

**2025-2026: CWRU SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
PROMOTION AND TENURE
GUIDELINES, PROCESS, AND PROCEDURES
FOR NOMINATING FULL-TIME FACULTY
FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TENURE
TRACK, PROFESSOR (TENURED) AND/OR AWARD OF TENURE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

I.	Timeline	2
II.	Review by the Department or MetroHealth CAPT.....	3
III.	Research Focused Faculty - Independent Scientist and/or Team Scientist?	4
IV.	Application materials to be forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Office.....	5
A.	Current CV	5
B.	Self-description	5
C.	Department CAPT Review	5
D.	Chair’s Nominating Letter	5
E.	List of External Referees	6
F.	List of Collaborators/Mentors/Colleagues	8
G.	List of Faculty Teaching Referees	8
H.	List of Student and Trainee Referees (current/former trainees).....	8
I.	List of Service Referees	8
J.	Teaching Evaluations Collected by the Department	8
K.	Updating Materials	9
V.	Teaching Portfolio	10
VI.	Format for Curriculum Vitae and Bibliography	12
VII.	Candidate Consent for Higher Review	13
VIII.	Self-Initiation	13
IX.	Checklist of Materials for Faculty Promotion 2025-2026.....	14
X.	E-version Instructions	16

I. Timeline

The process of promotion to associate professor tenure track, professor (tenured), and/or the award of tenure, begins in the spring of 2025 for promotion and/or tenure that is to be effective July 1, 2026.

January - March 2025: Department/system committees on appointments, promotion and tenure (CAPT's) review their candidates.

March 31, 2025: Faculty Candidate must submit a Declaration of Candidacy for Senior Level Promotion or the Award of Tenure to Faculty Affairs if they wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure effective July 1, 2026.

April 28, 2025: Department recommendations for promotion and tenure, with all materials, are due in the Faculty Affairs Office. Of particular importance are **complete referee lists, with current email addresses, and for external referees only, please include NIH data sheets/biosketches or the first 3 pages only of the CV.**

May 2025: The Faculty Affairs Office reviews materials and confirms receipt with department chairs and the administrator through an email. The department will be notified if there are any errors or omissions.

June – August 2025: The Faculty Affairs office solicits letters of reference and receives replies.

September - December 2025: The School of Medicine Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (“CAPT”) reviews candidates’ files.

October 2024 - January 2026: Faculty Council Steering Committee reviews the faculty CAPT recommendations for matters of equity.

November 2024 - January 2026: The dean reviews each candidate’s materials, adds his recommendation, and the Faculty Affairs Office forwards the materials and recommendation to the provost.

January – June 2026: The provost, with the assistance of an advisory panel for certain promotions, reviews each candidate’s materials, finalizes his recommendations, and forwards the files to the president for his review.

February-March 2026: Department Chairs receive copies of the SOM CAPT reviews and are notified of the Dean’s recommendations for promotion candidates in their department.

June 2026: The president presents final recommendations to the university Board of Trustees. The board takes formal action on the nominations.

July 1, 2026: The promotions and awards of tenure approved by the board become effective.

II. Review by the Department or MetroHealth CAPT

The department, or MetroHealth promotions committee shall review senior level promotion and tenure candidates. The committee should review, at a minimum, the candidate’s current CV, recent annual faculty activity summary forms, self-description (identifying the candidate’s area of excellence if on the non-tenure track), teaching evaluations, and any other materials it considers relevant. The department chair should always have the opportunity to meet with the committee, and s/he may invite the candidate’s division director or research mentor, as appropriate and if applicable, to appear before the committee to advocate on behalf of the candidate, to answer the committee’s questions, etc. The committee chair shall

_____ forward **ALL** (both positive and negative) department committee promotion and tenure recommendations to the Faculty Affairs Office.

**All VA based faculty will reviewed by the UH DCAPT where their primary faculty appointment resides.*

The medical school's CAPT, the dean, the provost, and the president will review all *affirmative* department committee recommendations. Such full higher review will also be accorded only at 3-year intervals, as described in the Faculty Handbook to: (a) negative department committee recommendations on mandatory tenure (*i.e.*, where the candidate is in his/her final pretenure year or was not awarded tenure following a previous full higher review for tenure) (b) all self-initiated promotions and tenure considerations proposed by (i) non-tenure track faculty members seeking promotion, (ii) tenured associate professors seeking promotion, and (iii) tenure-track faculty members seeking tenure (with or without promotion); and (c) all self-initiated promotion and/or tenure considerations made after receipt of notice of non-renewal (as described in the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 3, Part One, I.,I. 5. a-b.).

