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The BSD’s Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) and Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) play roles in Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

OFA’s focus is on educating faculty about the process and supporting their development of outstanding faculty careers.

OAA oversees reappointment/promotion/tenure processes, shepherding the case through the stages of review.

This OFA presentation highlights important elements of the process and provides advice accumulated from senior faculty. However, Dept. cultures vary and it is important to talk to your chair, section chief and/or promotion committee about their expectations. In addition, full policy/process documentation is available online from OAA.
BSD Track
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Overview
Processes
Promising practices and advice
Expectations of high caliber work:
  Important
  Innovative
  Impactful
  Creative
  Productive

At the level of promotion from associate to full, evaluation is of whether the candidate is a leader and will continue to lead in the field.
Outstanding **scholarship** is the primary expectation. Defined as *creation of new knowledge*.

Other activities can support or detract from the case but outstanding scholarship is the foundation.

In addition, faculty efforts are expected to include:
- Education
- Citizenship
- Clinical activities (if appropriate).
Some factors used in the evaluation of scholarship.

Peer-reviewed publications:
  Quality and Impact
  Number

What was the role of the professor and his/her lab on the work?

For multi-group projects, who provided the intellectual drive?
Who had responsibility for the research included?
Some factors used in the evaluation of scholarship.

Peer-reviewed funding success:

“Is neither necessary nor sufficient but it is very important factor that is considered because it is an indication of ability to perform work and an example of positive peer-review.”

In looking at successful promotion cases, peer-reviewed funding is characteristic of the vast majority of them.
Some factors used in the evaluation of scholarship.

Examples of ways to show you’re an established leader:

***This will vary depending on your sub-discipline:

Evaluation letters from experts (requested by your chair)
Leadership in professional societies
Invitations to speak about your research, plenary talks
Participation in grants panels and other service related to your research expertise.
Membership on external review committees for programs
Editorships
Beyond scholarship.

Other areas of our expected contribution:

- Education
- Citizenship
- Clinical effort (if appropriate)

There is expectation of appropriate effort and that effort be at high quality. Commitments should be discussed with the leadership of your unit (Department Chair/Section Chief).
Beyond scholarship.

Other areas of our expected contribution:

Education – Participating in classroom teaching, formalized training, other. Review teaching commitment in contract. Leadership in teaching and training programs, university service.

Citizenship – Committee service, taking on roles in service to the institution.

Clinical effort (if appropriate)

It is important to be citizens of the University but always keep in mind who is evaluating your case. Consider the value to you of different service/education roles.
Not just accomplishments but also trajectory.

Has the faculty member made appropriate progress since promotion to Associate? The work doesn’t have to be a new line of scholarship but does have to represent a significant advancing body of work since then, establishing the faculty member as a leader in the field.

Is there evidence that high caliber work will continue?

If productivity was high right after promotion to associate but tailed off in recent years, this could raise red flags for reviewers.
Review of accomplishments is nuanced, as cultures and expectations vary across disciplines and departments.

Review of trajectory is also nuanced, even more so, as are using past performance to make predictions of future success.

This variability can feel amorphous but is important and an asset to faculty in the process and diversity/creativity of work at the institution.

As your chair/section chief puts up and argues the case, this should be the best person to advise you on whether you are ready for promotion.
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Processes related to promotion and tenure.
Pathway for Reappointment and Promotion Materials.

Department (internal processes/vote).

Divisional Committees (COROAP for reappointment, COAP for promotion/tenure)

The Dean of the BSD.

The Provost’s Office. Authority to promote

Authority to bring case. Evaluation of case is advisory

Advisory

Endorses case.
Promotion to Full Professor

Review at Department, Division and at the Provost levels.

External letters are required.

Time is variable, no strict deadlines as for tenure.

The chair initiates the process – advice from senior faculty is to be proactive in getting on radar as chairs are super busy and this isn’t as pressing as promotion to associate/tenure.

Unlike tenure, can go up again but this might be an issue with letter writers and is a lot of effort.
When to go up for Full Professor?

It is flexible and varies somewhat but 5ish years is typical.

Look at accomplishments after promotion/tenure as well as full CV.

It can take time to establish trajectory separate from what you were evaluated on for promotion to Associate.
Departments have their own promotion processes.

