Promotion & Tenure Workshop

Lois J Geist, MD
Associate Provost for Faculty

April 27, 2021
Workshop Agenda

- Basic expectations and general tips regarding promotion and tenure
- Discuss the importance of strategic career development
- Discuss the approach to developing your tenure portfolio
- Review the tenure & promotion process
- A few tenure track caveats
## “Typical” Tenure Track Progression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>• Annual Department Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>• Annual Department Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>• Third-Year Reappointment Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>• Annual Department Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>• Annual Department Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>• Tenure Decision Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualifications: Associate Professor

III.10.4b. Associate Professor

https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty/qualifications-specific-ranks

Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher

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).

Departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and professional service will be expected.

Accomplishments should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.
General Recommendations

→ Be an effective teacher

→ Do excellent research/scholarship

→ Be steadily productive

→ Make an impact in the field

→ Bring in grants (if relevant for your discipline/unit)

→ Give back to the academic community
General Recommendations

- Identify mentors
- Ask for feedback during the annual review process
- Show up at meetings
- Cultivate contacts for letters
- Know department/college standards
Career Development
Career Development Best Practices

- Clarify expectations with DEO/supervisor/mentor regularly
- Seek mentoring – develop your network
- Welcome and incorporate feedback
- Build reputation in your area of scholarship/creativity
- Build collegial relationships inside and outside the institution
Create Your Plan for Promotion

→ First half career planning

• Understand unit and collegiate culture
• Prioritize assignments
• Develop career goals
• Begin to build a solid professional reputation
• Avail yourself of career development resources
• Document… document … document
Teaching Excellence

→ Who will you teach – and how will you impact them?

→ Clarify what successful teaching looks like

→ Seek mentoring and feedback about teaching skills

→ Be familiar with type/frequency of teaching evaluations

→ Review peer and learner evaluations regularly

• Resources – Center for Teaching and Learning

https://teach.its.uiowa.edu/organizations/center-teaching
Scholarship

→ Continue to refine your research area

→ Clarify and work on expectations:
  
  • Funding
  
  • Publications
  
  • Artistic creations
  
  • Multidisciplinary work

→ Develop a writing/creating schedule

  • Resources -

  https://writingcenter.uiowa.edu/
Service Excellence

→ Find service opportunities that enhance your career trajectory
  • Helps to develop networks
  • Informs your teaching or scholarly activities

→ Judicious yes; gracious no
Reappointment Year

- Put together dossier
  - Personal assessment of teaching, scholarship and service
- Re-evaluate and revise goals as needed
- Continue to develop strengths
- Identify and mitigate challenges
Continue Your Plan for Promotion

→ Second half career planning

- Develop milestones for promotion in conjunction with mentor
- Verify and maintain collection of dossier materials
  - What do you need to include?
    - Publications/ creative work
    - Teaching assessments
    - Teaching materials
    - Service work
  - Network- these people will be writing letters
Teaching Excellence

➔ Consider leadership positions
  • Course director
  • Section head

➔ Develop and refine curricular materials

➔ Know what your evaluations say – and how you would address shortfalls

➔ Continue to work on skill set

➔ Have first student at minimum post comps
Scholarly Excellence

→ Know the requirements for your field
  • Journal articles – how many? Which journals?
  • First book?
  • Creative works – how many? Where performed/displayed?
→ Ensure your contributions are clear
→ Where available access funding/fellowship/grant options
→ Continue to develop external presence
Service Excellence

→ Continue to carefully evaluate service opportunities

→ Seek service opportunities external to the institution

→ Continue to be judicious when you say yes and no
Preparing the Promotion Dossier
Promotion Time!

→ How is a promotion review initiated?

  • It is required in the final probationary year
  
  • You are approached by your department to submit your materials early
  
  • Based on your own assessment, you have requested promotion review

→ Know what your college expects regarding timelines

→ https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty#10.5
Tenure Process Characteristics

- Fair
- Transparent
- Thorough
- Methodical
- Accessible
Evaluation Criteria

- Research/Scholarly Productivity
- Teaching
- Service

https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty/criteria-promotions
Weighting of Efforts

Research/ Productivity

Teaching

Service
What is Expected for Promotion

→ You need to demonstrate:

- High quality teaching as evidenced by peer and learner reviews
- Developed area of scholarship/creative work
- Growing reputation outside the institution
- Professional service to the academic community both internal and external
Dossier Development

→ Start now – update as needed. Too much work to do at the last minute
→ Each college/unit has its own expectations – make sure you know what they are
→ Make sure your CV is up to date
→ Identify your best teaching materials to include
  • Know where your teaching evaluations are and what they say
  • Make sure you have had appropriate peer evaluations of teaching
→ Put together your scholarly/creative works
→ Develop a list of names for external reviewers
→ Write your personal statement
External Reviewers

- List of people who can fairly evaluate your work
- Need to come from outside the institution
  - Should be from peer institution for your discipline
- Need to be at or above the rank to which you aspire
- Each discipline is different
  - Should NOT be someone close to you
    - Former mentor
    - Former close colleague
    - Current collaborator
- Provide at least 8 – 10 names
Personal Statement

→ This is an “I” document
  • I did this
  • I accomplished that

→ Not to exceed 8 written pages
  • Teaching – up to 3 pages
  • Scholarship/creative work – up to 3 pages
  • Service – up to 2 pages

