member in the future in achieving those goals
 - vi. Review of departmental-collegiate recommendation by central administration
- c. Reappointments are for 3-7 years
- d. Termination
- i. Decision to terminate during the term of appointment only for failure to meet written standards of competence and performance established by the unit and the University
 - ii. Decision to deny subsequent reappointment after the clinical faculty member has received at least one successful three-year review
 - (a) failure to meet written standards of competence and performance established by the unit and the University
 - (b) changed economic circumstances or program needs such that the position itself is terminated. May occur only at the conclusion of an appointment, and must carry appropriate notice. (At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service)
- e. Promotion
- i. Initiated by department or by candidate
 - ii. Any regular promotion cycle
 - iii. No time limit at any rank
 - iv. DCG is all tenured, tenure-track, and clinical-track faculty at or above the rank being sought

II. Learning the System - the 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. Standards that may be applied
 - 1. Relative weights placed on each factor, such as teaching, scholarship (including grants), other professional contributions, and service

2. Teaching
 - a. How is teaching evaluated? Who will perform the peer evaluations?
 - b. How important are teaching evaluations?
3. Scholarship
 - a. What types of scholarship are most important? What is and what is not considered scholarship in your department?
 - b. Need for independent work
 - c. Importance of choosing mainstream topics in your field that are generally recognized as being meritorious
 - d. Publications - Are there "magic" numbers?
What are the quantitative requirements?
 - e. What types of publications are most important? Do they all count?
 - i. Reports of original research
 - ii. Book chapters
 - iii. Literature reviews
 - iv. Editing a book
 - v. Writing a book
 - vi. Book reviews
 - f. Other factors that may affect how much weight a publication carries
 - i. Quality, judged by whom?
 - ii. Prestige of journal, publisher
 - iii. Centrality to the field
 - iv. Refereed or not
 - v. Solicited or not
 - vi. Methodology - historical, narrative, quantitative
 - vii. Published before coming to Iowa
 - viii. Based on work performed prior to appointment at Iowa
 - ix. Page length
 - x. Co-authored publications
 - (a) Documentation of your contribution
 - (b) Order in which authors' names are listed
 - (c) Mentor/personal partner/co-author discount
 - xi. Necessary to publish thesis work?

- xii. Stage in the publication process - submitted, accepted, in print
- xiii. How frequently cited
- g. Grants – What are the requirements?
 - i. Number
 - ii. Dollar amount
 - iii. Source
 - iv. Does co-authorship matter?
- 4. Professional contributions
- 5. Service
 - a. Committee work
 - b. Administrative responsibilities
 - c. Clinical duties
 - i. Weight
 - ii. Time commitment
- C. Determine the standards actually applied at each level of review on the basis of:
 - 1. Consultation with colleagues
 - 2. Official evaluations of prior candidates who were successful and unsuccessful at various levels
 - 3. Your evaluation of the records of prior candidates. This is a difficult but crucial step in your education.
- D. Consider the possibility that performance standards may have been raised
In reality, standards may now be higher than those in effect at the time of your appointment, notwithstanding University rules prohibiting such changes in standards.
- E. Mitigating factors
 - 1. Extensions of probationary period
Although you have the “right” to take leave because of family, medical, or child care needs, your peers may conceivably penalize you for exercising those rights.
 - 2. Possible alterations in the normal review procedures

III. Setting Goals and Timetables

- A. Set goals to ensure that yours is not a "close" case
 - 1. Exceed requirements with a clearly adequate record
 - 2. Investigate standards that are applied in fact
 - 3. Consult with mentors and colleagues as your plans evolve
Consult them early and regularly. Be proactive.
Don't wait for others to come to you.
- B. Find out what is important, then do it
 - 1. Establish independence
 - 2. Publications
 - a. Dissertation material
 - b. Refereed papers
 - c. Books
 - d. Single or multi-authored contributions
 - e. Which journals to publish in
 - 3. Grant funding
 - 4. Cultivate professional relationships
- C. Importance of quality teaching
 - 1. Teaching is evaluated first
 - 2. Ask for feedback early
Make sure you are being evaluated at an early stage. If you receive poor evaluations or there is a perception that there are deficiencies in your teaching, ask for assistance and do whatever you can to improve your teaching.
 - 3. Resources
<http://www.uiowa.edu/homepage/fac-staff/teaching-resources.html>
 - a. Center for Teaching
 - b. Council on Teaching
 - c. Evaluation and Examination Service
 - d. Instructional Technology Centers
 - e. Office of Consultation and Research in Medical Education (OCRME)

