



**2022– 2023 UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RANK AND TENURE
Best Practices**

- **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 helps guide the candidate in developing their dossier for rank and/or tenure. The candidate should receive feedback from their mentor and/or Chair on a regular basis, no less frequent than annually . (i.e., when to apply for rank/tenure; what to include in the portfolio; what not to include in the portfolio).
 2. Chairs and Deans should be mindful not to burden individual faculty, particularly those on the tenure track, with insignificant or non-essential committee work.
 3. Candidates should be encouraged to contribute to community service and to include a list of such service in their dossier.
 4. When candidates have significant clinical duties, there can be a need for mentoring and collaboration to help them develop their research and to establish an independent line of inquiry.
 5. Non-tenure track faculty need guidance from their deans as to what they need to do for promotion.
-

- **Letter Writers**

1. A clear and evaluative conclusion (support or not support) should be made with regard to a 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 with regard to the candidate's **overall performance** for the granting of tenure and/or promotion.
3. Letters written by Chairs and Deans should explain the expectations of the particular clinician-educator duties, and explain why someone who is clinician-educator has no clinical site, if this is the case.
4. Deans should explain why a candidate was put on the TT or NTT initially, since this is not always clear and 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 if it is not obvious using traditional metrics (i.e. impact factor, citations, grants, invitations to speak at institutions or professional meetings).
7. It is important for Chairs, Deans, and school/college rank and tenure committees to articulate how teaching was assessed and what standards were applied their analysis of teaching

effectiveness. Guidance from school/college R&T committees is especially important in evaluating the effectiveness of clinicians. The Department of Medicine has a metric for quality and chairs could use something similar.

8. Any agreement or promise made by administrators at the time of hiring (Dean or Chair) with regard to time granted towards promotion or tenure should be included in the dossier. This includes, but is not limited to, agreements regarding the 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 changes in the candidate's duties should be made clear, especially for candidates in administrative roles.
 12. "Dean's-choice" letters should be marked on the document or clearly identified within the candidate's file.
 13. In cases when a Dean cannot get external letter writers, they should include an explanation and provide guidance.
-

- **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. The college and school rank and tenure committee should provide clarity on recusals throughout the process. A list of committee members from each college or school should be included in each college rank and tenure committee letter written.
5. Committee members should recuse themselves if they are letter writers for, or co-authors with, the candidate, or if there is the appearance of a conflict of interest or lack of objectivity.
6. All committee members must be accounted for in the final committee vote. The only four acceptable responses are yes, no, recuse, or absent. The committee letter will reflect committee membership, the date the meeting was held, and clearly state the vote (scores, recusals, members absent, present on that date).
7. Each school should have a checklist of materials to be included in the dossier.
8. Exemplars for CV and Faculty Profiles should be available for candidates.

- **UCR&T**

1. The Committee may consider developing guidelines for Chairs, Deans and Schools.
 2. If the tenure 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.
-

- **Dossiers**

- 1. Curriculum Vita**

- a. Every candidate's CV should be formatted to be consistent with the Faculty Handbook.
- b. CVs should not include manuscripts not yet accepted in the publications section. Candidates should include a separate section in their curriculum vita for manuscripts that are: 1. Published, 2. Under review or 3. Works in progress.
- c. Candidate should list all authors in citations (i.e. as done through APA, MLA, and other standard journal citations).

- 2. Faculty Profile**

- a. Candidates should use the Faculty Profile as an opportunity to provide details and expand their narrative with regard to their teaching, research, and scholarship. They should not restate the information provided in their CV. They should also use the Profile to explain any extenuating circumstances that affected their ability to carry out their job responsibilities, if applicable.
- b. The length for the Faculty Profile should be no more than 6 pages.
- c. Faculty profiles should be written in first person so authorship is clear.
- d. 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. This information should match what was included by the Dean or Chair.
- e. Faculty contributions to multi-authored publications should be made explicit.
- f. The Faculty Profile should directly address their performance against the rank and tenure guidelines. The Faculty Profile should be less of a 'story' and more direct in illustrating how the candidate meets the criteria and why the candidate has earned tenure and/or promotion.

- 3. Teaching**

- a. Any charts representing something like a candidate's teaching should indicate who compiled the chart and the date it was compiled.
- b. Candidates should list IDEA scores by course – one folder per course that includes all years the course was taught by the faculty member.

- 4. Letters of Support**

- a. The candidate should include both external and internal letters.
- b. The candidate should only seek letters from those at the rank for which the candidate applies, or a higher rank.
- c. Candidates should abide by the Faculty Handbook and have the minimum 6 letters.
- d. 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).

- e. While 2 external letters are the minimum for a dossier, additional external letter writers are helpful, especially in applications for promotion to Professor when impact of scholarship should be addressed.
- f. 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.
- g. Candidates should choose letter writers carefully, with focus on balance between internal and external references. Candidates should also avoid choosing letter writers who have a conflict of interest (i.e. friend, dissertation chair).

5. Preparation of Dossier Schools and Colleges

- a. Consistency in forms and process across the various colleges is recommended.
-

- **Standards**

1. Provide clarity regarding what is considered a normal teaching load or standard amount of teaching for each faculty category, including clinician-educator (e.g., bedside, medical students, fellows, residents) and how teaching is assessed and evaluated.
 2. There should be clear explanations 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. This is something that has been addressed previously (i.e. the need for peer evaluations or evaluations by equivalent faculty at other institutions).
 4. College and/or department standards should be applied consistently in each category and for each candidate.
 5. Standards need clarity in each school/college – i.e. confusion around “meet majority” vs. “meet all” criteria in each category and subsequent category.
-

Members: Amy A. Abbott, Amy Arouni, Erin Averett, Mary Ann Danielson, M. Lance Frazier, Anthony E. Kincaid, Paul E. McGreal, Lee E. Morrow, Jennifer Moss Breen Kuzelka, Barbara J. O’Kane, Mardell A. Wilson (*ex officio*)

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Moss Breen Kuzelka, Secretary, University Committee on Rank & Tenure