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Faculty Promotion System
Overarching Values and Principles

• Promotion based entirely on accomplishment
• For all tracks the target for promotion is a national level of recognition and impact -
• Tenure track and Regular Clinical track viewed as parallel pathways – dictated by how the faculty member is deployed
• All three missions equally important
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update Process

- Faculty members are entitled to review the complete contents of their dossier, including letters of evaluation. Ohio is an “open records” state, and external evaluations are notified that their letters may be seen by the candidate. University rules require that when the review process is completed at each level the candidate has the right to review the decision letters and to offer comments.

- At this point there is no mechanism to monitor progress of the dossier (other than the comments process).

- Another mechanism is being developed that could be adapted for this purpose.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update Process – Time Extension

• Exclusions of time from the probationary period allow up to three years to be excluded. Birth or adoption of a child is automatically approved. Other justifications of causes outside the candidate’s control are also accepted.

• The faculty member requests in writing an exclusion. This is considered by the Department’s Promotion and tenure Committee which then makes a recommendation to the Department Chairman. This is then forwarded to the Dean who makes a recommendation to the provost.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Content Issues

• Faculty are evaluated on the total body of accomplishment – scholarship, teaching, and service. All regular faculty are expected to have contributions in these areas. The relative weight of emphasis varies according to track (clinical, tenure, research).

• From the COM Promotion and Tenure Document: “The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a regional or national level of impact and recognition as demonstrated by…”
Promotion on the Regular Clinical Track

• From the COM P&T document: The awarding of promotion to the rank of associate professor on the regular clinical track must be based upon clear and convincing evidence that the candidate has developed a regional or national level of impact and recognition.

• Parallel pathways – parallel expectations
• Pathways to national recognition – clinical, education, service
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Content Issues

- Impact of the NIH funding crisis? There is no COM requirement for NIH funding. Although desirable for many reasons, the expectation defined in the COM P&T document is nationally competitive peer reviewed funding.

- Increased emphasis – and development of explicit criteria to address credit for team science.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Content Issues

• P&T process has two distinct components: evaluation and advocacy – in that order.

• The fundamental principle of the academic process is rigorous peer review. The University expects that concurrent with the notion that the department faculty are in the best position to evaluate a faculty member, that they will in fact conduct an appropriate evaluation, and use appropriate standards.

• Assuming a positive outcome of the evaluation, the Department (eligible faculty and Chairman) then become advocates, without glossing over obvious weaknesses.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Content Issues

• COM Committee does not necessarily know the specific journals in a special field or subfield. Often the very best journals in a “niche” area have very low impact factors. It is up to the Department to educate their COM colleagues. If there are other more important metrics that speak to the quality and impact of the work, the Department is welcome to present those data. This should be explained in the Department P&T document and should be reflected in the letter from the eligible faculty and/or the Department Chair.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Content Issues

• The review of scholarship expects that in today’s world, faculty will be engaged in research groups, and will have some publications on which they are first or senior authors and other publications in which they have a less prominent role. The evaluation of a record of scholarship is based on an assessment as a body of work that a faculty member has demonstrated an area of emphasis for which they are known. The balancing act between secondary role in first tier journals versus primary roles in second tier journals is difficult to quantify.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Content Issues – Grants vs. Papers

• Grants are important as an index of the quality of the idea, but for most of us they are a means to an end. Does anyone have an impact on their field solely or primarily because they get grants (but don’t publish)?

• For most people, high quality peer-reviewed science is the coin of the realm by which impact and reputation is developed.

• In this funding era – positive comments “pink sheets” can be helpful – particularly if they demonstrate a gradual improvement.

• PI vs. Co-I
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update
Common Pitfalls in Presenting the Case

• Don’t assume that the COM Committee will understand the importance of an accomplishment.
• Don’t under-sell – as long as there is good data to back it up.
• Analyze the trajectory
• Don’t ignore or minimize obvious weaknesses. Candidate’s are evaluated on the total dossier, weakness in an area can be explained or offset by extraordinary accomplishment in other areas.
2009 Promotion and Tenure Update

Content Issues

• All faculty are evaluated in teaching, service, and scholarship. The operational definitions of what is included in these arenas are extremely broad:
  
• Teaching can include didactics; supervision of fellows, students, post-docs; grand rounds or other CME activities. Important (and easy) to document.
  