→ Should include future goals in each area

→ Address any specific issues that may be a potential question to those reviewing your dossier
Sequential Development of Promotion Record through Decision-Makers:

1. Candidate and DEO compile dossier
2. Peer evaluation of teaching
3. Internal peer evaluation of scholarship
4. Peer evaluation of service
5. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
6. External peer evaluation of scholarship
7. Departmental Consulting Group’s vote and report
8. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
9. DEO’s letter to Dean
10. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if DEO’s recommendation is negative
11. Collegiate Consulting Group’s vote and summary report, if any*
12. Candidate’s opportunity to respond*
13. Dean’s letter to Provost
14. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if Dean’s recommendation is negative
15. Provost’s recommendation to the Board of Regents

*If recommendation is negative and contrary to DEO or DCG recommendation

https://provost.uiowa.edu/sites/provost.uiowa.edu/files/2021-02/prom_ten_proc_TT.pdf
Phase 1
Dossier developed

Sequential Development of Promotion Record through Decision-Makers:

1. Candidate and DEO compile dossier
2. Peer evaluation of teaching
3. Internal peer evaluation of scholarship
4. Peer evaluation of service
5. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
6. External peer evaluation of scholarship
7. Departmental Consulting Group’s vote and report
8. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
9. DEO’s letter to Dean
10. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if DEO’s recommendation is negative
11. Collegiate Consulting Group’s vote and summary report, if any*
12. Candidate’s opportunity to respond*
13. Dean’s letter to Provost
14. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if Dean’s recommendation is negative
15. Provost’s recommendation to the Board of Regents

*If recommendation is negative and contrary to DEO or DCG recommendation

Phase 2
Dossier assessed
Phase 1: Dossier Developed

NOTE: Candidate has the opportunity to submit any corrections to errors in the internal peer evaluations.
Phase II: Dossier assessed

7. Departmental Consulting Group’s vote and report
8. Candidate’s opportunity to respond
9. DEO’s letter to Dean
10. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if DEO’s recommendation is negative
11. Collegiate Consulting Group’s vote and summary report, if any*
12. Candidate’s opportunity to respond*
13. Dean’s letter to Provost
14. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if Dean’s recommendation is negative
15. Provost’s recommendation to the Board of Regents

*If recommendation is negative and contrary to DEO or DCG recommendation
Sequential Development of Promotion Record through Decision-Makers:

1. Candidate and DEO compile dossier
2. Peer evaluation of teaching
3. Internal peer evaluation of scholarship
4. Peer evaluation of service
5. **Candidate’s opportunity to respond**
6. External peer evaluation of scholarship
7. Departmental Consulting Group’s vote and report
8. **Candidate’s opportunity to respond**
9. DEO’s letter to Dean
10. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if DEO’s recommendation is negative
11. Collegiate Consulting Group’s vote and summary report, if any
12. **Candidate’s opportunity to respond***
13. Dean’s letter to Provost
14. Candidate’s opportunity to respond, if Dean’s recommendation is negative
15. Provost’s recommendation to the Board of Regents

*If recommendation is negative and contrary to DEO or DCG recommendation
Approval Process

Department: September - January
Dean: February - April
Provost: April - May
Board of Regents:
Relative Impact on Promotion Decision

Department ▶️ Dean ▶️ Provost ▶️ Board of Regents
What are the odds?

Data
- From 2011-2020 422 people were considered for promotion to associate professor with tenure
- Of those 19 were denied tenure
- So... the odds are that you will get tenure 95% of the time

Better than the lottery or the casino!
Other Tenure Process Items

Extensions (III.10.1)

• **Automatic:** for each minor child (e.g., biological, adopted, stepchild, or by guardianship) added to the family of a probationary faculty member from two years prior to the initial appointment through September 1 of the tenure decision year and upon relevant notification, the faculty member’s probationary period shall be automatically extended twelve months per child (up to two children)

• **Discretionary:** … because of a professional or personal impediment (e.g., additional responsibilities, failure to provide resources in timely manner, personal health reasons, ongoing care responsibilities)
Other Tenure Process Items

→ “Early” Tenure (Voluntary Review)
  • Individual faculty members may request review for promotion, tenure or both, **at any time**, and shall be afforded such a review by the applicable department or non-departmentalized college.

→ Terminal Year
  • A faculty member for whom a denial-of-tenure recommendation has been made by the Executive Vice President and Provost shall be given notification of a terminal year of appointment.

• [https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty/qualifications-specific-ranks](https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty/qualifications-specific-ranks)
• [https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty/qualifications-specific-ranks](https://opsmanual.uiowa.edu/human-resources/faculty/qualifications-specific-ranks)
Other Tenure Process Items

This decision can be challenged:

1. 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;

2. 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;

3. Improper Reason: That the decision was based in part or in whole on the faculty member's race, creed, color, religion, national origin, age, sex, pregnancy, disability, genetic information, status as a U.S. veteran, service in the U.S. military, sexual orientation, gender identity, associational preferences, or any other classification that deprives a person of consideration as an individual; or that the decision was based in part or in whole on a reason that violates the faculty member's academic freedom;

4. 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; or

5. 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.
Final Thoughts

- Engage in your department/unit
- Be a good colleague
- Be a strong and consistent teacher
- Be a strong and consistent scholar
- Seek out mentoring
- Take all feedback seriously
- Know the rules
- Prepare your dossier over time
- Take advantage of resources available
Questions?
Review and Promotion 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 candidates elects.

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.