

DOSSIER TEMPLATE

TENURE, TENURE TRACK (Probationary), and ACADEMIC TRACK

NOTE: Departments should also include a separate pdf of the completed [Dossier Checklist](#), with a signature of the reviewer/submitter.

BOOKMARKS

1. [Cover Sheet](#) (*Tenure and Tenure Track (Probationary) faculty only*)
2. [7.12 Statement OR Academic Track Statement](#)
 - a. Faculty who were hired or tenured while an older 7.12 statement was in effect will have had the choice to elect which 7.12 statement they wish to use as the set of criteria for the review. Make certain to include the correct, approved 7.12 statement.
3. [Curriculum Vitae](#)
 - a. The candidate should use the standardized *University of Minnesota CV- Health Sciences* template generated in [Works](#), or the [Medical School Curriculum Vitae](#) template
4. [Candidate Narrative Statement](#)
5. [Teaching](#)
6. [External Reviews](#)
7. [Other Review Letters](#)
8. [Annual Reviews](#)
 - a. Tenure Track (Probationary) faculty only - Form 12s and SAFE forms
9. [Reports](#)
10. [Statements of Assurance](#)
11. [Supplementary Material](#)

Inserting bookmarks:

** Bookmarks must reflect what's listed above. Create sub-bookmarks within that particular section due to the amount of material. Sections are marked within the template that will need sub-bookmarks.

** Tutorial on how to create pdf bookmarks can be [found here](#).

1. COVER SHEET

- o For Tenure Track (Probationary) faculty and Tenured faculty only.

- o The department must fill in the candidate's information. The Medical School voting information and Dean's recommendation (college level committee) will be added by the Office of Faculty Affairs.
- o Cover sheets are updated each promotion cycle. Be sure to use the up-to-date versions that will be linked on the [Office of Faculty Affairs website](#) (update dates on the cover sheets to reflect the current promotion cycle until up-to-date versions of the cover sheets are posted to the website):
 - o [Cover Sheet 1](#) = Probationary to Tenured
 - o Assistant Professor to Associate Professor or Associate Probationary to Associated Tenured
 - o [Cover Sheet 2](#) = Promotion to Professor only (already tenured)
 - o Associate Professors with Tenure to Professor with Tenure

2. 7.12 STATEMENT or ACADEMIC TRACK STATEMENT

- o This section includes the candidate's respective track statement:
 - o [7.12 Statement](#):
 - o There is a 7.12 Statement for Tenure Track (Probationary) and Tenured faculty for each department in the Medical School. Be sure to include all three parts of the statement (e.g. Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3).
 - o [Academic Track Statement](#):
 - o There is one track statement for those on the Academic Track.
 - o **NOTE:** Faculty who were hired or tenured while an older track statement (7.12 or Academic Track statement) was in effect will have had the choice to elect which track statement they wish to use as the set of criteria for the review. Make certain to include the correct, approved track statement.
 - o If you're unsure of which version of the track statement the faculty member selected, please contact ms-ofa@umn.edu.

3. CURRICULUM VITAE

- o The candidate should use the standardized University of Minnesota CV- Health Sciences template generated in [Works](#), or the [Medical School Curriculum Vitae](#) template.
 - o Works CVs are accepted as is, but be sure that all data is being placed into Works for it to show on the generated CV.
 - o If the CV is put together manually, it must follow the Medical School Format. Formatting it in a different way will result in sending it back for correction.

- o **Important Information Regarding CVs:**

- o **Publications:**

- o The impact analytics grid (see below) is to be inserted manually into the generated Works CV. This is generated through [Manifold](#):

h-index	h(fl)-index*	Total Publications	First/Last Author Publications	Total Citations	First/Last Author Citations

*h(fl)-index is not applicable to faculty who work at affiliate locations

- o Manifold is a web-accessible interface that generates profiles and reports of research impact and scholarly output for faculty and departments in the University of Minnesota Medical School. [Visit their FAQ section](#) if you feel your profile is missing publications.
 - o Peer-reviewed publications must include:
 - o Impact Analytics Grid
 - o Candidate name (in bold)
 - o Journal impact factor (use [Web of Science](#))
 - Web of Science is easier to access through the [UMN Libraries](#) webpage utilizing X500 information.
 - o Number of times cited (use [Manifold](#), [Google Scholar](#), [Web of Science](#) – be sure to indicate where the citation count was found)
 - o Faculty member’s role in the publication
 - o All other publications must include:
 - o Faculty member’s role in multi-authored publications
 - o Things to note about publications:
 - o Publications at the current rank of the candidate are the only ones that need to be annotated.
 - o Faculty at affiliate sites can use Google Scholar to derive their metrics and notate it on their CVs.

- o Bibliography can also be in [APA style format](#), if you want to use a citation manager such as EndNote.

