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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.
SOM Track
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Overview
Processes
Promising practices and advice
SOM Track
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Overview: Broad perspective on expectations.
Expectations of high caliber work:

- Important
- Innovative
- Impactful
- Creative
- Productive

There is no judgment on field, rely on case put forth by your department and external peer reviewers.
Timeline for SOM reappointment and promotion changes

**May 2011**: Two tracks: BSD and SOM

**Sept 2012**: Added language to welcome mentorship and advancement of diversity & inclusion as creditable activities.

**June 2013**: Emphasized expectation of scholarly activity in SOM track, or, where none, explanation for its absence.

**August 2014**

1. Revised definition of “outstanding”: would qualify for the recommended rank/track if he/she were in one of the leading academic departments nationwide. Asks: Which are the leading academic departments nationwide for those in the candidate’s specialty?
Outstanding contributions to any combination of our three missions determined by your individual department.

Scholarly activity

Clinical Activity

Education

*Citizenship is an expectation for all faculty*
Significant variability in distribution of activity
Factors used in the evaluation of scholarly activity in the SOM track.

Traditional research
Educational Scholarship
Clinical Scholarship
Scholarship Infrastructure
Other Scholarship
Factors used in the evaluation of scholarly activity

Traditional research
• peer-reviewed funding
• peer-reviewed publications

Educational Scholarship
• Production of scholarly teaching materials
• Teaching or training demonstrating incorporation of latest findings into education
• methods to assess impact of innovative curricula and dissemination of results
Factors used in the evaluation of scholarly activity

Clinical Scholarship
• Evidence-based improvements in institutional clinical practices
• Enrolling patients in clinical trials
• Technical assistance with others' research
• Case studies
• Presentations in clinical conferences, grand rounds, etc.
• Scholarly support of clinical trials

Scholarship Infrastructure
• Support of scholarship infrastructure
• Other contributions with great value to BSD, UCMC, and/or the University, eg. Building relationships
Factors used in the evaluation of scholarly activity.

Other Scholarly Activity

- Evidence-based formulation of research, educational, and clinical policy at a local, regional, or national level
- Service on study sections, examining Boards, as scholarly editors, etc.
Factors used in the evaluation of clinical activity.

- Defined by your departmental expectations
- Not RVU based, though these may be important in assessing your clinical accomplishments
- Always based on the highest quality of care/work but may be evaluated on contribution, breakthroughs in treatment/diagnostic care, niche area, reputation
Clinical acumen assessment for promotion (see handout)

**DOCUMENTATION OF CLINICAL ACUMEN IN PROMOTION CASES**

2012-11-20

ADVICE TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS FROM THE BSD COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS (COAP)

Departments proposing promotion based on outstanding contribution to the clinical mission must present evidence so that a reasonable person outside the department could review the evidence and reach the same conclusion. Such evidence often includes (among others):

(a) Quantitative and qualitative metrics of clinical acumen, performance, quality, productivity, and stature

(b) Objective written testimony from physicians with the stature, standing, and expertise to assess the candidate’s clinical acumen.

Where outstanding contribution to the clinical mission cannot be established to the satisfaction of a reasonable person outside the department, the department should simply state such and not advance outstanding contribution to the clinical mission as a primary basis for promotion. This should not prejudice other aspects of a case.
Factors used in the evaluation of education and training

Outstanding teaching and training evidenced by
• Internal/external recognition
• Teaching evaluations
• Time devoted to teaching
Looking at accomplishments and trajectory

- Very department and individual specific
- Important to know the expectations for your success (annual review, Contract)
- Trajectory is key in thinking about promotion (will you reach the next level of excellence?)
- There is no checklist to complete

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

Candidate’s Accomplishments

Upward Trajectory
SOM Track
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Processes related to reappointment, 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 reappoint and promote

Authority to bring case. Evaluation of case is advisory

Advisory

Advisory
Departments have their own reappointment and promotion processes.

Departments are required to have a fair, uniformly applied promotion review system but vary in how they implement it. 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 policy

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.

   COROAP: Committee on Reappointment of Assistant Professors.

   or

   COAP: Committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure.

