Promotion and Tenure @ IUSM

Sharon Andreoli, MD
Professor, Department of Pediatrics

Mary Dankoski, PhD
Associate Dean,
Faculty Affairs and Professional Development
By the end of this session, you will:

• Learn success rates of women and men seeking promotion and tenure at IUSM
• Understand the basics of P&T
• Know your timeline
• Recognize common challenges in dossier preparation
• Learn tips and strategies for success
PROMOTION & TENURE PATTERNS
BY GENDER
Promotion to Associate Professor

- **Men Approved**
- **Women Approved**
- **Men Denied**
- **Women Denied**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men Approved</th>
<th>Women Approved</th>
<th>Men Denied</th>
<th>Women Denied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Changes Over Time

**Full Time Faculty Who Are Women (by Rank)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank*</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>55/347</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>69/374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>102/362</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>144/421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>267/696</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>423/1025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>73/418</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>106/445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Full Time Faculty^</td>
<td>427/1411</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>640/1761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full time faculty (non-affiliate). The AAMC did not collect data on part time faculty until 2010.

^Total N includes lecturers (in 2008, there were 3 men and 3 women lecturers; in 2012, there were 6 men and 4 women lecturers)
WHAT DO YOU HOPE TO LEARN?
ABOUT THE TRACKS
I am on the...

1. Tenure track
2. Clinical non-tenure track
3. Research scientist non-tenure track
4. Don’t know
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in service, research</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other two areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in service or teaching</td>
<td>Satisfactory in other area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in research</td>
<td>Satisfactory service may be required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION
I will be seeking promotion to...

1. Associate Professor rank
2. Full Professor rank
Promotion Criteria – Research
Assistant to Associate

Excellence
• Coherent research program with peer reviewed dissemination
• Sustained funding or promise of sustained funding
• Independent research program or emerging independent program
• Emerging national reputation

Satisfactory
• Seeking publications
• Grants – do not need to be PI
• Participation in multicenter trials, collaborative research – do not need to be PI
• Research publications that are INDEPENDENT from scholarship of service or teaching
Promotion Criteria – Service
Assistant to Associate

Excellence
• Program development in your area of expertise
• Local/regional impact of a unique program or service
• Peer reviewed scholarship of service
• Emerging national reputation

Satisfactory
• Service to:
  – Patients
  – Students
  – Profession
  – Community
  – Institution
Promotion Criteria – **Teaching**

Assistant to Associate

**Excellence**
- Curriculum development and assessment
- Educational administration
- Teaching or curriculum grants
- Teaching awards
- Peer reviewed scholarship of teaching and learning
- Emerging national reputation

**Satisfactory**
- Teaching load
- Collated teaching evaluations with departmental norms
- Mentoring
- Philosophy of teaching statement
- Peer review of teaching
Promotion Criteria
Associate to Full Professor

• Continued activity, development in your area of expertise
• Outstanding scholarship
• Sustained and sustainable national and/or international reputation
• Only activities in rank are considered
My area of excellence is...

1. Service
2. Research
3. Teaching
4. Don’t know yet
Only hypothesis-driven research counts as scholarship

1. True
2. False
Scholarship has many forms

- Peer reviewed journal articles
- Textbooks and book chapters
- Presentations
- Procedure manual
- Development of best practices
- CD ROMs, Audio/Visual materials
- Curricular materials published on educational databases
UNDERSTANDING YOUR TIMELINE
I know my timeline for promotion and/or tenure

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
### 3 Year Review
- **Fall**: Notified review dossier must be prepared
- **Winter**: Dossier due to Office of Academic Administration (OAA)
- **Spring**: IUSM committee evaluates progress, provides feedback to faculty member & department chair

### Tenure and Promotion Review Year
- **Summer**: Dossier submitted to OAA
- **Fall**: IUSM committee evaluation; Dean’s evaluation
- **Winter**: IUPUI committee evaluation; IUPUI Dean of Faculties evaluation; IUPUI Chancellor evaluation
- **Spring**: Vice President’s Office (Bloomington) Trustees

### Tenure and Promotion Submission Year
- **Winter**: Prepare CV and dossier
- **Spring**: Notified that dossier must be prepared; Letters of evaluation sought
- **June**: Primary committee review; Department Chair review; Regional Center director review (if applicable)

### Traditional Tenure Track Timeline
- **July**: Appointment
- **Year 1**
- **Year 2**
- **Year 3**
- **Year 4**
- **Year 5**
- **Year 6**
- **Year 7**
- **Year 8**
- **Tenure Effective**: July
- **Promotion Effective**: July
3 Year/6 Year Review