4. CANDIDATE NARRATIVE STATEMENT

- o The goal of the narrative statement is to provide a cohesive narrative about your contributions to the mission of the Medical School. It is also a way of highlighting your focus (your primary mission area), your accomplishments and their impact on your field, and your future plans into one statement. There are three audiences for your narrative statement: colleagues in your department, reviewers in the promotion process who are not in your field, and your colleagues outside the institution who are asked to provide an objective review of your career and accomplishments. This comprehensive statement should be 3-4 pages (absolute maximum of 4 pages). All areas must be addressed in the narrative statement but you should focus on the area of your greatest contributions.
- o **Narrative Statement Tips:**
 - o **Start early** – this is the most difficult part of your dossier!
 - o Colleagues not in your field will be reading this so **avoid abbreviations and jargon**.
 - o **Do not rehash what is in your CV** – the narrative statement puts the “story” behind your CV.
 - o **Highlight the connections between your research/educational/clinical scholarship activity and your other activities – clinical service and/or other service.**
 - o **It’s OK to explain gaps in time or things in your CV that may raise questions in the reviewers’ mind.** Don’t let them make up the story for you, BUT be careful to always present yourself in a positive light i.e. “...someone left and I did 34 weeks of call so I couldn’t publish anything in 2016” vs. “...there was an unexpected clinical need that I stepped in to help the Department meet. This delayed some key publications, but since 2016, I published three highly impactful manuscripts...”
 - o **Review** - ask colleagues/mentors/lay people to read and critique your statement.
 - o **You are promoted and/or awarded tenure on SCHOLARSHIP and EDUCATION - spend the most time on those sections.**
- o **We suggest the following outline:**
 - o **Introductory paragraph:** Give a broad overview of what your career(s) goal is/are. Provide an overview of your accomplishments to date and the impact they had on your field. Conclude the first paragraph with what you hope to accomplish and contribute to

the excellence of the University of Minnesota Medical School in your new rank. [about a third of a page]

o **Education/Teaching:** [label with this heading]

- o Estimate of the percentage (%) of time spent in teaching/instructional/education effort. Provide a sentence or two about your educational philosophy. Provide the reviewers a broad overview of what you teach, who you teach, the effectiveness and impact of your teaching. [A third to half a page.]
- o *If you are going for promotion (Academic Track) or promotion with tenure based on educational scholarship, this section should go first and be about $\frac{2}{3}$ of your statement.

o **Scholarly activity focus:** [research or education - label with this heading]

- o This should be about $\frac{2}{3}$ of the document. Estimate of the percentage (%) of time spent in research/scholarship efforts. Why do you study what you do? Provide a high-level review of your accomplishments and the impact you have made on your field. Pick 2-3 major accomplishments and elaborate on each. [Aim for two pages]

o **Service:** [label with this heading]

- o For clinicians, provide the reviewers an overview of your clinical scope of practice and an estimate of the percentage (%) of time you spend in clinical care. Include how your clinical practice connects to your research or educational efforts, if applicable. [Short paragraph < $\frac{1}{3}$ page.]
- o When writing about your other service, do not repeat what is in your CV. Estimate the percentage (%) of time you spend in discipline-related, professional, and University service. Write about what impact your service contributions has on the institution, state, profession, and state/general population. [Short paragraph < $\frac{1}{3}$ page.]

o **Concluding paragraph:**

- o Consider re-stating your career goals, accomplishments, and what you will provide to the University and Medical School in the future in your new rank. [Short paragraph < $\frac{1}{3}$ page]

5. TEACHING

NOTE: Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.

- o **Teaching Experience**

- o [Teaching Table](#) of undergraduate/graduate courses taught, including course number, title, brief description, quarter/semester, role, and number of students enrolled.

- o [Mentoring Training Table](#) of persons trained /mentored /advised in research, degree sought, role as advisor, and status of advisee at time of training. Include the current position of these individuals, if known.
- o **Teaching Effectiveness**
 - o Didactic lectures
 - o [Lecture Evaluation Summary](#) of formal teaching evaluations (student or peer) over time. Summarize the evaluations obtained through either Office of Assessment and Evaluation, Office of Medical Education, or Office of Measurement Services or other formal measurement tools for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. **NOTE:** Do not include any raw data.
 - o Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs) - attach a representative sample of SRTs (minimum of three). **NOTE:** This may not be applicable to all faculty. A minimum of three SRTs would be considered a representative sample.
 - o [Peer Reviews of Teachings \(PRTs\)](#) - **NOTE:** Minimum of three are required for those on the Academic and Tenure tracks
 - o A paragraph (up to 250 words) including evaluation comments may also be added.
 - o Clinical teaching
 - o Clinical clerkship (medical student or other student) evaluations
 - o GME - residents/fellows or trainees (summarize evaluations only, obtained directly from office of GME)
 - o Single lecture evaluations - any relevant evaluation you received
 - o [Peer Reviews of Teachings \(PRTs\)](#) - **NOTE:** Not required for clinical bedside teaching. If applicable and the candidate wants to include PRTs, then a minimum of three are needed.
 - o Informal teaching evaluations such as peer, student, and advisee letters. If including actual letters, indicate whether letters were solicited or unsolicited or are an established component of the department's process of evaluating teaching effectiveness.
 - o A list of honors/awards received for teaching effectiveness.