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 reappoint, promote, tenure or not to renew the appointment.
Reappointment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Appointment</th>
<th>Reappointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Up to two reappts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>4 year</td>
<td>Up to 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>5 year</td>
<td>Up to 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Up to 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reappointment

The first Department and Division-level review

This is an internal process (no external letters)

Typically evaluation of the candidate and *formative feedback*.
1. CV (examples at https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu)

2. Personal Statement (*Past, Current, Proposed, Future*)
   - Education statement
   - Clinical Statement
   - Scholarship statement (5 exemplary works-*peer reviewed work* and/or *products*)
   - Institutional citizenship (include mentorship and D and I)
   - Career development-Reappointment only
Career Development Plan: reappointment only

(a) Describe the progress you have made and are making towards promotion, and the advice/mentorship you are receiving.

(b) On what basis and when do you expect to be promoted? What will you do differently during your next term as assistant professor, if anything, with respect to the mission areas? What assistance do you need from your colleagues for the successful culmination of your assistant professorship?
Career Development Plan-**for peer reviewed research**

(A) A statement of your progress on the pathway to research funding – in relationship to the timing for promotion

(B) If you don't presently have all the external funding you need, a copy of your most advanced 'Specific Aims' portion of the funding application. It is understood that this may be relatively crude if you are not in the final stages of preparing a grant application.

(C) A copy of the reviews, if available, of your most recent unsuccessful grant application, if any.

(D) A brief description of any steps you have taken to improve grant application success.
SOM track reappointment career development grid (6/2013)
This should provoke discussion with your Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reputation within the BSD as an outstanding CLINICIAN</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition outside the BSD as an outstanding CLINICIAN</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation within the BSD as an outstanding EDUCATOR</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation outside the BSD as an outstanding EDUCATOR</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly activity (<a href="http://tiny.cc/SOMscholarlyactivity">http://tiny.cc/SOMscholarlyactivity</a>) and other externally visible academic activity</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I expect to qualify for promotion in (year): ____________________

Names of my current or potential mentors:_________________________________________________________
Department letter to candidate-reappointment only

Our evaluation of your performance in the now-concluding term is as follows:
CLINICAL
EDUCATIONAL
SCHOLARSHIP
INSTITUTIONAL CITIZENSHIP

Our expectation for the next term is as follows:

Our expectation for promotion is as follows
Year 1 post-reappointment: [state]
Year 2 post-reappointment: [state]
Year 3 post-reappointment: [state]
Year 4 post-reappointment: [state]

To this end, your department anticipates assisting you as follows:
Promotion to Associate Professor

Review at Department, Division and at the Provost levels

External letters are required

Internal assessment is part of the process

The chair/section chief initiates the process – it is important that your chair/section chief knows what you have accomplished
When to consider promotion to Associate Professor?

Flexible and varies. On average, around year 7-8,

Remember:
It can take time to establish trajectory separate from what you were evaluated on in the past.

Note: While the expectation is for promotion, you can remain in your current rank without promotion. HOWEVER, your department must provide a rationale for this decision.
Years as assistant professor before promotion

N current faculty (122 total)
Promotion to Associate Professor: considerations

1. The body of contributions to our mission is coherent or at least has a recognizable theme
2. The contributions, whatever they may be, are special in some way (creative, innovative etc...)
3. Has gone beyond what is required for reappointment without a change in rank
4. The candidate has articulated a clear goal in advance of promotion, and then gone on to achieved it OR Identified a significant institutional need in advance of promotion and then gone on to meet it OR Actively improved before promotion to become the institutional expert or ‘go to’ person

Chair/Dean must answer these in their letter as well as: what is the evidence to support the above
Promotion Process

CV and Personal Statement

Teaching evaluations

Internal assessments

External letters

Section and/or Department Assessment and Vote

COROAP/COAP Assessment and Advice

Dean Decision to Endorse

Provost Decision to Approve
Letter writers are asked:
(a) your total contribution to our three mission domains, patient care, education, and scholarly activity; and
(b) Whether you are outstanding.

• In what respect and to extent is Dr. XX outstanding
• In comparison to what peer group
• What specific achievements form the basis of your conclusion
• Would Dr. XX be promoted at your institution?

Ordinarily around 7 are requested. Faculty can input 2-3 suggestions.
Used when assessment are invisible to the outside

e.g., teaching, many clinical procedures such as anesthesia, diagnostic radiology, primary care, and administration, assessments of clinical and educational acumen from BSD faculty in the same or other departments may be solicited and will be given considerable weight. These may be shared with external consultants, redacted as necessary.

**May be more important than external letters**
Tenure in SOM

• Can occur whenever deemed ready by your department

• Only allowed one attempt at tenure status.