Department CAPT Report: The department, or MetroHealth, promotions committee written report must reflect the committee's discussion, pro and con, and include a numerical vote on the nomination(s). If the vote is not unanimous, the report should explain the basis for the divide.

Committee reports which are cursory or summary in nature will be returned for a more complete and detailed review. The report must be signed by the committee chair, must include the date of the committee meeting, and must take care to be explicit regarding each candidate's status as either 1) on the tenure track, 2) tenured, or 3) on the non-tenure track.

Voting: Members of the committee are eligible to vote on appointments and promotions only to ranks that are equal to or below their own. That is, associate professors may not vote on promotions to the rank of professor and assistant professors may not vote on promotions to the rank of associate professor or professor. **Only committee members who are tenured may vote on a proposed award of tenure.** If an individual is a candidate for both promotion and award of tenure, separate votes must be taken on each. All members of the committee, regardless of rank or tenure status, however, may participate in discussion regarding all candidates. Voting should be by secret ballot. An affirmative recommendation requires a majority vote, *i.e.*, an evenly split committee vote is not affirmative. Abstentions: Abstentions should be rare. An abstention is recorded only for an *eligible* voter who participates in the deliberations but in the end declines to vote affirmatively or negatively. **The Provost will count abstentions in the total; therefore, an abstention has the effect of a negative vote.** Do not record an abstention for a member who does not vote because of a conflict of interests or a member that is ineligible to vote because of rank or tenure status.

Confidentiality and notification: Committee deliberations and votes are confidential and must not be discussed outside the committee with anyone, especially the candidates. The department chair, however, should communicate the result of the vote promptly to the candidate and, while preserving the confidentiality of individual committee members' votes, counsel the candidate on the basis of any substantive remarks made by the committee. The department chair may call on the chair of the department's CAPT to assist in carrying out this responsibility.

III. Research Focused Faculty - Independent Scientist and/or Team Scientist?

All research focused candidates, whether in the tenure track, already tenured, or in the non-tenure track, with a primary area of excellence for the purpose of promotion in research, must assist the School of Medicine's CAPT and subsequent reviewers to appreciate their research accomplishments by identifying themselves as primarily an independent scientist, a team scientist, or as both.

A typical independent scientist is one who has been awarded or aspires to be awarded federal, foundation, or other extramural funding as Principal Investigator with the greater portion of their research program, publications, and national reputation resting on work derived from research projects for which they have been the major driver. A typical example would be a principal investigator with extramural support awarded through a competitive peer-reviewed process from a federal (e.g., NIH R01, PI on a major component of a program project, VA Merit award) or foundation source who publishes results as first or senior author along with graduate students and other junior scientists.

Typical team scientists are those for whom the greater portion of their research accomplishments, publications, and national reputation rest on original, creative, indispensable, and unique contributions made either a) in conjunction with a group of other scientists or b) with a changing series of groups of other scientists. A team scientist may play the same or different roles within each team. A successful team scientist will be able to document national recognition for the research area, approach, technique or theme that characterizes his or her work through such means as study section memberships, invited presentations, editorial positions on boards of peer review journals, national awards for such work, etc.

A significant portion of a candidate's contributions may be made both as an independent and a team scientist, in which case the candidate should identify himself or herself as both types.

Those who identify themselves as Team Scientists or as Both Team and Independent Scientists are required to supplement the materials described in sections IV through VII of this document as follows:

- a. Team candidates' personal statements should include a detailed description of the type or types of contributions they have made to the team or teams of which they are a part and describe the type of team scientist they believe themselves to be;
- b. Team candidates must annotate each team publication and team grant on their CV to indicate the precise role and the nature and extent of the contribution they made to that publication or research;
- c. At least two of the four collaborators/mentors/colleagues selected (see IV. F. below) to write on behalf of the candidate should be identified as a Team Colleague, and one of these should be the team's leader. Such referees will be explicitly asked to address the question of the candidate's contributions to team science;
- d. Team candidates should keep this status in mind when identifying their external referees.

