

# Medical School Abbreviated Dossier Template

The Medical School abbreviated dossier template should be used for all new faculty hires in the following circumstances:

- New postings for tenured hires
- Spousal or exceptional tenured hires
- New hires at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor (includes all non-tenure tracks)

This process is not used for probationary faculty hired on the tenure-track who are seeking tenure. Tenure-track faculty seeking tenure must follow the full dossier process for promotion and tenure.

---

---

## **UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA MEDICAL SCHOOL ABBREVIATED DOSSIER FOR MID/SENIOR CAREER HIRES**

*Cover sheet it for template reference only – do not include it in submitted dossiers*

---

---

1. Departmental 7.12 Statement
2. Departmental Letter of Recommendation
3. Departmental Record of Vote
4. Departmental Report
5. Curriculum Vitae
6. External Review and Evaluation
7. Selected Reprints – list and selection of three scholarly reprints
8. Personal Statement

\* Insert bookmarks to represent each “Tab” in the dossier. Please ensure that all bookmarks have the correct labels prior to submitting your dossiers. They should be the same as those listed above.

1. To insert a bookmark in a PDF file, go to the page you want to bookmark (for sections with multiple pages, such as the CV, go to the first page of that section)
2. “Right Click” on that page, and select the “Add Bookmark” Option. You can alternatively do this by going to that page and clicking “Ctrl +B”.
3. Type the label as noted above. You can view your bookmarks after they’ve been inserted by clicking on the bookmark icon on the left side of the screen.

## **1. Departmental 7.12 or Academic Track Statement**

7.12 Statement (most recently approved):

- Tenured and tenure-track  
**(Part 2: Departmental Addendum only – delete Parts 1 and 3)**

Departmental Track Statement:

- Academic track statement

## **2. Departmental Letter of Recommendation**

A letter from the department head, signed and dated, must include the following:

- Details for why the candidate was chosen and why the rank (and if applicable, the granting of tenure) is appropriate.
- Reference to the departmental vote, including majority and minority viewpoints (if applicable).
- Personal recommendation as to why the department head agreed or disagreed with the faculty vote.

### 3. Departmental Record of Vote

The department must include a record of vote, signed and dated by the department head, with one vote taken for both the hire at rank and (if applicable) the granting of tenure by voting-eligible faculty members.

If the granting of tenure is not applicable to the candidate, remove the mention of it from the record of vote form. See form on page 6.

Departments should encourage a minimum of 50% eligible faculty to participate in the discussion and vote of the candidate.

If necessary, departments should update their ballots to include a section for optional comments and rationale from faculty members.

**NOTE:** There must be at least five (5) eligible faculty members to review and vote on recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. Voting-eligible faculty must be at the same rank or higher as candidate, and only tenured faculty may vote on tenure-track/tenured faculty.

**Record of Vote**  
**Department of \_\_\_\_\_**

**Promotion and Tenure Vote:**

Record of vote of the faculty members of the (department) \_\_\_\_\_ regarding the proposal for the hiring of (candidate's name) \_\_\_\_\_ at the rank of (proposed rank) \_\_\_\_\_ and, if applicable, for the granting of tenure.

_____	Total eligible members*
_____	Voting yes
_____	Voting no
_____	Abstaining
_____	Total ballots returned
_____	No ballot received

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department Head's Signature

**\*NOTE:** Ballots voting "yes," plus ballots voting "no," plus number listed under "abstaining," plus number listed under "no ballot received" should equal the number of "total eligible members."

#### **4. Departmental Report**

The departmental report must be prepared and signed by the department head or a designee. For tenured/tenure-track candidates, the designee must be tenured. This report must include:

- Representation of the faculty's recommendation.
  - NOTE: Faculty may file a separate report if they believe their views are not adequately represented in the departmental report.
- References to the departmental vote.
- Summary of the candidate's file.
- Summary of majority and minority views where appropriate and any other relevant information.

## 5. Curriculum Vitae

The curriculum vitae must be a complete CV (not abbreviated) and must be in the [Medical School CV template](#).