**Fall:** Notified review dossier must be prepared

**Winter:** Dossier due to Office of Academic Administration (OAA)

**Spring:** IUSM committee evaluates progress, provides feedback to faculty member & department chair

Tenure and Promotion Review Year

**Summer:** Dossier submitted to OAA

**Fall:** IUSM committee evaluation; Dean’s evaluation

**Winter:** IUPUI committee evaluation; IUPUI Dean of Faculties evaluation; IUPUI Chancellor evaluation

**Spring:** Vice President’s Office (Bloomington) Trustees

Tenure and Promotion Submission Year

**Winter:** Prepare CV and dossier

**Spring:** Notified that dossier must be prepared; Letters of evaluation sought

**June:** Primary committee review; Department Chair review; Regional Center director review (if applicable)

Revised Tenure Track Timeline

- **July:** Appointment
- **Fall:** Notified review dossier must be prepared
- **Winter:** Dossier due to Office of Academic Administration (OAA)
- **Spring:** IUSM committee evaluates progress, provides feedback to faculty member & department chair
- **Year 1:** Appointment
- **Year 2:** Tenure and Promotion Submission Year
  - **Winter:** Prepare CV and dossier
  - **Spring:** Notified that dossier must be prepared; Letters of evaluation sought
- **Year 3:** Tenure and Promotion Submission Year
  - **Summer:** Dossier submitted to OAA
  - **Fall:** IUSM committee evaluation; Dean’s evaluation
  - **Winter:** IUPUI committee evaluation; IUPUI Dean of Faculties evaluation; IUPUI Chancellor evaluation
  - **Spring:** Vice President’s Office (Bloomington) Trustees
- **Year 4:** Promotion Effective
  - **July:** July
- **Year 5:** Tenure Effective
  - **July:** July
Clinical Non-Tenure Track Timeline

**Long Term Contract**
Required in the 5th Year

**Year 1**
- **July:** Appointment

Year 2

Year 3

Year 4

**Year 5**
- **Spring:** Prepare personal Statement and CV; Letters sought from clinical service chief and/or Division Director
- **June:** Department Chair Review

Year 6
- **Summer:** Dossier submitted to Office of Academic Administration (OAA)
- **Fall:** Review by Executive Associate Dean (EAD) for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development; Review by Dean and all other EADs

Year 7
- **July:** Contract effective

**Promotion**
Can be sought in any year

**Submission Year**
- **Winter:** Prepare CV and dossier
- **Spring:** Letters of evaluation sought
- **June:** Primary committee review; Department Chair review; Regional Center director review (if applicable)

**Promotion Effective**
- **July**

**Review Year**
- **Summer:** Dossier submitted to OAA
- **Fall:** IUSM Committee evaluation; Dean’s evaluation
- **Winter:** IUPUI Committee evaluation; IUPUI Dean of Faculties evaluation; IUPUI Chancellor evaluation
- **Spring:** Vice President’s Office (Bloomington) Trustees
Scientist/Research Professor Non-Tenure Track

- Assistant rank: Normally on one-year, renewable appointment subject to annual review by chair/director and assurance of funding

- Associate and senior ranks: May be appointed for up to 3 years depending on nature of research missions to which they are assigned, responsibilities, and funding prospects
Faculty on the tenure track can petition to stop the clock for which of the following reasons?

1. Childbirth
2. Adoption
3. Personal health problems
4. Change in research environment
5. All of the above
6. None of the above
Information on stopping the tenure clock

- [IUSM Family Leave Policy](#)
- [IUPUI Supplement to the Academic Handbook](#):
- Consultation with your Chair, [OFAPD](#), [IUSM Academic Administration](#), and/or [IUPUI Academic Affairs](#)
DOSSIER PREPARATION AND REVIEW
Dossier Components

- **Standardized IUPUI CV format**
  - *New format required beginning 2012-2013*
- Personal statement
- Peer assessment letters
  - External
  - Internal
- **Supporting Documentation**
Personal Statement

• What is the focus of my career?
• Why am I doing it? What problem, issue, or challenge am I addressing?
• How am I doing it (methods/strategies)?
• How well am I doing it? What outcomes show the impact of my work?
• What do I plan to accomplish in the future for this aspect of my career?
• What is the overall vision for my career?
Tips for dossier preparation

- Start early
- Document everything
  - Become familiar with guidelines
  - Meet with your department chair, primary committee chair, mentor
  - Review sample dossiers
  - Attend school and campus-wide P&T programs
Steps in Dossier Review

- **Department Committee**
  - Department chair
- **IUSM Committee**
  - Review by Non-dept member
  - Dean
- **IUPUI Committee**
  - Review by Non-SoM member
- **IUPUI Dean of Faculties**
- **IUPUI Chancellor**
- **IU Board of Trustees**
EXTERNAL LETTERS
External Letters

- Total of 6 required
- Provide suggestions to your administrator early
- Request must come from Chair, **not** from you directly
- Must be of rank you’re seeking or higher
- Must meet arm’s length criteria
- Slight difference between tenure and non-tenure tracks in what is considered external
Which of the following would meet the arm’s length criteria for external letters?

A. A candidate’s former mentor
B. A colleague who has coauthored numerous papers with the candidate
C. A collaborator on a grant that occurred less than 5 years ago
D. A collaborator on a grant that occurred greater than 5 years ago
E. All of the above
F. None of the above
Criteria Defining “Arm’s Length” or Independence of External Reviewers:
The relationship between the reviewer and the candidate should be as independent as possible. To qualify as “arm’s length” or independent, reviewers providing external assessment should have no personal or professional relationship with the candidate that would cause them to be vested in the candidate’s promotion. Specific examples of reviewers to avoid include (but are not limited to) former or current mentors, co-authors, or scholarly collaborators in the last five years. Exceptions can be made in the case of very large national clinical trials where multiple authors have a very distant relationship or in the case of serving on national research panels. The department chair needs to specifically make the case for including such a reviewer. If in doubt, please contact the Associate Dean of the Faculties. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that referees are objective and credible; persons closely associated with the candidate may not be as objective as those who are not personally associated.

http://medicine.iu.edu/administration/faculty-promotion-tenure-and-appointment-contract-dossiers/
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