6. EXTERNAL REVIEW

NOTE: Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.

- o **Arm's length letters only** (external to the UMN; minimum of 4 / maximum of 9)
- o **Things to note:**

- o Faculty going up for promotion must not reach out to the reviewers. Candidates may supply a list of who to contact, but it's the department head and/or department administrator who will solicit that request.
- o Letters from reviewers who have a personal relationship with the candidate are not acceptable. Dossiers that do not meet these requirements will be returned to the department for amendment.
- o **The following criteria should be considered when identifying potential reviewers:**
 - o Reviewers need to have, or have had, a position within academia. Exceptions can include those who are NIH staff or international experts in niche areas. Any question regarding external reviewers can be directed to OFA.
 - o Review [Guidelines for Selecting Arm's Length Reviewers](#) for more information.
 - o Reviewers must be equal to the rank or above for which the candidate is being considered for promotion.
 - o Ability to provide an impartial and evaluative review of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments.
 - o Candidates should not be compared to faculty at the reviewer's institution.
 - o Contribution to achieving an overall balanced view of the candidate and to providing a range of perspectives.
- o **Dossier should include:**
 - o A numbered list of each letter requested in the following order ([see a sample list here](#)):
 - o Arm's Length Reviewers
 - o Letters Not Received
 - o Include the following information:
 - o Name, credentials, title, and affiliation of each reviewer contacted.
 - o A professional standing statement about each reviewer's qualifications
 - o A nature of relationship statement to the candidate.
 - o For 'Letters Not Received', include the name, credentials, title, and affiliation of the reviewer, plus the reason why the reviewer was unable to provide a letter. Professional standing and nature of relationship statements do not apply to letters not received.
 - o The following statements may be used to describe the relationship:

- o *I have never worked with, collaborated with or published with the reviewer, and have no personal or professional relationship with the reviewer.*
- o *I have only collaborated with the reviewer on multi-center clinical trials but do not know the reviewer personally or professionally.*
- o *I have met the reviewer at professional meetings but do not have a personal or professional relationship with the reviewer.*

- o For those reviewers who were contacted but did not provide a letter, explain why the request was not fulfilled.

- o A sample copy of the letter sent to potential reviewers soliciting an evaluation. Template letters are available on the [OFA website](#). Letters should specifically ask for an evaluation of clinical expertise and clinical reputation.
 - o If a faculty member has extended their “Maximum Period of Probationary Service” ([University Forms 1910](#)), a statement to that effect MUST be made in the request from the Department.

- o Arm’s length letters from reviewers external to the University of Minnesota.

7. OTHER REVIEW LETTERS

NOTE: *Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.*

- o **2 non-arm’s length letters of review** (external to the UMN; minimum of 2)
 - o Do not solicit more than two letters from reviewers with a professional relationship (non-arm’s length) to the candidate.
 - o Follow the guidelines for arm’s length external reviews (above)

- o The following statements may be used to describe the non-arm’s length relationship:
 - o *I have previously/currently worked on a grant review committee or professional society committee with the reviewer, but have no further personal or professional relationship with the reviewer. **
 - o *I have previously worked with the reviewer. ***
 - o *I have previously trained with the reviewer. ***
 - o *I have previously/currently collaborated with the reviewer. ***
 - o *I have previously/currently published with the reviewer. ***

- o *The reviewer has previously (or currently) serves/ served as a mentor. ***

** Depending on the circumstances, may count as one of the two letters where a professional relationship is present.*

*** Counts as one of the two letters where a professional relationship is present*

- o **2 internal letters of review** (internal to the UMN; minimum of 2)

- o **Things to note:**

- o “Arm’s-length” policies do not apply to internal letters.
- o All internal reviewers at or above candidate’s proposed rank
- o Request must be made by the Department Head or designated faculty member, not by staff.
 - o Consider soliciting some of these letters from faculty outside the department/college.