IV. Application Materials to be Forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Office

The department chair (as assisted by a department administrator) is responsible for providing full and detailed information on the candidate's activities to the Faculty Affairs Office so that it can be provided to the School of Medicine CAPT. Incomplete dossiers are potentially detrimental to the candidate.

- A. Current CV, dated, following the format adopted by the faculty (see page 11). Research support should be listed in the CV and include identifying NIH grant number(s), if any, or may be listed separately as an addendum to the CV. **The CV must accurately list the candidate's CWRU faculty appointment, promotions, and effective dates (see Section VI for details).**
- B. Professional self-description. Candidates are required to provide a narrative professional self-description (three pages or less) in which they highlight their major accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching, or service and comment on relevant matters not discernible from the CV (e.g., specific role within a research team; research theme in grants/articles not easily recognized by those without intimate knowledge of the field; importance to the department/school/hospital of teaching or service activity, etc.). **Team scientists and Individual and Team scientists should be certain to explain the precise nature and extent of their contributions.** If a document exceeds this limit, it will be rejected and if a satisfactory document isn't received in its place only the first 3 pages of the original submission will be included in the promotion packet.
- C. The department or MetroHealth promotions committee's report. See page 3.
- D. Chair's nominating letter. The nominating letter represents the chair's opportunity to advocate on behalf of the candidate. Along with the candidate's CV and external letters of reference, the nominating letter is of the most critical importance. A chair, hoping to strongly advocate for a candidate, should explain the candidate's past, current, and future role in the department or school, how the candidate helps fulfill departmental or institutional goals, and what curricular, research, or clinical directions the candidate is pursuing. The chair's nominating letter must be dated and signed by its author.

Candidates in the **tenure track** are, by definition, primarily engaged in research activity. The department CAPT and department chair's nominating letter should focus primarily on this aspect of the candidate's record.

For candidates in the tenure track, and those in the non-tenure track that identify research as their primary area of strength, the Chair's nominating letter must specify whether the candidate is seeking tenure/promotion as an independent scientist, as a team scientist, or as both an independent and team scientist.

If applicable, the candidate's hospital director, division chief, and the chair of a department where the candidate holds a secondary appointment, should provide assessments of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or the award of tenure. It is the responsibility of the primary department chair to obtain such letters.

- E. Chair's nominating letter from the secondary department. If interested in promotion in the candidate's secondary department, a nomination letter(s) from chair(s) of department(s) where the candidate holds secondary appointment(s) must be included in the promotion application. The secondary department chair's letter must include the secondary DCAPT's recommendation and vote (in favor, against, and abstain).
- F. List of external referees. The letters received from external referees are of paramount importance. External referees should be carefully selected in order to provide an objective, detailed assessment of the candidate's work and scholarly contributions. **An external referee is someone with whom the candidate has not had a working relationship as colleague, collaborator, trainee, or student. Professionals within the same discipline might be acquainted with a candidate and still be classified as external referee if they are "arm's length" referees whose knowledge of the**

candidate comes from their awareness and understanding of the candidate's work through publication, presentation, or even personal exchange, so long as that personal exchange is not in the context of a mentor, boss, co- worker, etc. Arm's length does not mean that the referee must never have met or heard of the candidate, but it does mean that referees should not be those who are likely, or perceived to be likely, to be predisposed, positively or negatively, about the candidate. Referees should be from outside the University, but preferably not outside the academy. External referees are expected to provide an objective assessment of the candidate's accomplishments, and comment on the impact of the candidate's work on their field.

Examples of what may violate the arm's length requirement include:

- Serving as the candidate's doctoral or postdoctoral supervisor
- Being supervised by the candidate (e.g. as a former mentee, trainee, or student)
- Serving as supervisor of the candidate (e.g., in an employment relationship)
- Having a close familial/friend relationship with the candidate
- Being a former departmental colleague (or school colleague for schools that do not have a departmental structure) within the past seven years. Visiting faculty members are considered colleagues for the purpose of this restriction.
- Having a close research collaboration with the candidate within the past seven years, or actively planning to collaborate with the candidate. (See exception for team-science interactions noted below.)
- Coauthoring with the candidate within the past seven years, or actively planning to coauthor with the candidate. (See exception for team-science interactions noted below.)
- Having received compensation from or on behalf of the candidate

Examples of what does not violate the arm's length requirement include:

- Having conversation(s) with the candidate at a conference
- Participating on a panel or a committee with the candidate
- Inviting the candidate to present a paper at a conference organized by the referee, or to write a chapter in a book edited by the referee
- Presenting a guest lecture or seminar at the university of the referee
- Reviewing for publication a manuscript authored/coauthored by the candidate
- Participating in team-science¹ research, and/or coauthoring publications based on team-science research, provided that the referee certifies that there is significant distance within the team (no or very little direct interaction) between the referee and the candidate.