- D. Find a niche for yourself
 - 1. Sell and promote yourself to your colleagues
 - 2. Create a need for yourself in your department
- E. Set concrete timetables and share them with mentors and close advisors
- F. Be aware of threats to meeting your goals
 - 1. Avoid professional associations and meetings that do not advance your research and publication agendas
 - 2. Avoid excessive committee work
 - 3. Avoid added teaching or administrative responsibilities

These activities may not advance your career. The risks can be particularly problematic for women and minorities who are in short supply for this type of service work.

IV. Maintaining Proper Documentation

- A. Keep a file of all correspondence
 - 1. Employment letter, terms of offer from University
 - 2. Changes in status
 - 3. Correspondence to or from DEO
 - 4. Everything, no matter how unimportant it may seem at the time

- B. Listen carefully

In any meeting with your DEO or other senior colleagues, listen closely. Make careful notes of any criticisms; suggestions for improvement; statements about standards, norms, or expectations; or anything else that may become important. It is easy to misunderstand.

DEO says, "Things seem to be going well, although we've had complaints that your grading standards are out of line, but you'll work it out, I'm sure."

DEO wants you to hear, "You have a problem. Your grading standards are too high. Do something about it or your future here could be in jeopardy."

You hear, "You're doing a great job. You have a minor problem with grading standards, but don't give it a second thought."

- C. Maintain a diary

Maintain a diary of all conversations relevant to your case. Include details about anything on which you may later need to rely.

D. Consider writing a “Dear DEO” letter

1. Write a letter to your DEO to document any relevant oral communications not accompanied by a memo or letter that already covers the subject in full detail.
2. In the letter, state fully your understanding of the conversation with an inquiry whether this is consistent with the DEO's understanding. Ask for correction or clarification if you missed something or misunderstood.
3. Under certain conditions, such as a situation involving a standard to be applied by the faculty, consider asking the DEO to share relevant portions of your letter with the faculty. If the DEO chooses not to circulate the letter, you might also consider, after consultation with friends and mentors, doing so yourself.
4. If your DEO does not respond to your letter, you may have a problem.
5. If you anticipate a possible negative reaction to your letter or suspect that it may appear antagonistic, consider writing the letter for your files but not sending it.

E. Keep your dossier up to date

1. Curriculum vitae
Maintain complete and exact records, with full dates.
2. Teaching portfolio
 - a. Lectures and classes taught
 - b. Syllabi and class materials
 - c. Student evaluations
 - d. Guest appearances
 - e. Outside lectures
 - f. Awards
3. Scholarship and service
 - a. Publications
 - b. Funding
 - c. Accomplishments
 - d. Awards
4. Packaging is important
Your dossier should be well organized and professional.

F. Personal file

1. Publications (with reviews)
2. Grant applications (both funded and unfunded, with reviews)
3. Unpublished scholarship
4. Teaching materials
5. Lectures
6. Presentations at meetings
7. Relevant external correspondence
8. Newspaper clippings
9. Anything that may potentially bear on your status

V. Obtaining support and advice**A. Communication is vital**

1. Don't take anything for granted or make assumptions
2. Talk to your DEO and senior colleagues to find out what they expect of you
3. Investigate the standards in your department

B. Learn the culture of your department

1. Know what conduct is considered civil, tactful, and gracious
2. Know what is considered objectionable, obnoxious, inappropriate, or unacceptable behavior
3. Learn the politics of the place, the various factions, and who knows what
4. Decide whom you can trust

C. Find a mentor

If an official mentor is not offered early on, make it a priority to find someone who will:

1. Provide information
2. Disclose unwritten rules
3. Give candid advice
4. Help evaluate politics
5. Lend support
6. Advocate on your behalf

D. Don't rely on only one person

Don't rely too heavily on the advice of a single individual, including your mentor. Consider forming several, less formal mentoring relationships.