Departments are required to have a fair, uniformly applied promotion review system but vary in how they implement it. Bringing the case to the Dept. is up to Dept. leadership. In NO CASE is it simply up to the chair/section chief to review the case.

Promotion committees
Who votes?
Ask chair for department’s policies (sometimes they change)

However, the elements of the package of materials that are submitted to the Division are consistent across Departments.
Divisional review includes:

1. Discussion and advisory vote by Division Committees whose members are senior BSD track faculty from across the Division. Additional information may be requested from the Department.

   COAP: Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure.

   (COROAP: Committee on Reappointment of Assistant Professors.)

2. Review by Dean and recommendation to Provost.
Provost review includes:

1. All packages are reviewed in the Provost’s office and they may discuss package with Divisional representatives to clarify.

2. The Provost makes the ultimate decision to promote or not to renew the appointment.
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Promising practices, guidance and support.
These are important documents from the Office of Academic Affairs and University.

*The compendium.*
(http://pondside.uchicago.edu/~feder/eforms.htm)

*Pathways for successful faculty development and promotion.*
(http://pondside.uchicago.edu/~feder/pathways.htm)

*Appointments, reappointments, promotions and tenure process guidelines.*
(http://tiny.cc/BSDProcessGuidelines)

*Appointment and Promotion Criteria (The Shils Report).*
(https://facultyhandbook.uchicago.edu/page/academic-appointments)

*The University Statutes.*

*Statute 11. Faculty and Other Academic Appointments*
(http://secretary.uchicago.edu/)
Know the documents.

Compendium.docx document from the Office of Academic Affairs

(http://pondside.uchicago.edu/~feder/eforms.htm)

Includes instructions and examples for the candidate.

And

Is useful to look at the instructions to the department.

Will return to the compendium later..

This site also has exemplar materials

From successful cases
Looking at accomplishments and trajectory.
This is a useful table supplied to external evaluators that reflects these elements of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Outstanding contributions to knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>Contributions are foreseeable, and faculty member is fully prepared to make them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor without tenure*</td>
<td>Tenure is highly likely within 3 years, or tenure and promotion to full professor are highly likely within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Outstanding contributions to knowledge that establish (professor) or will establish (associate professor) a faculty member as among the leading scholars in a significant field of biology or medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor with tenure*</td>
<td>Clearly will become and then remain among the leading scholars in a significant field of biology and medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor with tenure</td>
<td>Is and will remain among the leading scholars in a significant field of biology and medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your submission for reappointment/promotion includes:

1. CV

2. Scholarly activity statement.
   a. Past and current (2 pages).
   b. Proposed and future (1 page).
   c. Exemplary peer reviewed publications. 5 max.

It may be useful to think about how these works demonstrate a cohesive and deep body of work.
Your submission for reappointment/promotion includes:

3. Education Statement (1 page). “Don’t need to repeat what’s in the CV.”

(a) Past and current:
Courses/classroom teaching.
Clinical teaching.
Educational administration.
Supervision of research trainees.
Production of educational materials.
Other

Good to think about now – as have opportunities, consider how they fit into your career narrative.
Can expound upon points raised in CV and show how it connects.

(b) Proposed and future:
Describe any contemplated changes.
Your submission for reappointment/promotion includes:

4. Clinical Statement (1 page). “Don’t need to repeat what’s in the CV.”

(a) Past and current:

Elaborated on activities related to clinical efforts.

To help you do this, you may wish to ask your department to provide applicable metrics of how clinically busy you are. If you have regular clinical activity and this is not already in the CV, describe its duration and frequency (e.g., clinics per week, their length, their frequency).

(b) Proposed and future:

Describe any contemplated changes.
Your submission for reappointment/promotion includes:

5. Citizenship Statement (1 page). Don’t need to repeat what’s in the CV.

(a) Past and current:
Describe only activity concerning service on UChicago committees, boards, task forces, and searches, and any other forms of contribution to UChicago.

(b) Proposed and future:
Describe any contemplated changes.

***Please do include (i) mentorship of other faculty, and (ii) contributions to diversity and inclusion. For the latter, in addition to typical activities do not overlook any education, scholarship, or patient care that considers or advances diversity and inclusion. If you’ve already mentioned these elsewhere, there is no reason to repeat.
These statements can be used to clarify trajectory as well as accomplishments when appropriate.

