



**2021 – 2022 UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RANK AND TENURE
Best Practices**

I. Mentoring

1. Mentoring is an important part of the development of both tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty. There should be a mentoring plan for each faculty member which guides the candidate toward rank and/or tenure and the candidate should receive feedback from their mentor and/or Chair.
 2. Chairs, Deans, and senior faculty members should mentor junior faculty in all areas, including service.
 3. Chairs and Deans should be mindful not to burden individual faculty, particularly those on the tenure track, with too much committee work.
 4. Candidates should be mentored to do community service and to include a list of such service in their dossier.
 5. When candidates have demanding clinician duties, there is a need to mentor the candidate to develop lines of inquiry in which the candidate can contribute to original research.
 6. Non-tenure-track faculty need clarity from their deans as to what they need to do for promotion.
-

II. Letter Writers

1. A clear and evaluative conclusion should be made in regard to candidate's performance on **each facet of performance** (i.e., teaching, research, service, clinical) as it pertains to the application for rank and/or tenure.
2. A clear and evaluative conclusion should be made in regard to the candidate's **overall performance** for the granting of tenure and/or promotion.
3. Chairs' and Deans' letters should explain expectations of the particular clinician-educator duties and explain why someone who is clinician-educator has no clinical site.
4. Deans should explain why a candidate was put on the TT or NTT initially since this is not always clear and yet can make a difference to the faculty member and the department.
5. Deans should explain if a candidate's chair letter comes from someone other than the current academic department chair.
6. Letter writers should explain the impact of the candidate's scholarship and whether, per Boyer's scholarship of application, the candidate's scholarship should not be measured by more traditional measures such as impact factor.
7. It is important for the chairs, deans, and school/college committees to articulate how teaching was assessed and what standards were applied in the judgment of the quality of the teaching and scholarship for the clinician-educator in order to help UCRT evaluate the quality of the

candidate's contributions. The Department of Medicine has a metric for quality and chairs could use something similar.

8. Departmental letter writers should clearly discuss and identify any agreements made in regard to receiving credit for contributions at past institutions. This includes, but is not limited to, agreements regarding tenure timeline and other unique circumstances.
 9. Reviewers should have the department or school/college guidelines and should address them in their letter.
 10. Requests from the dean's office should direct letter writers to speak to the relevant rank and/or tenure requirements.
 11. Any shifts in the candidate's duties should be made clear, especially for candidates in administrative roles, and especially if it is a change from what was written in the original contract.
 12. Dean's choice letters should be marked on the document or clearly identified within the candidate's file.
 13. In cases when deans cannot get external letter writers, deans should include an explanation.
-

III. Committees

1. College and school committee members should sign the committee letters.
2. Letters should articulate the rationale for the vote.
3. Committee letters should include actual committee votes with numbers (not just "unanimous").
4. Committee members should recuse themselves if they are letter writers for or co-authors with the candidate.
5. All committee members must be accounted for in the final committee vote. The only four acceptable responses are yes, no, recuse, or absent.
6. Each school should have a checklist of materials to be included in the dossier.
7. A list of committee members from each college or school should be included in each college rank and tenure committee letter written.
8. Exemplars for CV and Faculty Profiles should be available for candidates.

IV. UCR&T

1. The Committee may consider developing guidelines for Chairs, Deans and Schools.
 2. If the clock was stopped (e.g., due to Covid-19), this should be included in UCRT archives, but not necessarily explained (because the reasons may be confidential).
 3. UCRT should make candidates aware of the different deadlines relative to the college/school since often colleges/schools have earlier deadlines than the University.
-

V. Dossiers

1. Candidate CV should be formatted to be consistent with the Faculty Handbook.
2. CVs should not include manuscripts not yet accepted in the publications section, although it is proper to list "works in progress" as they are labeled as such.

3. When describing contributions, candidates should match their contributions to the standards to show how they fulfill the standards.
 4. Candidates should make their case in the Faculty Profile and address any weaknesses.
 5. The suggested length for the Faculty Profile is no more than 6 pages, although sometimes longer is needed.
 6. Faculty Profiles should not repeat the information provided in the CV.
 7. Faculty contributions to multi-authored publications should be made explicit.
 8. Any charts representing something like a candidate's teaching should indicate who compiled the chart and the date it was compiled.
 9. Faculty profiles should be written in first person so the authorship is clear.
 10. In the Faculty Profile, candidates should clearly discuss and identify any agreements made in regard to receiving credit for contributions at past institutions. This includes, but is not limited to, agreements regarding tenure timeline and other unique circumstances.
 11. The candidate should include both external and internal letters.
 12. The candidate should seek letters from those with the rank for which the candidate applies.
 13. Candidates should abide by the Faculty Handbook and have the minimum 6 letters.
 14. A complete list should be included in each dossier of the contacts from whom a letter request was sent in each of the possible categories (i.e., dean's letter requests, peer letter requests, student letter requests).
 15. While 2 external letters are the minimum for a dossier, additional external letter writers are helpful, especially in applications to Professor when impact of scholarship should be addressed.
 16. The Faculty Handbook does not indicate a minimum of internal letters, but candidates should include some internal letters especially for tenure applications.
 17. The letters from the various category of letter writers (e.g., deans, peer reviewer) should be clearly marked in the dossier and identified in the appropriately labeled folder.
 18. Consistency in forms and process across the various colleges is recommended.
-

VI. Standards

1. There is a need for clarity regarding what is considered a normal or standard amount of teaching for clinician-educator (e.g., bedside, medical students, fellows, residents) and how teaching is assessed and determined to be effective, or not.
 2. There should be clarity as to what counts as service, and whether service to Creighton is required in addition to service at a clinical site such as a hospital.
 3. Standards should allow for moving beyond student evaluations as the sole form of evidence of teaching effectiveness.
-

Members: Amy A. Abbott, Mary Ann Danielson, M. Lance Frazier, Frederick Hanna, Nancy D. Hanson, Anthony E. Kincaid, Paul E. McGreal, Lee E. Morrow, Jennifer Moss Breen Kuzelka, Barbara J. O'Kane, Mardell A. Wilson (*ex officio*)

Respectfully submitted,
M. Lance Frazier, Secretary, University Committee on Rank & Tenure