E. Solicit help from your colleagues

1. Scholarship

Circulate drafts of your scholarship early on to colleagues, but only after you learn which colleagues will recognize that these are only early drafts and will place them in proper perspective.

2. Teaching

Request some peer review of your teaching early on from people you trust, either through class visitation or videotape. Don't wait until your department performs an official evaluation for your Promotion Record.

3. Politics

Ask how you are perceived by your colleagues and whether your behavior is considered appropriate and collegial.

F. Form a supportive network

G. Learn the culture of your field

1. Grants funded
2. Papers accepted
3. Invitations to serve on panels

H. Cultivate professional relationships, especially at national meetings

1. Mentorship
2. Personal support
3. Professional assistance
4. Possible reviewers for grants, papers
5. Potential contacts to write letters of recommendation
6. Name recognition

Others will associate your name with a face. You become a real person and an individual instead of another anonymous name.

I. Avoid controversy

Don't become involved in controversial politics during your probationary period. Wait until you have tenure.

J. Avoid making enemies

Don't anger or annoy your colleagues or administrators.

VI. Handling Setbacks

- A. Don't ignore red flags
- B. Annual evaluations are important, especially for probationary faculty
 - 1. Listen to any advice given
 - 2. Correct inaccuracies
- C. Try to resolve problems as early as possible. Don't wait 5 years.
- D. Examples of common setbacks
 - 1. Unfair impediment – lab wasn't ready as promised
 - 2. Environment that is not collegial or conducive to productive work
 - 3. No mentor is appointed and/or you have difficulty developing mentor relationships.
 - 4. No clear standards for promotion
 - 5. DEO fails to provide you with information you requested
 - 6. No reply to a 'Dear DEO' letter
 - 7. Annual review not conducted or results of the review not communicated in writing to you
 - 8. Annual review is negative or mixed, especially in the 3rd year
 - 9. DEO will not meet with you or avoids discussing substantive matters you consider important
 - 10. Hostile relations with peers, supervisors, or the DEO
 - 11. A manuscript is rejected for publication or a grant application is not funded
 - 12. Weak teaching evaluations
 - 13. DEO or other senior faculty pressures you to accept unwanted service or teaching obligations
 - 14. Possibility that your promotion recommendation may not be positive
- E. Basic guidelines for reducing the adverse consequences of setbacks, learning from them, and strengthening your position
 - 1. Keep cool. Avoid public displays of anger or hurt. Take no action while angry/upset that could be counterproductive and aggravate the situation. Avoid confrontations, verbal exchanges, and irate letters.
 - 2. Do not assume that everything will be all right in the end because you are right.

3. Do not assume that you are right and the other person is wrong because you are
 - a. a nice person
 - b. doing your job well
 - c. helpful in the department
 - d. popular
 - e. a good teacher
 4. Don't overreact to criticism.
 5. Get advice about your options and specific courses of remedial action you might pursue. When you decide on a course of action, discuss the idea with a mentor/advisor to estimate all possible consequences - e.g., financial, psychological, personal.
 6. When the setback is accompanied by advice concerning your teaching or scholarly productivity, follow the advice whenever possible.
- F. Try to deal with setbacks within your department.
- The use of outsiders and outside intervention is often perceived as a hostile act, although it may be necessary.
- G. Possible outside sources of counsel, advice, and intervention on your behalf
1. Ombudspersons (Cynthia Joyce and Craig Porter)
 2. Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee of the Faculty Senate
 3. AAUP Committee A (Ekhard Ziegler, Chair; Dave Baldus, Samir Bishara, Jeffrey Cox, Lois Cox, Beth Pelton, Ruth Wachtel)
 4. Associate Deans
 5. Associate Provost (Susan Johnson)
 6. General Counsel (Marcus Mills)
- H. Departure
1. If it appears that you may not be successful in your 6th year, prudence may call for departure from Iowa to avoid an adverse decision.
 2. Maintain a network to keep you apprised of other opportunities.