The curriculum vitae must include a fully annotated bibliography, with the following information listed:

- Number of times cited. Use [Web of Science](#) or [Google Scholar](#) and indicate what source was used.
- Journal impact factor (most current impact factor, not from year of publication). Use [Web of Science](#) to find the journal impact factor.
- Faculty member's role in the publication (if it is a multi-author publication).



## 6. External Review and Evaluation

4 External Letters of Review (see page 11 for examples)

The department must submit an external reviewer list that identifies the rank of each reviewer and the relationship of the reviewer to the candidate. See pages 11-13 for a template. The department must include the [sample letter](#) that was used to solicit reviewers. **Dossiers that do not include a reviewer list or the sample letter will be returned to the department.**

The review list should be formatted in the following order:

- Arm's Length
- Non-Arm's Length (Professional)
- Letters Not Received

For each reviewer, include the following information:

- Name, credentials, title, and affiliation of each reviewer contacted
- A statement about each reviewer's qualifications, professional standing, and relationship to the candidate. Statements from the "[External Review and Evaluation](#)" document may be used to describe the relationship.
- For those reviewers who were contacted but did not provide a letter, include a brief statement for why the request was not fulfilled.

The following criteria should be considered when identifying potential reviewers:

- Distinguished faculty or, occasionally, highly regarded non-academics
- Faculty at a rank **above** that of the candidate, or of a status or position considered to be **at least equal to the rank for which the candidate is being considered**
- Ability to provide an impartial and evaluative review of the candidate's qualifications and accomplishments
- Contribution to achieving an overall balanced view of the candidate and to providing a range of perspectives

No more than two (2) external letters can be included from reviewers who have a non-arm's length (professional) relationship with the candidate. Letters from reviewers who have a personal relationship with the candidate are not acceptable. **Dossiers that do not meet the abovementioned requirements will be returned to the department for amendment.**

The objective of obtaining letters from external reviewers at arm's length is to solicit an unbiased, impartial assessment of the candidate's academic progress. To that end, external reviewers at arm's length must have no conflicts of commitment or interest with respect to evaluation of the candidate. The following guidelines should be helpful but are not exhaustive. The P&T committee reserves the right to characterize the relationship between the external reviewer and the candidate.

**External reviewers at arm's length may have:**

- Met at professional meetings
- Served with the candidate in positions in professional societies
- Been colleagues on review boards
- Served together on grants reviews/study sections
- Served together on national committees
- Been hosted by candidate for visiting professorships/seminars
- Hosted candidate for visiting professorships/seminars
- Been the editor of a journal the candidate submits an article to OR is a reviewer

**External reviewers at arm's length may not have:**

- A major scientific professional role in the candidate's career
  - Contributing to the scientific development or execution of a project(s) in a substantive, measurable way (Senior/Key Personnel, Project/Site/Core Director, collaborator, or consultant)
  - Co-authored manuscripts
  - A major teaching role with the candidate
- Been a scientific or career mentor for the candidate
- Directed a training program in which the candidate participated
- Employed the candidate
- Employment from the same institution as the candidate at the same time
- Personal relationships with candidate
- Business relationships with candidate
- Asked the candidate to be a on an editorial board
- Shared patients with the candidate resulting in a close working relationship
- Been a member of candidate's thesis review committee
- Wrote a chapter in candidate's book/candidate wrote chapter in reviewer's book
- Unusual circumstances that lead a reasonable person with all the relevant facts to question the impartiality of the reviewer

## EXTERNAL REVIEWER LIST FORMAT TEMPLATE

**Mary Smith, MD**  
**External Reviewers**

### **Arm's Length Reviewers:**

1. Dr. Meryl Cohen, Associate Professor  
Director, Echocardiography  
The Children's Hospital of Philadelphia  
34th Street and Civic Center Boulevard  
Philadelphia, PA. 19104  
Phone: 215-590-1000  
Email: [cohenm@email.chop.edu](mailto:cohenm@email.chop.edu)

**Professional Standing:** Dr. Cohen is the Director of Echocardiography at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. She is an expert in Echocardiography in Fetuses and Children.