For example, going from being a member on a committee to chairing that committee shows progress in leadership and effort.

If you took over an important course/training responsibility and revamped it.

If you were involved in putting together institutional grants (training grants, instrumentation grants, etc.).
Your submission for promotion includes:

6. Suggest Assessors

(a) *Suggested assessors of scholarship.*

You can suggest three and should. Preferably leading scholars at peer institutions. Good if they have some distance from you – people who know you well but who aren’t your former advisor or collaborators.

(b) *Suggested assessors of clinical practice.* (If applicable).

No limit, but the number is ordinarily less than 5. Faculty in Chicago Medicine who are not in same Section but are personally familiar with your clinical practice and/or clinical teaching, and could be contacted for an assessment.
Promotion cases go to the Provost with a letter from your chair.

By a vote of XX in favor, YY opposed, ZZ abstaining, and ZZ not returning a ballot, the Department of Dept name proposes appointment as full professor effective as of MMMM DD, 20YY. Faculty eligible to vote were [name or describe]. Accompanying this proposal are the candidate’s curriculum vitae and pertinent statements or other materials, which provide the basis for the proposal as follows:

☐ Lay Summary [state the major research accomplishments and findings in language that an intelligent non-scientist could understand and appreciate, with a sentence each on education, institutional service, and clinical care delivery if any. This is at the Provost’s request.]

☐ What is the rationale for having the candidate's area of scholarship [as opposed to the candidate himself/herself] represented at UChicago? [This is for the Provost's benefit, not BSD's]

☐ Analysis of the candidate's past research program and findings: strengths, weaknesses, creativity, and impact, including the candidate’s success in extramural funding. [Discuss the work, not the candidate.] This should include for each exemplary work a paragraph summarizing the faculty discussion in which it has been assessed; this should be assessment and not re-summary of the work.*

☐ Analysis of the candidate's proposed/future research program: to what extent will it be sustainable both in the scientific sense (in terms of putting/keeping the candidate, your department, BSD and UChicago in the forefront) and the funding sense (if it requires funding)?
Promotion cases (not reappointments) go to the Provost with a letter from your chair. Continued…

☐ Comparative stature of the candidate [RESTATED].

☐ [NEW] Transformational contribution/potential. What has been and/or will be the transformational impact of the candidate on other faculty and research/educational programs at Uchicago.

☐ Analysis of the letter case (not all may be necessary/relevant).

☐ Analysis of the significance and quality of
The educational contribution
The clinical contribution (if any)
Institutional citizenship. If there have been contributions to (i) mentorship of other faculty, and (ii) diversity and inclusion, please discuss them.

Letters are usually around 3-4 pages.
Accumulated advice on promising practices

Reality Check - How do you compare to successful same-stage colleagues at peer institutions? Also review posted exampled of successful case materials online that can give you a sense of what has worked recently. Again noting differences in cultures among departments.

Get help - We all have our strengths and weaknesses but it is hard to recognize them in ourselves. Mentorship and help with grant proposals, writing, methods in lab and others issues can make a huge difference, even at our advanced stages.

*Senior faculty found writing workshops just as/perhaps even more useful than junior faculty.

*Institution is changing and we may have perceptions that are no longer true. News office/Social media can help disseminate work.
Accumulated advice on promising practices

**Be Proactive** – Mentoring at Associate and Professor levels is sorely lacking but in many ways just as important.

**Talk to Your Chair/Section Chief** – Understand their expectations. Talk about your plans and accomplishments.

**We’re trying to talk to them too and educate on promotion process and practice from the institutional side.**
Office of Faculty Affairs – How can we help?

[https://bsdfacultyaffairs.uchicago.edu](https://bsdfacultyaffairs.uchicago.edu). Website has programming, resources and links to other sites. Also look for emails on upcoming events and activities (sent out once per month).

Feel free to email Melina for additional information/conversation: [mhale@uchicago.edu](mailto:mhale@uchicago.edu).

Martin Feder, Dean for Academic Affairs is also happy to talk with you. [m-feder@uchicago.edu](mailto:m-feder@uchicago.edu). And a beautiful new Academic Affairs website will be launching soon. Information and other resources are currently available through links through talk.