VII. Formal Grievance Procedures

- A. You need a lawyer
- B. Is it really worth it?
 - 1. Time
 - 2. Money
 - 3. Emotional toll
 - 4. Unpleasant work environment
- C. Tenure track – denial of tenure, promotion, or reappointment
 - 1. Exclusive remedy within the University (Operations Manual III.29)
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/29.htm>
 - 2. Grounds for challenge
 - a. Violation of a University Obligation: that the decision was made in violation of a written promise of tenure, promotion, or reappointment to the faculty member by an authorized administrator of the University
 - i. The faculty member must show, by clear and convincing evidence, that, on the basis of a written promise to the faculty member by departmental executive officer, collegiate dean, or other authorized administrator of the University, the faculty member was justified in believing that promotion or reappointment would be granted on the basis of the faculty member's acknowledged accomplishments and that the faculty member relied detrimentally on the promise.
 - ii. In order to rely on a written promise the faculty member must either present in evidence the written document or documents upon which the claim of a violation of a University obligation is based or else justify the failure to do so. If the faculty member shows only that the promise was conditional on adequate performance or some other requirement whose satisfaction is independently at issue, the panel shall not find in favor of the faculty member on this ground.
 - b. Clearly Adequate Record of Achievement: that the decision is unjustified in view of the faculty member's clearly adequate record of achievement under governing standards of the department or other academic unit in question.
 - i. The faculty member must show, by clear and convincing evidence, that the faculty member's record of achievement justifies tenure, promotion, or reappointment as the case may be. Thus, the panel shall sustain

the challenged decision unless the panel is of a firm and definite conviction based on the faculty member's record that denying the faculty member such tenure, promotion, or reappointment was unjustified.

- ii. The panel shall judge the merits of a claim of a Clearly Adequate Record of Achievement in the case of a tenure, promotion, or reappointment decision by the relevant clearly defined written standards of the faculty member's department or other academic unit that were in effect at the time of the faculty member's appointment, unless other standards by which the faculty member would be judged were stated in a written communication made to the faculty member by the departmental executive officer or collegiate dean at that time. The panel may also consider comparable decisions concerning other faculty members in interpreting and applying written standards.
 - iii. The panel shall give great weight to the assessment of any person or persons knowledgeable in the faculty's member's teaching area, field of research or comparable activity, or area of professional service, to the extent such person's knowledge is relevant to evaluating the judgments underlying the decision being reviewed.
- c. Improper Reason: That the decision was based in part or in whole on the faculty member's race, creed, color, national origin, age, sex, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, or any other classification that deprives a person of consideration as an individual, including but not limited to associational preference; or that the decision was based in part or in whole on a reason that violates the faculty member's academic freedom
 - d. Improper Procedure: that the decision was made without reasonable consultation with the faculty colleagues of the faculty member as required by the University, college, or department, or in a way that violates some other established University, college, or department procedures
 - e. Unfair Impediment: that the decision was the result of a failure of the faculty member to meet the requirements for tenure, promotion, or reappointment due to an unfair impediment for which the University or one of its officers is responsible.

3. Stages

- a. Informal Discussions
- b. Request for a Written Statement of Reasons
- c. Investigation, Hearing, and Faculty Judicial Panel Recommendation
 - i. Formal request for an investigation to Presiding Officer of the Faculty Judicial Commission,

- ii. Appointment of the Judicial Panel
 - iii. Stay of Proceedings
 - iv. Submission of Preliminary Statements
 - v. Obtaining the Evidence by the Investigating Officer
 - vi. Final Statements and Rebuttal
 - vii. Distribution of materials to the panel
 - viii. Hearing, if requested by either party
 - ix. Recommendation from the panel
- d. President's Decision
- i. Recommendations that are accepted will be implemented
 - ii. With respect to recommendations that are not accepted, the case will then be closed, subject only to a decision by the Board of Regents to grant the faculty member a request for review
- D. Clinical track - denial of reappointment or promotion, or termination
1. Exclusive remedy within the University (Operations Manual III.29.9
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~our/opmanual/iii/29b.htm#299>)
 2. Grounds for challenge
 - a. Decision to deny initial reappointment before the clinical faculty member has received a successful three-year review
 - i. Violation of a University Obligation
 - ii. Clearly Adequate Record of Achievement
 - iii. Improper Reason
 - iv. Improper Procedure
 - v. Unfair Impediment
 - b. Decision to Deny Promotion
 - i. Violation of a University Obligation
 - ii. Clearly Adequate Record of Achievement
 - iii. Improper Reason
 - iv. Improper Procedure
 - v. Unfair Impediment
 - c. Decision to terminate during the term of appointment

Lack of Justification: that the decision is not based on failure to meet written standards of competence and performance established by the unit and the University.

- d. Decision to deny subsequent reappointment after the clinical faculty member has received at least one successful three-year review

Lack of Justification: that the decision is not based on

- i. failure to meet written standards of competence and performance established by the unit and the University.
- ii. changed economic circumstances or program needs such that the position itself is terminated. Non-renewal for changed economic circumstances or program needs may only occur at the conclusion of an appointment, and must carry appropriate notice. (At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years of service)

DETAILED OUTLINE AND SUMMARY

I. LEARNING THE SYSTEM - THE WRITTEN RULES	1
A. Where to find the written rules	
1. University guidelines	
2. Collegiate guidelines	1
3. Departmental guidelines?	
B. Know the written rules – standards for each rank	2
C. Know the written rules – written standards	3
1. Tenure track	
2. Clinical track	5
D. Substantive standards vary by college and department	6
E. Know the written rules - procedures	8
1. Tenure track	
2. Clinical track	13
II. LEARNING THE SYSTEM - THE UNWRITTEN RULES	14
A. Some colleges provide more guidance than others	
B. Standards that may be applied	
1. Relative weights placed on each factor	
2. Teaching	15
3. Scholarship	
4. Professional contributions	16
5. Service	
C. Determine the standards actually applied at each level of review	
1. Consultation with colleagues	
2. Official evaluations of prior candidates	
3. Your evaluation of the records of prior candidates	
D. Consider that performance standards may have been raised	
E. Mitigating factors	
1. Extensions of probationary period	
2. Possible alterations in the normal review procedures	
III. SETTING GOALS AND TIMETABLES	17
A. Set goals to ensure that yours is not a "close" case	
1. Exceed requirements with a clearly adequate record	
2. Investigate standards that are applied in fact	
3. Consult with mentors and colleagues as your plans evolve	
B. Find out what is important, then do it	
1. Establish independence	
2. Publications	
3. Grant funding	
4. Cultivate professional relationships	
C. Importance of quality teaching	
1. Teaching is evaluated first	
2. Ask for feedback early	
3. Resources	

- D. Find a niche for yourself 18
 - 1. Sell and promote yourself to your colleagues
 - 2. Create a need for yourself in your department
- E. Set concrete timetables
- F. Be aware of threats to meeting your goals
 - 1. Avoid professional associations that do not advance your agendas
 - 2. Avoid excessive committee work
 - 3. Avoid added teaching or administrative responsibilities

- IV. MAINTAINING PROPER DOCUMENTATION 18
 - A. Keep a file of all correspondence
 - 1. Employment letter, terms of offer from University
 - 2. Changes in status
 - 3. Correspondence to or from DEO
 - 4. Everything, no matter how unimportant it may seem at the time
 - B. Listen carefully
 - C. Maintain a diary
 - D. Consider writing a "Dear DEO" letter 19
 - E. Keep your dossier up to date
 - 1. Curriculum vitae
 - 2. Teaching portfolio
 - 3. Scholarship and service
 - 4. Packaging is important
 - F. Personal file 20
 - 1. Publications (with reviews)
 - 2. Grant applications (both funded and unfunded, with reviews)
 - 3. Unpublished scholarship
 - 4. Teaching materials
 - 5. Lectures
 - 6. Presentations at meetings
 - 7. Relevant external correspondence
 - 8. Newspaper clippings
 - 9. Anything that may potentially bear on your status

