Policy Title: Faculty Promotion

Policy & Procedure Statement:

The faculty promotion evaluation criteria outlined in Appendix F of the Employee Handbook are used to determine whether a faculty member should be recommended for promotion in academic rank. Advancement in rank cannot be guaranteed according to any fixed schedule and seniority by itself cannot be the primary reason for promotion to any academic rank. However, the policies listed herein are recognized as a general guide and as an indication of the various criteria that will be considered in making a decision regarding promotion.

The faculty member being considered for promotion must excel in two of the three areas (education, scholarly activity, and service or contributions to mission) and must demonstrate satisfactory activity in the third area to be eligible for promotion.

Promotion in academic rank assessments are based on the record of accomplishments of the candidate in the three primary areas of:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarly activity
3. Service, including leadership and service in support of the institutional mission, the profession and the community

In addition, since the work of the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee represents a peer review process, it is reasonable to assume that intangible factors will also carry weight in the final recommendation of the Committee. Examples of such factors include:
• Level of responsibility accepted and contributions to the mission, goals and objectives of the faculty member’s Department and to ICOM
• Quality of the results of the candidate’s effort
• Evidence of a thoughtful and critical approach to work
• Evidence of originality of thought and innovation
• Evidence of regional, national and international recognition of talents and expertise

Promotion in Academic Rank Process Timeline

Initial Review by Department Chair

Faculty members should discuss the timing and appropriateness of the application for promotion with their Department Chair. This should be an ongoing process that is discussed with the Chair at the faculty member’s annual evaluation meetings.

Faculty members are expected to be productive and should develop a record of accomplishment that would lead to promotion to the next academic rank within a reasonable time frame. Failure to do so may ultimately jeopardize the continuing renewal of contracts.

If the Department Chair agrees with the appropriateness and timing of the application for promotion, an application dossier should be prepared by the faculty candidate and presented to the Chair of the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee by no later than October 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day) of the year that the promotion in rank is requested (see Appendix G - Promotion Dossier in the Employee Handbook).

If the Department Chair disagrees with the appropriateness and timing of the application for promotion, a letter of intent to seek promotion is prepared by the faculty candidate and submitted to the Chair of Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee by no later than January 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day) of the year that the promotion in rank is requested. An application dossier should be prepared by the faculty candidate and presented to the Chair of the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee by no later than February 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day) of the year that the promotion in rank is requested (Appendix G - Promotion Dossier). If the Department Chair disagrees with the appropriateness and timing of the application for promotion, the Chair should advise and counsel the faculty candidate on what
needs to be done in order to enhance the candidate’s dossier. If the Chair disagrees on the appropriateness and timing of the application for promotion, the faculty candidate has two choices:

1. Follow the Chair’s recommendations to improve their application
2. Apply directly to the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee without the Chair’s endorsement.

Review by Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee

The Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee will review the faculty candidate’s dossier and request, and the letters of support and assessment. The Committee will deliberate on the candidate’s request and vote to approve or deny the request. The faculty candidate’s dossier and a letter of assessment from the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee will be forwarded to the Dean by no later than March 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day) with either a recommendation for approval or denial of the application for promotion in academic rank.

Review by Dean

If the Dean agrees with the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee’s decision to approve the candidate’s request, the Dean’s conferral will be made by May 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day).

If the Dean either agrees with the recommendation by the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee to deny the faculty candidate’s application for promotion in academic rank or the Dean disagrees with a positive recommendation from the Committee, the Dean will advise the faculty member in writing by no later than May 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day) on what would be required for a favorable decision, citing information from the Committee and/or his or her own assessment. A copy of this letter will be provided to the Chair of the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee and to the faculty member’s Department Chair.

The Promotion Dossier will be returned to the candidate by May 1st (or the first following business day if this date falls on a non-business day) of the year in which it was submitted. All letters and evaluative comments regarding promotion are considered confidential and, upon completion of the review period, are to be forwarded
in a confidential manner to the Human Resources Office, where they will be permanently maintained in the Faculty member’s file.

**Review by ICOM Administration**

The President, and then the Board of Trustees, in sequence, will review the recommendation provided by the Dean as an information item by no later than June 30th.

**Application Following Denial of Promotion Request**

If the faculty candidate’s request for promotion in academic rank is denied, the candidate should follow the recommendations provided to improve their application dossier. The candidate will work with Department Chair to accomplish the recommendation and prepare additional documentation of accomplishment.

When the above recommendations are deemed accomplished, this additional documentation will be submitted to the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee as an addendum to the original dossier for reconsideration of the promotion request.

If the candidate does not accomplish the recommendations or criteria for improvement provided to improve their application dossier and/or does not receive approval of the request for promotion at the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee or Dean’s level within two (2) years following the original submission, the application process must be re-initiated with a new dossier.

**Preparation and Components of the Promotion Dossier**

The promotion dossier should present a concise exposition of the relevant activities of the candidate during their employment as a faculty member at the Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine. During a faculty member’s first five (5) years at ICOM, achievements prior to employment at Idaho College of Osteopathic Medicine may be considered. The dossier, originated by the candidate with direction from the faculty member’s Department Chair, will contain five components:

1. Letter to the Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee (not to exceed 2,000 words) prepared by the candidate requesting and providing support of
their promotion. This letter affords the candidate an opportunity to portray their own accomplishments and plans for the future.

This letter is the closest the candidate will come to personally addressing decision-makers at the various levels of the promotion process. Consequently, it should be thoughtfully written and carefully organized. This letter should speak to the responsibilities and accomplishments in the three major areas (teaching, scholarly activity and service) with evidence of unique accomplishments, innovative approaches to problems, and peer recognition of achievements.

Because teaching is a high priority activity, a narrative summary of the results of student evaluations should be included and, if appropriate, the history of improvement of ongoing evaluations.


3. A list of the names, titles, and addresses of individuals who would be capable of assessing the candidate’s promotion dossier and qualifications for promotion. The Committee may also identify one to three individuals who may not know the candidate directly, but would be able to comment and assess the candidate’s promotion dossier. These individuals would usually be faculty members at comparable institutions who might be familiar with the candidate’s specialty area, scholarship, teaching ability, and/or professional service.

4. A letter from the candidate’s Department Chair. This letter should summarize the Chair’s assessment of the progress made by the candidate in the three major areas of evaluation. In addition, the Chair should comment on the candidate’s major contributions toward the realization of the objectives of the Department and COM. This document must also contain an unequivocal statement regarding the supervisor’s level of support for the proposed promotion.

5. Documentation of performance in the three areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

The Academic Appointment & Promotions Committee acknowledges that the preparation of a dossier, which thoroughly represents the quality and quantity of faculty expertise and activity, will be time-consuming and difficult. Faculty members, however, must recognize that the granting of academic promotion are not automatic approvals at any step in the process.