- o **Dossier should include:**

- o A numbered list of each letter requested in the following order (use the same format as the external reviewer list; [see a sample list here](#)):

- o Non-Arm’s Length Reviewers (external to the UMN; those with a Professional Relationship with the candidate)
 - o Include the following information:
 - Name, credentials, title, and affiliation of each reviewer contacted.
 - A professional standing statement about each reviewer’s qualifications
 - A nature of relationship statement to the candidate.
- o Internal Reviewers (internal to the UMN)
 - o Include the following information:
 - Name, credentials, title, and affiliation of each reviewer contacted.
 - A professional standing statement about each reviewer’s qualifications
 - A nature of relationship statement to the candidate.
- o Letters Not Received (those unable to provide a letter)
 - o Include the following information:
 - Name, credentials, title, and affiliation of each reviewer contacted.
 - Indicate the reason why the reviewer was unable to provide a letter.

- o Letters from reviewers in the order listed.

8. ANNUAL REVIEWS

NOTE: Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.

- o Tenure Track (Probationary) faculty only
 - o If your candidate is a faculty member at an affiliate location and they do not have annual reviews on file, please add a page noting that for the committee.
- o This section includes:
 - o [Form 12s](#) for each of the probationary years:
 - o The current year's review recommending promotion and/or tenure should be included in this section.
 - o The following statement can be used in the comments section of the Form 12:

"The Department of XXX recommends Dr. XXX for the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure."
 - o If applicable, attach "[Extension of Maximum Period of Probationary Service for Tenure Track Faculty](#)" form (University Form 1910) to Form 12 for extension years.
 - o [Summary of Annual Evaluation Forms \(SAFE\)](#) or Works annual review
 - o All forms must be in reverse chronological order (most recent to oldest)
- o If dossiers include annual reviews for faculty who are not on the tenure track (probationary), they will be returned to the department for removal.

9. REPORTS

NOTE: Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.

- o This section includes:
 - o [Departmental Report](#) – This report is prepared by the department head or designee and reviewed by faculty in appropriate rank and track, which states:
 - o Faculty's recommendation.
 - o References Record of Vote outcomes.
 - o Summary of the candidate's file.
 - o Summary of majority and minority views where appropriate.
 - o Signed and dated.

NOTE: The candidate may file a separate report if they believe their views are not adequately represented in the departmental report.

o **Record of Vote**

- o The department must include a department record of vote, signed and dated by the Department Head, with one vote taken for both the rank the candidate is seeking and (if applicable) the granting of tenure by voting-eligible faculty members.
- o If the granting of tenure is not applicable to the candidate, remove the mention of it from the record of vote form.
- o Departments should encourage a minimum of 50% eligible faculty to participate in the discussion and vote of the candidate.
- o If necessary, departments should update their ballots to include a section for optional comments and rationale from faculty members.
- o [Appointment of Non-Departmental Voting Members Template](#) must be submitted prior to the departmental vote if departments cannot meet the minimum number of faculty (5 faculty) to vote on a candidate. This form allows faculty from other departments to partake in another department's vote.
- o **Things to note:**
 - o There must be at least five (5) eligible faculty to review and vote on recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. Voting faculty must be at the same rank or higher as the proposed rank of the candidate, and only tenured faculty may vote on tenure-track/tenured faculty.
 - o Faculty members with dual appointments should include a copy of the memorandum of agreement (MOU) between the primary and secondary appointments. The secondary department does NOT provide a separate vote on the promotion of the faculty member.

o **Department Head Letter:**

- o The department head's personal recommendation.
- o Include a summary of majority and minority views where appropriate.
- o Include why he/she/they agreed or disagreed with the faculty vote, summary of candidate evaluations, etc.
- o Signed and dated

NOTE: This is separate from the departmental report.

10. STATEMENTS OF ASSURANCE

NOTE: Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.

- o These statements should be signed as the final step before submitting the dossier.
- o This section includes:
 - o [Departmental Statement of Assurance](#) signed by the department head indicating:
 - o The final dossier was made available to all who participated in the discussion and vote.
 - o The candidate was given an opportunity to review the contents of the dossier following addition of department and/or collegiate votes.
 - o Signed and dated by the department head.
 - o [Candidate's Statement of Assurance](#) signed and dated by the candidate. This indicates that the candidate:
 - o Has reviewed the contents of the dossier.
 - o Has had an opportunity to add materials or comments, properly identified, to the dossier.
- o **Things to note:**
 - o It is the responsibility of the candidate to review the results of the departmental vote before submitting their final dossier.
 - o Forms that are dated before the departmental recommendations (departmental statement of assurance, department head letter, department report, departmental vote) will be returned to the department for re-signature by the candidate.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

NOTE: *Sub-bookmarks needed for this section due to the amount of material.*

- o [A list of candidate-selected reprints.](#)
 - o The reprints selected should reflect the significant contribution(s) of the candidate.
 - o **NOTE:** In the case of multiple authorships, the contribution of the candidate to the project must be clearly established and reported within the CV.
- o **Three (3) reprints should be included in the pdf dossier, and bookmarked** (e.g. Reprint 1, Reprint 2, and Reprint 3).
- o Other relevant information included by the candidate, but not required by the college.