

Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

“Tips for Faculty”

The SOM CAPT co-chairs from AY2022 would like to share a few thoughts regarding CAPT review of appointments, promotion, and tenure packets, informed by ideas highlighted at the Fall 2022 SOM Faculty Council meeting. It seems like committee work follows the 80/20 rule in that 80% of the committee effort is spent sorting out the issues with 20% of the cases!

The following are some recommendations and tips for faculty applying for senior level appointments and promotions from the CAPT.

- **Use the CWRU CV Template:** It may seem like extra work, but the standard [SOM template for a CV](#) provides information in a predictable and organized format that facilitates CAPT review.
 - Not following the standard is burdensome since sometimes we feel like we are on a “fishing expedition” to extract data for review.
 - Enumerating bullet items helps when summarizing data.
 - Having the faculty ORCID number or link to the candidate’s bibliography facilitates publication verification.
 - Organize activities (e.g. lectures, presentations, etc) by level of reputation (i.e. local, regional, national, international).
 - Utilize standard reporting format for grants (e.g. PI, co-I).

- **Organize your Teaching Portfolio:** There are published guidelines ([available in the Promotions Guidelines of the CWRU SOM Faculty Affairs page](#)) for the Teaching Portfolio that help the committee create an argument for teaching excellence.
 - The committee can miss important data if there is variance from guidelines, templates, and recommended sections.
 - The teaching portfolio should not simply be the teaching activities from the CV cut and pasted into a separate document. The portfolio should be used to outline scope and impact of teaching activities, including narrative description of most important teaching contributions and one’s teaching philosophy.
 - It helps the committee when the teaching documents are crafted such that regional versus national impact is clear.

- **Differentiate Scholarship**
 - Categorize productivity. Clearly segment invited, poster, podium, etc. presentations.
 - Place an asterisk next to the primary author if they are a mentee of the candidate.
 - If the faculty member is “in the middle,” and played a key role in this project, the CV should be annotated to include a description of the faculty’s unique contribution.
 - If you identify as a “team scientist” make this explicit and follow the additional guidelines for team scientist applicants.
 - For grants, clearly indicate the source and amount of funding; study title and period; name of the PI; and their role on the study; and % effort.
 - It helps if the level of local clinical service is clearly delineated from that which establishes a regional or national reputation in service.

- **Letters of reference**
 - Committee can only base decisions on objective evidence presented. Letters that are generic are not as strongly supportive as those where examples are provided.
 - It is challenging when a superb packet is absent the required number of arms-length letters – be thoughtful in selecting external referees. An external referee is someone with whom the candidate has not had a working relationship as colleague, collaborator, trainee, or student. Examples of what violates the arm’s length requirement can be found in the promotions guidelines on the [CWRU SOM Faculty Affairs Forms page](#). (Department chairs are a good resource when selecting external referees)
 - Very clearly define the collaboration at, say, the national level on a society committee.
 - Letters about teaching are very helpful, indeed.

- **Nomination Letter**
 - In particular for NTT -- the nominating letter should provide a clear statement of primary area of strength, and the data should support that primary strength.
 - Support for primary area of strength should specifically address the criteria for promotion. The most frequent reason for an unfavorable CAPT vote is lack of clear evidence for regional/national reputation commensurate with the desired academic rank.
 - It is perplexing to the committee when the secondary strength is outlined in more detail and is more compelling than the primary area of excellence.
 - For NTT faculty, the primary area of excellence should be clearly stated in the nomination letter, DCAPT letter, faculty’s personal statement, and faculty’s declared primary area of excellence. It should also be the SAME.