

FORM B FOR INSTRUCTIONAL TRACK FACULTY PROMOTIONS
-- which becomes a communication to the Regents --

PROMOTION RECOMMENDATION
 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN MEDICAL SCHOOL
 DEPARTMENT OF _____

Name: The three-page proposal from the department chair or unit director should begin with the candidate's name, present rank, and the proposed rank.

This paragraph includes *instructional titles only*, not adjunct, supplemental, primary research or professional/administrative titles. Please specify any joint instructional appointments the candidate may hold within the Medical School or other schools/colleges.

Academic Degrees: List these by degree, year, college with most current first:

M.D.	1983	Ohio State University
B.A.	1979	University of Michigan

Professional Record: Include all titles held at the University of Michigan and other universities, plus any other professional affiliations. The year and employment should be most current first.

Summary of Evaluation:

The proposal summary should include a strong supporting statement covering each point, in order, as outlined below:

Teaching:

1. Document *quantity* of teaching.

Refer to subjects taught rather than to course titles. In case of shared responsibility for courses, identify the proportion actually carried out by the candidate. Mention any teaching in other units of the university. Give the total number of hours of teaching per year. In documenting which persons the candidate has taught, include not only medical students but also other groups, such as house officers, fellows, graduate students, undergraduate students, students in other curricula, and participants in continuing education programs. Note guidance of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, particularly if in the role of chair of a doctoral committee.

2. Document *quality* of teaching.

Include description of any evaluation measurements used to assess the candidate's teaching performance, originality, and significance. Excellence can be documented by peer evaluations, student evaluations (include results produced by any systematic rating), awards, and/or invitations to teach at other institutions. Documentation of quality of teaching is essential and should include mention of the standards of the institution at which the teaching was performed.

3. Document *leadership and creativity* in teaching.

This category might include responsibility for coordinating the teaching of others, such as serving as a course director for a major course; work on curriculum or course development; or innovations in teaching techniques and materials, particularly if this has resulted in peer-reviewed publications, books, book chapters, or audiovisual materials.

Research:

Describe and evaluate the quality, originality, and significance of the candidate's research. The statement should be as complete as can be made in one paragraph. Include a description of work in progress. Scholarly activity includes, but is not limited to, laboratory research, clinical research, innovative contributions to the delivery of health care, and creativity in continuing medical education. Consider the following:

1. Level of competence and mastery exhibited in the field of research.
2. Productivity in initiation and completion of research.
3. Publications, which should be viewed not as an end in themselves but as a practical way of documenting the nominee's contributions. Comment in particular on the candidate's five most significant publications since his or her last promotion. For a multiauthor publication, it is often difficult to evaluate the contribution that each author has made to the final product. Therefore, if the nominee is an intermediate author of important publications, it is crucial that the chair identify the nominee's role in and contributions to these projects.
4. Ability to compete successfully for investigator-initiated, peer-reviewed external research funding.
5. Scholarly activity with structure, focus, continuity, and innovation.
6. Evidence of national recognition, which might include, but is not limited to
 - Service on study sections and councils.
 - Membership on editorial boards of journals.
 - Serving as an officer of national professional organizations.
 - Invitations to appear on national symposia, panels, or continuing-education programs.

Promotion recommendations must specifically highlight all current and past funding agencies and funding periods; dollar amounts may be included.

Recent and Significant Publications: List the five most significant publications of the candidate since his or her last promotion, in standard bibliographic format. Publications included among these five must be at least in press.

Service: In a paragraph, describe and evaluate the administrative and other service the candidate has performed for the department, within the Medical School, to other units within the University, to governmental and other outside groups, and to the profession as a whole.

- Effectiveness in attracting referrals
- Contribution to the prestige of the university, as evidenced by clinical publications, presentations, and memberships in regional and national societies.

Professional Work: Describe and evaluate the candidate's patient care responsibility. State where clinical activities take place (e.g., University Hospitals, Briarwood Health Center, Northville). Although excellent clinical care is the expected norm and truly outstanding performance may be difficult to document, the following factors are relevant:

- Area of unique clinical expertise
- Relationship to other clinical disciplines

External Review: Summarize the comments of all external peer reviewers. To maintain the confidentiality of the external peer reviewers, use designations "Reviewer A," "Reviewer B," etc. In choosing quotations from letters, look for sentences that will be clear to readers who are not specialists in the field. Comparisons with other scholars in the field and estimated rankings,

nationally and internationally, are especially helpful. Avoid references to the age of the candidate. Some *abbreviated* examples:

Reviewer A: “I can state with confidence that Dr. Healer would qualify for an equivalent position at <our institution>. . . . I have personally observed that she is a caring and gifted clinician and an enthusiastic, dedicated teacher for both medical students and house officers.”

Reviewer B: “Dr. Healer has already produced some noteworthy research on liver function. . . . Having two articles in the *Journal* is an outstanding accomplishment and a harbinger of things to come.”

Reviewer C: “In her cohort, Dr. Healer is in the top 10% of hepatologists nationwide. She has already demonstrated that she meets the requirements of the proposed position.”

Summary of Recommendation: Summarize in one persuasive four- or five-line paragraph the grounds for this recommendation, describing clearly the candidate’s role in the department. Please also indicate the candidate’s potential for a successful career in academic medicine, as applicable.

5/02