Faculty with a current CWRU appointment cannot be an external referee (*including faculty based at MHMC, UH, and the VA*).

¹ For the purpose of this restriction, "team science" is defined as collaborative effort of seven or more individuals, addressing a scientific challenge through leveraging the expertise of researchers from different fields.

The Provost prefers all external letters to be authored by those at the level of professor. External evaluators for candidates for promotion to professor must be at the academic rank of professor or equivalent. External referees for candidates for promotion to associate professor must be at the academic rank of associate professor, professor, or equivalent.

To meet the Provost's requirement that external referees be identified by more than one person, we ask that the candidate select nine of the external referees and the chair select the other nine. The list of external referees provided to the Faculty Affairs Office should indicate whether the candidate or the chair named that particular candidate; we will compare the lists for duplication. The candidate and the chair are responsible for making sure that their selections meet the definition of "external referee" above. (Please complete and submit the External Reviewer List in the excel template). The specific numbers of external and other types of referees required are indicated below.

The selection of external referees should be made with the requirements for the candidate's recognition in mind. Tenure track candidates must demonstrate national or international recognition for their research accomplishments. Non-tenure track candidates for promotion to associate professor must provide evidence of recognition at least at the regional level if their primary strength is teaching or professional service and at the national level if their primary strength is in research. All candidates for promotion to professor in the non-tenure track must provide evidence of recognition at the national or international level. **Team scientists should select external referees with particular care and consider including external referees who are themselves team scientists. These referees will be explicitly asked to address the question of the candidate's contributions to team science.**

The Provost's office requires that a biographical sketch be provided for each external referee. **Please note that only an NIH data sheet/biosketch or the first 3 pages of the referee's CV will be accepted.** The purpose of the biographical information is to help file reviewers discern the candidate's independence from the evaluator and the evaluator's qualifications to assess the candidate's accomplishments. Biographical information that includes the reviewer's credentials and appointment history can often be found on a university website or similar source. If an evaluator submits a full-length CV, only the pages that convey the author's credentials and appointment history, often the first 1-3 pages, should be enclosed with the file. Responsibility for collecting the referees' biographical information might be delegated to the candidate's department to minimize the magnitude of the task on any one staff person. The professional biosketch should not be a paragraph retyped from the website.

The Faculty Affairs Office will solicit all letters of reference after reviewing the referee lists and materials submitted. The promotion or tenure review is confidential. A sentence included in letters to external reviewers and individual teaching evaluators promises that their responses will be held confidential to the extent permitted by law.

The list of those asked to write letters or teaching evaluations is selected by the dean from those suggested by the candidate and the department chair, but the composition of the final list is intended to encourage a balanced list of potential referees and to discourage a candidate or colleagues from approaching or attempting to influence potential evaluators. **Correspondence or other contact with evaluators is to be conducted only by the dean or other person charged with responsibility for managing the review process. Discussion of the case at all levels is confidential, and not shared with the candidate or others outside the review process.**

The Faculty Affairs Office will ask referees to email their letters directly back to the Faculty Affairs Office. A complete list of eighteen referees, with at least nine selected by the candidate and at least nine selected by the chair, should be included in the candidate's promotion packet.

Teaching or professional service activity at the regional or national level should be well documented by external referees to the extent possible. Because it is essential that the CAPT be able to assess the independence of a candidate's scholarly efforts, letters in support of faculty extensively involved in collaborative research, such as center and program projects, should delineate specifically the candidate's role and contributions.

- G. Letters from research collaborators (for team scientists only): These letters are intended to elucidate the candidate's role in collaborative research projects or other cooperative efforts. Candidates may omit names in this category if they have not participated in collaborative projects likely to be significant factors for promotion or award of tenure. Up to four referees, selected with advice from the candidate's department chair, may be provided. These letters may **not** substitute for letters from external referees. Team scientists must designate at least two of these four referees as team science referees. These referees will be asked, along with their general evaluation, to comment explicitly on the candidate's contributions in the team context.
- H. Faculty teaching referees: The chair and candidate will provide names of a maximum of four faculty colleagues who are able to comment on the quality and quantity of the candidate's teaching activities. These evaluators might include curriculum coordinators, course directors, clerkship directors and residency directors, i.e., colleagues who have knowledge of the candidate's teaching through supervising or observing the candidate's teaching or experiencing the results of the candidate's teaching through contact with the candidate's former trainees.
- I. Student and Trainee referees (current or former): The department will provide names and email addresses for a maximum of 10 students, graduate students, residents and/or post-doctoral fellows. For candidates who teach residents, chief residents for the past three years should be asked to comment in addition to the maximum of 10 mentioned above. (Please complete and submit the Student Referee List in the excel template)
- J. Service Referees: The department may provide names and email addresses for a maximum of up to four referees who can speak to the candidate's role in providing institutional or professional administrative service. Service referees will be asked to provide a description of the activities involved, the effectiveness of service relative to others who have performed similar duties, the amount of time devoted to service on a regular basis, the number of years served, whether the candidate's selection for participation in the service activity was the result of a competitive selection process, and whether this type of service might be considered especially time-consuming, difficult, or demanding.
- K. Teaching evaluations collected by the department (**required for ALL promotion candidates**). All available current and past formal student and course evaluations for the previous three years should be provided. Formal evaluations are a particularly important resource for the CAPT's review and are often found to be much more persuasive than letters from former students and others.
- L. The Provost requires a summary of the course evaluations prepared by the department chair, curriculum director, or other appropriate person. The summary may include information regarding the type of learner, details regarding the teaching setting, and how these evaluations

compare to other faculty in the department. This summary is generally between a paragraph to one page

- M. Reprints. Candidates are welcome to submit up to 5 key reprints. Publications such as peer-reviewed articles and individual book chapters are highly recommended. Case reviews, article/literature reviews, and editorials are acceptable. Abstracts, poster presentations, and entire books will not be accepted. Please note that the CAPT prioritizes the impact of your work over the reprints themselves. If you have questions, please contact facaffrs@case.edu.
- N. Updating materials. Chairs are urged to provide the Faculty Affairs Office with relevant updated information (*e.g.*, acceptance of submitted publications, awards of grants, *etc.*) throughout the process so that it can be added to the file to support the candidate's nomination.

V. Teaching Portfolio

All candidates should present a teaching portfolio to enable better evaluation of the quantity and quality of their teaching contributions. **Promotion candidates in the non-tenure track with teaching (rather than research or professional service) as their primary area of excellence for promotion, are required to use the following outline for preparing materials for review.** Their portfolios along with their CV and personal statements will be sent to external referees for their review and comment. Teaching Portfolios may not exceed 25 pages. If a document exceeds this limit, it will be rejected and if a satisfactory document isn't received in its place only the first 25 pages of the original submission will be included in the promotion packet. Teaching evaluations (required for all promotion candidates) do not count towards the 25 page limit in the Teaching Portfolio.

Tenure track candidates and non-tenure track candidates with primary strength in research or professional service are encouraged, but are not required, to submit a Teaching Portfolio.

- A. Philosophy of Teaching/Personal Development
Please submit a narrative essay of no more than two pages to answer the following questions:
- Under what conditions do you think students learn best?
 - How does the answer to the previous question influence your teaching strategies?
 - What teaching choices have you made on that basis?
- The SOM CAPT will read your essay to assess the extent to which your teaching is self-reflective, self-critical, and scholarly.
- B. A Teaching Inventory
Please provide an inventory of all your contributions to education since appointment to the Case faculty, and optionally during prior years, organized by level and learners in the manner listed below:
- Local
 - undergraduate students
 - medical students
 - graduate students
 - residents and fellows
 - continuing medical education
 - others
 - Regional

- National/International

Please remember that our promotion standards define teaching very broadly. These settings may include medical student teaching in lectures, subject committees, small group conferences, clinical science programs, elective programs, family clinic, core and optional clerkships, and ambulatory medicine, as well as undergraduate and graduate courses in the basic science departments and in other schools of the university; graduate medical and postgraduate medical teaching; and continuing medical education and community teaching.