• No penalty for failure to obtain tenure

• Once tenured, you become a BSD track faculty
Tenure expectations in SOM Track:

- Grow your program of *peer-reviewed scholarship* until your body of work and future program qualify for tenure.

- The subject matter and nature of the work (i.e., how ‘clinical’ it is) are unimportant as long as the work meets the quality and impact expectations.
SOM Track Tenure consideration

Scholarship of such caliber may take typical form.

However, it may also create impactful knowledge that brings high distinction to the BSD in the clinical or educational arenas.

This might include intellectual leadership in clinical trials that establish the standard of care, important scholarly contributions in education or curriculum development that have national/international impact, technical innovation (new procedures, treatments, or devices), or other paradigm-shifting advances.

The quality and impact of these contributions will also be judged by the quality of the peer-reviewed publications that describe them.
SOM Track Tenure consideration (Continued)

Evidence of consistency (a track record of ongoing scholarship that is not episodic, one-time, or occasional) and sustainability, such as success in obtaining research funding, is necessary.

Comparisons of the body of work are made to the very best tenured clinician-scholars within peer programs in the specific specialty/discipline.

Scholarly productivity (as opposed to quality) should be commensurate with clinical and other responsibilities.
BSD Track
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Promising practices and advice
Know the documents.

Compendium.docx document from the Office of Academic Affairs

(http://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu)

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
https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu

The navigation bar on the left will lead you to pages intended for faculty.

BSD Office of Academic Affairs

For FACULTY
In addition to the Compendium, these are important documents from the Office of Academic Affairs:

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

*Appointments, reappointments, promotions and tenure process guidelines.*
(http://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu)

*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/)
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].

☐ Lay Summary [state the major activities, contributions and accomplishments in the three mission

Time allocation to the various missions (from departmental budget submission scheme):

| A. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP [formally approved or ACGME-mandated roles such as Residency/Fellowship Program Director, designated ‘core faculty’, or Director of a Pritzker course; 0 for most faculty] |
| B. CLINICAL/CLINICAL TEACHING [typically 80%; time spent in (1) in patient care and (2) clinically educating clinical trainees (clinical fellows, students, and residents) other than ‘A. Educational Leadership’] |
| C. EDUCATION other than A. Educational Leadership and B(2). Clinical Teaching [includes didactic teaching in The College, Ph.D. programs, and in Pritzker and GME if not captured above] |
| D. ADMINISTRATION [Department Chair, Section Chief, or equivalent role for which protected time has been negotiated with the Dean’s Office; will be 0 for most faculty] |
| E. FUNDED OR RESEARCH OR RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION [must match salary recovery from funds other than departmental / Divisional operating funds] |
| F. OTHER/BALANCE [Unfunded research; other scholarship; etc.] |

TOTAL 100%

Recognition outside UChicago is / is not [delete one] currently an essential component of the position.

☐ Discuss how the candidate is outstanding. If not, what is the rationale

☐ Analyze magnitude and quality of contributions in CLINICAL CARE (effort/quality). Do consider administrative/leadership, institutional citizenship, and external activities relevant to this topic. Discuss the changes for the term
Promotion cases (not reappointments) go to the Provost with a letter from your chair (continued)

☐ Analysis of the significance and quality of EDUCATION

☐ Analysis of the OTHER ACADEMIC/SCHOLARLY/ETC Contributions

☐ Analysis of the letter case
  a. How did you choose those solicited for letters? Explain the rationale for your choices if it is not obvious. Are any from non-peer institutions and/or not “at arm’s length”; why did you include them anyway?
  b. Who did not respond to your request? Do the non-responses reflect unfavorably on the candidate?
  c. Which letters are unreservedly positive [just list the names of their writers]? Of those with reservations, how do you respond to the reservations?

Letters are usually around 3-4 pages.
Promising Practices

1. Meet often with your section chief/department chair
   • Graceful self promotion is important

2. Network with those in your field (profiles)
   • Need to develop a reputation for high quality work
   • Increases opportunities for regional/national presentations

3. Work with your mentorship team and knowledgeable others
   • Solicit help when needed
   • Listen to feedback
   • Let others review your grants/manuscripts (great grants)
   • Use your COROAP feedback to assist your career trajectory

4. Know your departmental reappointment/promotions process
Office of Faculty Affairs – How can we help?

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 Karen or Melina for additional information/conversation: kekim@medicine.bsd.uchicago.edu; mhale@bsd.uchicago.edu

Martin Feder, Dean for Academic Affairs is also happy to talk with you. m-feder@uchicago.edu.

OAA website: http://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu