

## The Promotion Package

1. Transmittal Letter from the Department Chair to the Dean. This letter requests the promotion and states the proposed date of promotion. To help prevent delay in processing, the letter may also point out any unusual features about the promotion – for example, the rationale for an accelerated promotion request or an explanation of an asymmetrical evaluation. It will be helpful to note at the beginning if the individual is fulltime or has reduced effort. *If the candidate has a secondary appointment in another department, that chair should also sign this letter or provide their own transmittal letter. The letter should comment on the candidate's contributions to interdisciplinary activities with regards to teaching and research.* The promotion process will be compromised if this letter is missing.
2. Three Page Summary (Form B). This is drafted by the departments and should include direct quotes from all of the external evaluators. Soft and general praise is not helpful to senior level candidates – select strong reviewers and pick unequivocal quotes. Since we are demanding direct quotes from each arm's length reviewer, circumstances may require expansion of some Forms B's to four pages. (*Reviewers should be listed in Alphabetical Order.*) An overall career impact factor may be obtained from the Science Citation Index (Web of Knowledge) - and if the chair wishes, this could be included (see section III, 6, e). Example Form Bs for each track are attached (Appendix A). For promotions to the assistant professor level on the clinical and research tracks, a career development plan must be included in the Form B. (Appendix B)

***Please submit both a paper copy and upload a copy of the Form B to the Xythos website or attach the Form B document to an e-mail and send to Mary Wurz in the Faculty Affairs Office at [mwurz@umich.edu](mailto:mwurz@umich.edu)***

3. CV. The standard Medical School model can be found at <http://www.med.umich.edu/medschool/faculty/promopackage/AppendBCVGuidelines.pdf> (Appendix C). **Do not use a table of contents on the CV.**
4. Publications – Recent and significant since last promotion. These are to be selected by the candidate as emblematic of best work and typically are those produced since the previous promotion *and are the same papers listed on the Three Page Summary under Recent and Significant Publications.* For all promotions submit one copy of the reprints.
5. Bibliographic Notes. A document that explains for each paper, why the author selected the paper, what unique and seminal contributions might have been made, and exactly what constitutes the author's contribution to the paper (including an explanation of the authorship position). Each paper should be keyed to its place in CV (Appendix D). The citation survey may be useful to demonstrate impact of some or all of the papers. The number of citation hits can be mentioned **if** this information is thought to give good evidence of impact. The URL to check on citations is as follows:  
<http://www.lib.umich.edu/taubman/>

- . • Click on Databases by Subject
- . • Under Medicine click on Science Citation Index (Web of Knowledge)
- . • Under CrossSearch click on “More search fields”

- . • Under Author/Inventor type in your last name followed by initials
- . • Find the article you are looking for and click on “Web of Science”

6. Letters of Evaluation:

External Reviewer Letters. The independent, external reviewers **excludes close collaborators, present or former mentors/supervisors, and close personal friends.** *Letters from persons who have been a co-author or major research collaborator in excess of 10 years prior to the promotion will be considered “arm’s length” reviews.* Letters from former mentors/supervisors, etc. will be considered only as supplemental to the independent letters. The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique the candidate’s work and scholarly contributions and be at a level higher than the candidate’s current rank. All letters solicited and received must be included. Original letters of evaluation must accompany the promotion packet. If the letter is sent as an e-mail attachment, a copy of the email should be attached to the letter.

Internal Reviewer Letters. Internal reviewers are considered to be any University of Michigan faculty member regardless of school, unit, or department of appointment. Letters from internal reviewers can be helpful because they are presumed to have a good sense of both the candidate and the work. If such letters are included, they will be considered additional to the minimum requirement of external letters. One or two internal letters are expected for faculty members with significant clinical activity.

7. Solicitation Letters (to external reviewers). The chair should elicit suggested names of reviewers from the candidate but also include other appropriate reviewers in the final solicitation list. The letter should stress that we seek a measured, unbiased evaluation. The quality of independent analysis has special implications for a tenure decision. Evaluators on the instructional track will be asked to describe, very specifically, impact in field or seminal contributions in cases of senior level faculty. The evaluators should receive the candidate’s CV, the five papers, the bibliographic notes, and our descriptions of faculty tracks & ranks. No other materials should be sent to reviewers. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) considerations need to be mentioned. A model solicitation letter is attached for faculty with a single appointment. (Appendix E-1) *For faculty with joint appointments, a different solicitation letter (Appendix E-2) is used that asks the reviewer to comment on the candidate’s contributions to interdisciplinary activities.* Several chairs send the external evaluators a note or card of thanks after receiving the evaluations, with a mention of the subsequent length of process and time of outcome. This costs little and garners good will from those asked to study and report on our faculty. *One copy of the solicitation letter for external reviewers must accompany the promotion packet.*

List of External Reviewers. The list should be in Alphabetical order by last name. (This should be in the same order of Reviewer quotes on the Form B.) A short statement for each reviewer should include the reviewer's position, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of that individual to provide an unbiased expert evaluation. Any close professional associations with the candidate such as dissertation committee, post-doctoral supervisor, co-author, etc. should be disclosed. Designate each external reviewer as "arm's length" or "not arm's length" and note how the names of the reviewers came to the attention of the chair/review committee (i.e. candidate recommended, chair selected, etc.). *If a non-academic reviewer is identified as being "arm's length", provide justification that the title held by the reviewer equates to or is at a level above the academic rank to which the candidate is being considered for promotion.* (Appendix F-1)

*A second list should be included (in Alphabetical order by last name) of reviewers who were asked to write a letter but declined and the reason for declining.* (Appendix F-2)

8. Educator's Portfolio and Teaching Evaluations.

The Department of Medical Education has created a two-to four-page Medical School Educator's Portfolio, which is completed by the candidate and should describe teaching activities, time spent on teaching and the learner groups served; document teaching awards or citations; relevant teaching accomplishments, summarize comments and evaluations of seminars, conferences, lab supervision, etc.; and document research concerning the educational process. Two examples are given in Appendix G. The Educator's Portfolio can be found at:

<http://www.med.umich.edu/medschool/faculty/portfolio/>

The Office of Faculty Affairs requires relevant teaching documentation.

Undergraduates, graduate students, medical students, house officers, fellows, or continuing medical education participants are considered students.

The documentation should include SUMMARIES of all teaching evaluations (including numerical evaluations as well as learner comments) since the last appointment or promotion, pertaining to the learner groups mentioned in the Educator's Portfolio.

Be certain to mention the standards used, e.g., "scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being outstanding."

Typical examples include: (if applicable)

- Undergraduate/graduate education: summary of all lecture evaluations
- M1 and M2 medical students: summary sheets of classes or labs taught
- M3 and M4 medical students: yearly summary sheets (available on-line) with summary of comments
- House Officers: summary sheets of numeric medhub evaluations with summary of comments
- Fellows: summaries of evaluations
- CME (Peer educations): summary evaluations of lectures, only if this is the main part of teaching
- Graduate Students or lab teaching: Individual student feedback may be selectively included if relevant to a major mentoring activity.

If there are only minimal evaluations available that should be addressed in the Transmittal Letter. In that particular circumstance letters may be solicited from previous learners to attest to the applicant's teaching abilities. If the teaching evaluations contain negative remarks or low scores this needs to be explained in the Transmittal Letter as well, e.g. how that was discussed with the candidate and what the plans for improvement have been.

Do NOT send individual evaluation forms.

9. Talking Points. A single page commentary by the candidate describing scholarly niche (and type of scholarship), professional expertise, contributions to field, special skills, instructional contributions, national leadership etc. This is a sort of self assessment that may help a chair understand the candidate and that candidate's self image. The primary intent of the talking points is to help the chair in writing the Form B. The committees that review the casebook find this to be a helpful document in understanding the candidate's work. *A copy of the talking points must be submitted with the promotion package.*
10. Bridging Support Form (Form RS-2) for Research Track only – the Statement of Understanding Regarding Responsibility for Bridging Support form. This form is required by the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) and must be included in all research track promotion casebooks. The form needs to be signed the Department Chair. The Office of Faculty Affairs will obtain the Dean's signature. (Appendix L)

### **FOR YOUR INFORMATION –ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO FACULTY PROMOTIONS**

Instructional/Clinical/Research Tracks – Definition/Ranks/Criteria (Appendix H)

Miscellaneous Information (Appendix I) This contains two documents: a) Qualifications for appointment and promotion in the several faculties of the University of Michigan; and b) Promotion Do's and Don'ts.

Faculty Promotion Process Chart (Appendix J)

Guidance on Teaching/Mentoring Criteria for the Research Professor Track (Appendix K)