C. Important Teaching Contributions

Please describe your most important teaching contributions under each of the following five headings. Candidates should delineate an inventory of activities and a **narrative description** of your most important contributions in each area. Reviewers will look at both quantity and quality. Please describe how your approach is scholarly and highlight any scholarship that falls under that area. These materials will be counted towards the 25-page limit.

1. Direct Teaching/Facilitation (*You may wish to combine this section with the Teaching Inventory above*). This section may include teaching role, number of learners, level of learners, frequency, duration and time invested (preparation and teaching).
2. Curriculum Development & Assessment. This section may include number of courses, number of learners, frequency, duration, and time invested (preparation and teaching).
3. Learner Assessment. This section may include number of learners assessed, frequency of use, and time commitment.
4. Advising & Mentoring. This section may include, number of advisees/mentees, time investment, evidence of level of commitment, and outcomes of relationship.
5. Educational Administration & Leadership. This section may include number of activities, breadth of activity, years in role, level of institutional importance, leadership role, evidence of success, alignment with best practices, and participation in the community of educators (workshops, publications, demonstrations, etc.)

D. Evaluation Reflections and Awards

Please present evidence, either quantitative or qualitative in nature, which would lead evaluators to conclude that your teaching has been effective. You may also include a description of any plans to make your teaching more effective in the future. List number of awards, school of the award (division, department, school, national organization) and selectivity.

The last 3 years of teaching evaluations are submitted as a separate document and are not included in the 25-page limit. *Unsolicited student emails and letters should not be included, as new letters will be solicited for promotion.*

VI. FORMAT FOR CURRICULUM VITAE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Following is the recommended format for a curriculum vitae and bibliography at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine. All faculty should maintain a complete and up-to-date curriculum vitae and bibliography. A required template for your CV can be found at <http://casemed.case.edu/facultyaffairs/administrators/faculty-forms.cfm> (Misc. Forms/Format for Curriculum Vitae/Bibliography).

1. Personal data: name; education with dates, places, and types of degrees; postgraduate training with dates and places.
2. Professional appointments: dates, names of departments and institutions, and the rank of the appointment.
3. Licensure and board certification when appropriate.
4. Membership in professional societies: highlight any leadership roles to reflect regional, national and international recognition.
5. Honors and awards.
6. Professional service: service on study sections, editorial boards, professional societies, advisory groups, etc.
7. Service on medical school, hospital or university committees, including the names of the committees and dates of service.
8. Past and present teaching activities: teaching of medical, graduate, postgraduate and undergraduate students and house officers, as well as teaching in undergraduate and other professional schools of the university. The documentation should cover the frequency of the contributions, the number of actual contact hours and additional input such as planning, evaluation and coordination. A listing of former graduate students and their present status would also be a helpful addition. The completed Teaching and Clinical Service Activities Form may substitute for this section of the curriculum vitae for the purposes of the promotions committee. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to maintain a current listing of all teaching contributions.
9. Past and present research support: this list should include the granting agency, duration of the grant, title, the principal investigator, the percent of effort expended, and the total direct costs awarded. Applications pending review should be included. If desired, research support may be listed separately as an addendum to the curriculum vitae.
10. Bibliography: references should include the names of all authors, titles of articles, and inclusive pages. Peer-reviewed publications, abstracts, presentations, chapters, and books should each be listed separately, as should articles which have been submitted or are in preparation.

Note: Social security numbers should **never** be listed on a CV.

VII. Candidate Consent for Higher Review

If the school-level review is not favorable for either promotion or tenure or both, the candidate should be given the option to either continue with higher review or to withdraw their application. If there is a

negative school-level review for tenure but a positive school-level review for promotion, the candidate can determine to move forward with the promotion review only. The decision to withdraw can only be made if the candidate is not in their mandatory tenure or promotion year.

After a negative school-level review, the dean's office should ask the candidate if they want the file to continue for full higher review. If the candidate does not reply to the question in a timely manner, the review will continue to the higher level. The communication to the candidate, as well as the candidate's response, should be included in the file.