• Service can include clinical service, department or institution committees, service on advisory groups, service on professional committees, review activities (editorial boards, grant reviews)

• Credit for these activities is not mutually exclusive
Teaching
Upper

• Principal investigator or co-investigator of a funded educational grant
• Leadership (e.g. residency/fellowship program director, course director, clerkship director, educational committee chair)
• Development of education aids (e.g., computer programs, videos, CDs, etc.)
• Curriculum design (for example: course development or redesign)
• Development of innovative teaching programs
Teaching Middle

- Structured medical student, graduate student, or resident/fellow teaching
- Recipient of teaching excellence award
- Structured clinical teaching (e.g., lecture, grand rounds, CME presentation)
- Chair of thesis committee (e.g., MD MPH, MD MBA programs, etc.)
Teaching
Lower

• Unstructured medical student, graduate student, or resident/fellow teaching (for example: teaching during rounds or in clinic)

• Other teaching activities (for example: case conference, journal club, department seminars)
Service
Upper

• Chair of a university or School committee
• Development of innovative clinical program
• Chair or officer for regional or national medical, scientific, or public health organizations
• Development of innovative programs or policies broadly impacting medical education or public health
• Community service (major leadership position)
Service
Middle

• Member of a School or WSU committee
• Membership on committees or boards of regional or national medical, scientific, or public health organizations
• Participation in multi-center clinical and educational trials/studies
• Organizing a local or regional scholarly or research symposium
• Membership on hospital or health department committees (uncompensated)
• Community service (service on a board or steering committee or an organization)
Service
Lower

• Community service (occasional volunteer participation)
• Membership of a department committee
Scholarly Activity
Upper

- Principal investigator or co-principal investigator of a funded research grant
- Grants reviewer at a national level
- Original publication in refereed journal
- Invited Visiting Professor
- Publication of a book
- Journal and/or book editor
- Member of national consensus panel or study section
- Invited chair of an international or national scientific/educational/clinical symposium
- Member of an editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal
Scholarly Activity

Middle

• Presentation at national meeting
• Writing an invited editorial in refereed journal
• Guest lecturer outside own institution
• Publication of a book chapter or a review article
Scholarly Activity
Lower

• Journal reviewer for a refereed journal
• Case report in a refereed journal
• Consultant to externally funded grant, medical or scientific organization or site or departmental review
• Contributing investigator in a multi-center clinical trial or study
• Presentation at regional meeting
Assistant Professor

• The academic rank of assistant professor is ordinarily an entry rank for faculty members.
• Candidates should hold the terminal degree in their fields, have completed training in their disciplines, and demonstrated effective performance in their disciplines that is recognized by their peers.
• If the department so stipulates, board certification or postdoctoral training/experience may be required.
Associate Professor

• Candidates must hold the terminal degree in their fields.
• Certification. Physician faculty must have board certification in their specialties or sub specialties.
• Time in previous rank. A minimum of five years.
Associate Professor Investigators

Academic activity.

– Sustained and superior performance in research.

– Minimum of 5 articles in peer-reviewed journals or equivalent peer-reviewed repository from work done while at the rank of assistant professor.

– Designation as principal investigator on extramural research grants, contracts or training grants.

– Evidence of activity in education and service at least at the middle tier is also expected.
Associate Professor Educators

- Sustained and superior performance in education and service.
- Minimum of 5 articles in peer-reviewed journals or equivalent peer-reviewed repository from work done while at the rank of assistant professor.
- Outstanding teaching performance as documented by learner and peer evaluations and awards.
Associate Professor Educators

• The candidate must have achieved broad recognition and respect by peers as a superior practitioner in the field.

• Recognition by peers at the state, and regional level.
Professor

Candidates must hold the terminal degree in their fields.

Certification. Physician faculty must have board certification in their specialties or sub specialties.

Time in previous rank. A minimum of five years.
**Professor Investigators**

- Major responsibility for an independent research program, playing a leadership role in a collaborative research effort, or having a sustained clinical research effort.
- A minimum of 20 articles in peer-reviewed journals or equivalent peer-reviewed repository, the majority published while at the rank of associate professor.
- A sustained record of extramural funding through research grants, contracts or training grants.
Professor Educators

- Sustained and superior performance in education and service.
- A minimum of 15 articles from peer-reviewed journals or equivalent peer-reviewed repository, the majority published while at the rank of associate professor.
- Outstanding teaching performance as documented by learner and peer evaluations and awards.
Professor Educators

- The candidate must have achieved broad recognition and respect by peers as providing superior education and service in the field.
- The candidate must have achieved broad recognition and respect by peers as a superior clinician, when applicable.
- Recognition by peers at the national level.