**ADVICER Template for Faculty Reviewer Letters for Promotion and Appointment**

\*\*DELETE THIS GUIDE BEFORE SENDING THE REVIEW LETTER\*\*

Dear Colleagues:

ADVICER (Alliance of Directors and Vice Chairs of Education in Radiology) has developed a template for faculty letters by outside reviewers.

**Goals of this template:**

1. Provide a flexible, modifiable, comprehensive faculty review letter template
2. Provide guidance to reviewers as to the key components important to APT committees
3. Simplify, focus and standardize the review process
4. Reduce inter-reviewer and intra-reviewer subjectivity
5. Reduce the potential use of gender or racial biased adjectives/criteria
6. Reduce ‘creative writing’ in these reviews
7. Provide Promotions and Tenure Committees with an easy to interpret format.

**To use the template**

1. The template is provided as a Microsoft Word Windows form. It contains checkboxes, drop-down selections and free-text boxes.
2. Delete or change any sections that you don't want to use.
3. Free-text fields appear on the template in red, drop-downs in blue. These should automatically format in black when completed. If they don't, when complete click ctrl-A and select black text option.
4. To complete the template as it is, click in the fields and select the appropriate option or type in text.
5. On a Mac, you may need to hover over free text field until an arrow appears, then click and enter text.
6. If you use a Mac with an older version of Word, the fields may not work correctly, if so download the legacy Mac version [here](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1A28vp0Bfu_DlAIX9V9rQFA2AEpS3kpxh/view?usp=sharing).  Tab between the fields to complete.

**To edit the template in Windows**

1. The template can be edited to suit your specific needs. To delete or add text, just type it as usual.
2. 'Controls' (fields) can be copied and deleted, but if you want to edit them or add new fields, you will need to [open the developer tab in word](https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/create-forms-that-users-complete-or-print-in-word-040c5cc1-e309-445b-94ac-542f732c8c8b#DevTabTopic=Windows) and select "Design" so that the tool options are visible. [Here](https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/create-forms-that-users-complete-or-print-in-word-040c5cc1-e309-445b-94ac-542f732c8c8b) are descriptions of the field tools.  Reselect "Design" to enable form completion. You can prevent further changes by selecting "Protect".

**To edit the template on a Mac**

1. The template can be edited to suit your specific needs. To edit anything you need to 'Unprotect' the document
2. Open [the developer tab in word](https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/create-forms-that-users-complete-or-print-in-word-040c5cc1-e309-445b-94ac-542f732c8c8b#DevTabTopic=Windows) and select "Unprotect" so that the tool options are visible. [Here](https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/office/create-forms-that-users-complete-or-print-in-word-040c5cc1-e309-445b-94ac-542f732c8c8b) are descriptions of the field tools.  Reselect "Unprotect" to enable form completion.

**Note**: depending on your version of Word, the ribbon may appear slightly different. Google ‘using forms in Word XXX for clarification)

**Template criteria**

1. The criteria for promotion vary between institutions and tracks. This is focused on the Clinician-Educator or similar track, but can be used for other tracks.  If necessary, modify the template to suit your purpose.
2. Review the supplied promotion criteria from the institution that you are reviewing for (ask for them if not sent) and use these as your guide.
3. Academic Promotions and Tenure (APT) Committees vary in the criteria they assess, so this template is designed to cover most potential criteria.
4. APT committees look for the impact of a faculty's work:
   * Clinical, research, educational, administrative, leadership, service
   * This can be local, regional, national, or international
   * Higher-rank appointments require more and wider impact e.g. for Associate Professor, regional impact and early national is expected. For Professor, generally national/early international impact.
   * Impact can be shown through the use and dissemination of resources, audience types and numbers, patient care improvements, quality improvements
   * As there is no single metric for ‘impact’, this remains subjective. We have put in the modifiers ‘minimal, good, excellent and outstanding’ to evaluate impact in each area.
   * The primary focus is on the faculty's individual creativity and productivity but joint/team efforts are recognized.
   * Impact on trainees/junior faculty through mentorship (career, research, educational) is usually highly regarded.
   * First, second and last authorships are considered most important.
   * Peer-reviewed materials are more highly regarded than non-peer-reviewed.
   * Journal quality (e.g. Impact factor) can affect impact.
   * Invited presentations and those for CME increase impact and it may be affected by societal meeting prestige.
   * Grant impact will vary by source (e.g. federal>societal>private sponsor e.g pharmaceutical company >institutional),?? peer reviewed ??, amount, investigator status (PI or co-investigator or collaborator) and % FTE
5. Citation indices are included as options.
   * [Here](https://researchguides.uic.edu/c.php?g=252299&p=1683205) are instructions on identifying these indices depending on the resources available at your institution.
   * Consider checking citation numbers for a few key publications.  [Google Scholar](https://scholar.google.com/) is quick and easy but may not be as accurate as [Web of Science](https://login.webofknowledge.com/) or [Scopus](https://www.scopus.com/home.uri).
6. Included are some criteria that ask you to rank the candidate relative to other similar candidates you know, or have assessed.  It is recognized that these are subjective and can be omitted if you prefer.
7. Know the criteria for your own institution, but these should only be applied in the final section.
8. For more information about promotion as a clinician-educator, [watch this movie.](https://youtu.be/83NOPGVe__k)

Name of Promotions Committee Chair

Address of Promotions Committee Chair

Friday, November 12, 2021

Dear Chair of the Promotions Committee:

Thank you for inviting me to serve as an outside referee for Candidate Name who is applying for Appointment to the rank of: Associate Professor at Institution on the following track: Track Tenure

*This letter was prepared using a standardized template that was developed and by ADVICER, the Alliance of Directors and Vice Chairs of Education in Radiology, a Special Interest Group of the Association of University Radiologists.* *The scaling metrics compare this candidate to prior candidates that I have reviewed or similar ranked individuals at my institution.*

My current position is Rank at Institution. My previous contact with the candidate is the following: Contact with candidate. I do not feel that I have a conflict of interest in providing this review.

The following is a summary of my assessment of the candidate’s major achievements in the areas of education, clinical work, research and administration/service. This was based on the materials provided to me which include:CV, Personal statement, Educator portfolio, Evaluations, Selected publications, Chairs letter, Institutional promotion criteria, Online resources developed by the candidate, and No other materials provided, as well as my stated interaction with the candidate.

**Educational activities**

1. The candidate is involved in teaching the following groups of learners:

Undergraduate students, Graduate students, Medical students, Residents, Fellows, Faculty, Associate Providers, Technologists, Nurses, Community, Other None in presented portfolio

1. The candidate mentors:

Undergraduate students, Graduate students, Medical students, Residents, Fellows, Faculty, Associate Providers, Technologists, Nurses, Other None in presented portfolio

1. Of particular importance is their involvement in the following educational activities: Educational activities
2. The impact/importance of their teaching is particularly supported by the following:
   1. Awards: None in presented portfolio
   2. Evaluations from: Undergraduate students, Graduate students, Medical students, Residents, Fellows, Faculty, None in presented portfolio
   3. Educational innovations/program development: None in presented portfolio.
   4. Invited presentations: Institutional/medical school, Regional, National, International
   5. Educational workshops: Institutional/medical school, Regional, National, International
   6. Educational-related social media (include metrics where possible): None in presented portfolio.
   7. Educational quality improvement: None in presented portfolio.
   8. Other achievements: None in presented portfolio.
3. I would evaluate the impact of the candidate’s education activities as the following:
   1. Institutional: Cannot assess.
   2. Regional: Cannot assess.
   3. National: Cannot assess.
   4. International: Cannot assess.
4. Identified areas of perceived educational weakness: None.
5. Other comments related to educational activities: None.
6. Overall, I would rank the educational achievements of this candidate compared to other similar candidates as being in the top Cannot assess

**Clinical activities**

Clinical activities are better assessed by internal reviewers. However, from the information supplied to me I can provide the following evaluation:

1. The candidate is involved in the following clinical areas: Clinical areas.
2. Of particular importance is their involvement in the following clinical activities: Clinical activities
3. The impact/importance of their clinical activities is particularly supported by the following:
   1. Awards: None in presented portfolio.
   2. Clinical innovations/program development: None in presented portfolio.
   3. Sectional assessments: None in presented portfolio.
   4. Clinical quality improvement: None in presented portfolio.
   5. Other achievements: None in presented portfolio.
4. I would evaluate the impact of the candidate’s clinical activities as the following:
   1. Institutional: Cannot assess.
   2. Regional: Cannot assess.
   3. National: Cannot assess.
   4. International: Cannot assess.
5. Identified areas of perceived clinical weakness: None.
6. Other comments related to clinical activities: None.
7. Overall, I would rank the clinical achievements of this candidate compared to other similar candidates as being in the top Cannot assess.