- V. OBTAINING SUPPORT AND ADVICE 20
 - A. Communication is vital
 - 1. Don't take anything for granted or make assumptions
 - 2. Talk to your DEO and senior colleagues
 - 3. Investigate the standards in your department
 - B. Learn the culture of your department
 - 1. Know what conduct is considered civil, tactful, and gracious
 - 2. Know what is considered inappropriate or unacceptable behavior
 - 3. Learn the politics of the place
 - 4. Decide whom you can trust
 - C. Find a mentor
 - 1. Provide information
 - 2. Disclose unwritten rules

- 3. Give candid advice
 - 4. Help evaluate politics
 - 5. Lend support
 - 6. Advocate on your behalf
 - D. Don't rely on only one person
 - E. Solicit help from your colleagues
 - 1. Scholarship
 - 2. Teaching
 - 3. Politics
 - F. Form a supportive network
 - G. Learn the culture of your field
 - 1. Grants funded
 - 2. Papers accepted
 - 3. Invitations to serve on panels
 - H. Cultivate professional relationships, especially at national meetings
 - 1. Mentorship
 - 2. Personal support
 - 3. Professional assistance
 - 4. Possible reviewers for grants, papers
 - 5. Potential contacts to write letters of recommendation
 - 6. Name recognition
 - I. Avoid controversy
 - J. Avoid making enemies
- VI. HANDLING SETBACKS
- A. Don't ignore red flags
 - B. Annual evaluations are important, especially for probationary faculty
 - 1. Listen to any advice given
 - 2. Correct inaccuracies
 - C. Try to resolve problems as early as possible
 - D. Examples of common setbacks
 - 1. Unfair impediment – lab wasn't ready as promised
 - 2. Environment that is not collegial or conducive to productive work
 - 3. You have difficulty developing mentor relationships.
 - 4. No clear standards for promotion
 - 5. DEO fails to provide you with information you requested
 - 6. No reply to a 'Dear DEO' letter
 - 7. Results of annual review not communicated in writing to you
 - 8. Annual review is negative or mixed, especially in the 3rd year
 - 9. DEO will not meet with you
 - 10. Hostile relations with peers, supervisors, or the DEO
 - 11. A manuscript is rejected or grant application is not funded
 - 12. Weak teaching evaluations
 - 13. DEO pressures you to accept unwanted obligations
 - 14. Possibility that promotion recommendation may not be positive
 - E. Basic guidelines for reducing the adverse consequences of setbacks
 - 1. Keep cool

2.	Do not assume that everything will be ok because you are right.	22
3.	Do not assume that you are right	23
4.	Don't overreact to criticism.	
5.	Get advice about your options	
6.	Follow the advice whenever possible.	
F.	Try to deal with setbacks within your department.	
G.	Possible outside sources of advice	
1.	Ombudspersons	
2.	Faculty Policies and Compensation Committee	
3.	AAUP Committee A	
4.	Associate Deans	
5.	Associate Provost	
6.	General Counsel	
H.	Departure	
1.	Prudence may call for departure to avoid an adverse decision	
2.	Maintain a network to keep you apprised of other opportunities	
VII.	FORMAL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES	24
A.	You need a lawyer	
B.	Is it really worth it?	
1.	Time	
2.	Money	
3.	Emotional toll	
4.	Unpleasant work environment	
C.	Tenure track – denial of tenure, promotion, or reappointment	
1.	Exclusive remedy within the University	
2.	Grounds for challenge	
3.	Stages	25
D.	Clinical track - denial of reappointment or promotion, or termination	26
1.	Exclusive remedy within the University	
2.	Grounds for challenge	

END