VIII. _____ Self-Initiation

If a department-level review, or school-level review if the unit is not organized into departments, is negative, some candidates have the option to self-initiate. According to the Faculty Handbook, a non-tenure track promotion candidate, a tenured associate professor promotion candidate, or a tenure track candidate seeking tenure may initiate formal consideration of promotion and/or tenure at the departmental level by submitting a request in writing to the department chair or dean. Self-initiations are entitled to a full review no more than every three years. (Chapter 3 I.5 and J.1.)

If a candidate self-initiates, the written request should be included in the file.

VII. CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS FOR FACULTY PROMOTION

Candidate: _____

Department: _____

Proposed for promotion to: _____

- tenure track
- Tenure Award

Department contact name: _____

Phone number and email address: _____

All materials must be provided electronically
A COMPLETE PROMOTION PACKET CONTAINS:

- Nomination letter by the chair, addressed to Dean Gerson
- If interested in promotion in the candidate’s secondary department, nomination letter(s) from chair(s) of department(s) where the candidate holds secondary appointment(s), hospital division chief (must include the DCAPT vote in the letter)
- Signed and dated report from the department, MetroHealth, or CCLCM promotions committee that lists the numeric vote. Report separate votes on nominations for promotion and for tenure
- Curriculum vitae, including bibliography and listing of past and present research support. ****The CV must be dated and must accurately show dates of faculty appointments.***
- Professional self-description, maximum length three pages; may be affixed to the CV.
- Teaching Portfolio (required if candidate is in non-tenure track with greatest strength in teaching)
- Teaching evaluations from the previous three years collected by the department; evaluations should refer only to the candidate with rating of or reference to others obliterated
- Summary of the course evaluations prepared by the department chair, curriculum director or other appropriate person - The summary may include information regarding the type of learner, details regarding the teaching setting, and how these evaluations compare to other faculty in the department. This summary is generally between a paragraph to one page.
- Candidate’s key reprints, a maximum of **FIVE** reprints (Preferably from the time since last CWRU appointment/promotion)
- Referee lists with complete and accurate **email** addresses. (Please use excel template)
 - (9) External referees – selected by department chair including CVs/Biosketches
 - (9) External referees – selected by the candidate including CVs/Biosketches

- (4) Collaborators, former mentors and colleagues suggested by chair and candidate
- (4) Faculty teaching referees suggested by candidate
- (10) List of students, graduate students, residents, and post-doctoral trainees who can be asked to write evaluations suggested by candidate
- (if applicable) Chief residents from previous three years, if candidate teaches residents (provided by the department chair).
- (4) Service referees: selected by department chair and candidate

VIII. Submission Instructions

Label the folder as: **Last Name, First Name, degree(s), proposed position, and, if tenured, label as Tenured (e.g. Smith, Avery, Tenured) or in the tenure track, label as TT (e.g., Smith, Avery, Professor, TT)**

As you acquire the required materials for each candidate's folder, please use the shortest name possible to identify the document.

Please include the candidate's (last name, first name) after the document's name. For example,

- Chair's nominating letter (Smith, Avery)
- Secondary nominating letter (Smith, Avery), if the department chair for a secondary appointment submits a letter
- CV (Smith, Avery)
- Self-Description (Smith, Avery)
- DCAPT vote (Smith, Avery) *or MHMC CAPT vote.*
- Teaching portfolio (Smith, Avery)
- Teaching evaluations (Smith, Avery) – previous three years, **specific to the candidate only.**
Please do NOT include any other faculty members' evaluations ➤ Reprint 1 (Smith, Avery), reprint 2 (Smith, Avery), etc...

*There is no need to put items into individual folders inside the candidate's folder.

*Please make sure to name BIO or CV for each external referee with their last name followed by the candidate's name in parenthesis.

***Please do not run external referees' BIO/CV's all together in one pdf.**

***The referees must be submitted using the Excel template found on the Faculty Affairs website at <https://case.edu/medicine/faculty-staff/faculty-affairs-hr/forms-additional-information> (Faculty Promotions - Full Time/ Full Time Senior Level Promotion Referee Tables).**

All other materials must be submitted as a word document or a PDF.

When you're ready to submit, please email the folder to facaffrs@case.edu with the following subject line:

**Candidate Name _ Department Name _ Campus (i.e. SOM, CCLCM, MHMC, UH, VA)
_ TT _ Promotions _ July 1 2026 _ Submission**

**Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions: SOM
Faculty Affairs Email: facaffrs@case.edu**