**Scholarly activities**

1. The candidate’s prime areas of scholarly activity include: Scholarly areas
2. The candidate has received grants at the following levels: Institutional, Regional/State, Foundational/societal, Federal
3. Of particular importance is their involvement in the following scholarly activities: Scholarly activities
4. The impact/importance of their scholarly activities is particularly supported by the following:
   1. Awards: None in presented portfolio.
   2. Grants: None in presented portfolio.
   3. Unfunded research projects: None in presented portfolio.
   4. Publications: None in presented portfolio.
   5. Digital resources/websites: None in presented portfolio.
      1. Specific metrics (downloads, views) from digital resources: None in presented portfolio.
   6. Grant review committees/boards: None in presented portfolio.
   7. Editorial boards: None in presented portfolio.
   8. Scholarly innovations/program development: None in presented portfolio.
   9. Research quality improvement: None in presented portfolio.
   10. Other creative scholarly activities: None in presented portfolio.
5. Assessment of the candidate’s scholarly activity:
   1. Total number of peer-reviewed papers is: #
      1. # first author peer reviewed papers
      2. # last author peer reviewed papers
      3. Peer reviewed papers that include trainees: Cannot assess
   2. **OPTIONAL** metrics
      1. Papers cited > 20 times = Unknown.
      2. Papers cited >100 times = Unknown.
   3. Total number of peer-reviewed abstracts and educational/scientific exhibits is: #
      1. # first author peer reviewed abstracts/exhibits
      2. # last author peer reviewed abstracts/exhibits
      3. Peer reviewed abstracts/exhibits that include trainees: Cannot assess
6. Overall assessment of publication history compared to similar candidates: compared to expectations
7. I would evaluate the impact of the candidate’s scholarly activities as the following:
   1. Institutional: Cannot assess.
   2. Regional: Cannot assess.
   3. National: Cannot assess.
   4. International: Cannot assess.
8. Identified areas of perceived scholarly weakness: None.
9. Other comments related to scholarly activities: None.
10. Overall, I would rank the scholarly achievements of this candidate compared to other similar candidates as being in the top Cannot assess

**Leadership, service and administrative activities**

1. The candidate is involved in leadership, service or administration at the following levels: Departmental, Hospital , Medical School , Regional , National, International , Community , Public advocacy , Other: None
2. Of particular importance is their involvement in the following leadership/service/administrative activities: Service/leadership/administrative activities
3. The impact/importance of their leadership, service and administrative activities is particularly supported by the following:
   1. Awards: None in presented portfolio.
   2. Committee products: None in presented portfolio.
   3. Leadership roles: None in presented portfolio.
   4. Administrative innovations/program development: None in presented portfolio.
   5. Administrative/leadership quality improvement: None in presented portfolio.
4. I would evaluate the impact of the candidate’s service/administrative activities as the following:
   1. Institutional: Cannot assess.
   2. Regional: Cannot assess.
   3. National: Cannot assess.
   4. International: Cannot assess.
5. Identified areas of perceived service/administrative weakness: None.
6. Other comments related to service/administrative activities: None.
7. Overall, I would rank the service/administrative achievements of this candidate compared to other similar candidates as being in the top Cannot assess

**Is there other additional relevant information regarding this candidate e.g. advocacy, volunteer or global health activities?**

None

**Summary**

In summary, using the criteria supplied to me, I feel that Dr. Name is Qualification level for Promotion/Appointment to Rank at Institution on the following track: Track Tenure .

Criteria for promotion vary considerably between institutions and a direct comparison is not always possible. However, if this candidate were applying for a similar level/track at my institution, I believe that he/she would be a Qualification level candidate.

If not a potential candidate at my institution, this was based on the rationale outlined here: Not applicable.

Please feel free to reach out to me for further information

Yours sincerely,



Name

Title

Institution

Address

Email: Email

Phone: Phone number