**Nature of Relationship with Promotional Candidate:** Dr. Smith has not met, published or collaborated with Dr. Cohen.

2. Dr. Daniela Lax, Associate Professor  
Department of Pediatrics  
The University of Arizona Medical Center  
535 North Wilmot Road  
Tucson, AZ 85711  
Email: [dlax@peds.arizona.edu](mailto:dlax@peds.arizona.edu)

**Professional Standing:** Dr. Lax is a Pediatric Cardiologist at The University of Arizona Medical Center. She is an expert in Pediatric Cardiology and Echocardiography.

**Nature of Relationship with Promotional Candidate:** Dr. Smith met Dr. Lax one time, but has not published or collaborated with him.

### **Not Arm's Length:**

1. Dr. William E Hellenbrand  
Professor of Pediatrics  
Chief, Pediatric Cardiology  
Yale Pediatric Cardiology  
302 LLCI Building  
333 Cedar Street

New Haven, CT 06510-8064  
Phone 203-785-2022  
E-mail- [William.hellenbrand@yale.edu](mailto:William.hellenbrand@yale.edu)

**Professional Standing:** Dr. Hellenbrand is the Professor of Pediatrics and Chief of Pediatric Cardiology at Yale University. He is a Pediatric Cardiologist and Interventional Cardiologist in children's.

**Nature of Relationship with Promotional Candidate:** Dr. Smith has worked with Dr. Hellenbrand as a cardiology fellow at Columbia University, New-York Presbyterian Hospital. She has collaborated or published with him.

2. Dr. Lynn Simpson, Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology  
Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine: High-Risk Obstetrics  
Columbia University, Dept. Ob/Gyn  
622 W. 168th Street, PH 16-66  
New York, NY 10032  
212-305-6293  
*Fax:* 212-342-2717  
E-mail- [ls731@mail.cumc.columbia.edu](mailto:ls731@mail.cumc.columbia.edu)

**Professional Standing:** Dr. Simpson is Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology at Columbia University, New York. She is an expert in high risk pregnancy with fetuses diagnosed with cardiac defects.

**Nature of Relationship with Promotional Candidate:** Dr. Smith was a Fellow in Pediatric Cardiology at Columbia University and has published with Dr. Simpson.

**Contacted But Not Included:**

1. Elizabeth Perlich Sweeney  
President, Children's Heart Link  
5075 Arcadia Avenue  
Edina, MN 55436  
e-mail [Elizabeth@Childrensheartlink.org](mailto:Elizabeth@Childrensheartlink.org)  
Phone 952-928-4860  
*Did not respond.*

2. Dr. Thomas J. Starc, MD, MPH  
Professor of Clinical Pediatrics  
Pediatric Cardiologist  
Morgan Stanley Children's Hospital  
New York-Presbyterian

3959 Broadway, Room 255  
2 North, New York, NY 10032  
[tjs1@columbia.edu](mailto:tjs1@columbia.edu)

*Was unable to write review due to time constrains.*

## 7. Selected Reprints

This section should include:

1. A complete, annotated list of the candidate's selected reprints (separate page from the actual reprints). This list must include:

- Number of times cited (use [Web of Science](#) or [Google Scholar](#) and indicate what source was used).
- Journal impact factor (most current impact factor, not from year of publication). Use [Web of Science](#) to find the journal impact factor.
- Faculty member's role in the publication (if it is a multi-author publication).

*\* This information may be copied and pasted from candidate's CV.*

2. **Three (3)** reprints of scholarly papers of which the candidate is first- or senior-author.

- The candidate selects the reprints.
- The reprints selected should reflect significant contribution(s) of the candidate.

## 8. Personal Statement

This statement, written by the candidate, is a personal narrative summary describing the candidate's research, teaching, and (if applicable) service activities. The statement may be written as three separate documents, or an all-in-one document, separated into appropriate headers or sections. It should not exceed two (2) pages in length.

### Guidelines:

The personal statement should:

- Demonstrate the impact of the candidate's work and their reputation in their area of excellence.
- Exhibit the candidate's teaching effectiveness and how it is novel to their trainees.
- State the focus of the candidate's independent research and scholarly activities and accomplishments.
  - This section should stress why their research is important and novel – do not include raw data
- May also demonstrate their significance to their field, their department, the Medical School and the University through clinical and/or discipline-related service efforts.

Do not include tables, raw data or evaluation scores.