## Materials
- 10-28-2015 Meeting Minutes
- UMMS Criteria for Promotion: Distinction in Clinical Practice
- UMMS Criteria for Promotion: Distinction in Education
- UMMS Criteria for Promotion: Distinction in Investigation

### Materials available on the OFA Website:
[http://www.umassmed.edu/ofa/academic/governance-policies/academic-personnel-policy/revision/](http://www.umassmed.edu/ofa/academic/governance-policies/academic-personnel-policy/revision/)

### Agenda
1. Review minutes from 10-28-2015
2. Criteria for Promotion Format & Process
3. Review of example
4. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor & Professor table discussion
5. Table Report Out
6. Next Steps

### Comments/Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Comments/Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>L. Thorndyke</td>
<td>Dr. Thorndyke asked the AAWG to review the minutes. Minutes approved without change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>L. Thorndyke</td>
<td>Dr. Thorndyke gave a summary of the process up to this point; areas of focus now called “areas of distinction” The goal for this meeting is to review the expanded criteria for advancement in academic rank for Associate Professor and Professor and determine: (1) are the criteria appropriate? (2) is anything missing? Areas of Distinction received approval of the group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>R. Milner</td>
<td>Dr. Milner gave an overview of the process used to expand the criteria and how the framework was established. Tables reviewed criteria, made notes for recommended changes, reported out the results of the discussion and recommendations for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>L. Thorndyke</td>
<td>Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor &amp; Professor: Table Discussion Each table is asked to review the criteria for their area of distinction and determine if the criteria are appropriate and recommend any changes and/or additions. After each table worked on their assigned area of distinction, they were asked to review a second, different area of distinction with the same process. Report Out: Education Associate Professor • Recommend strong local to regional level in education and clinical practice. • Academic reputation criteria are appropriate • Add “formal” in front of “Advising and mentoring of graduate students…” • Add “Development, implementation and evaluation of innovative educational materials…” Professor • Comfortable with “sustained” record • Comfortable with regional to national, and in some cases international, level of academic reputation Clinical Practice Associate Professor • Recommend adding to the last bullet of Academic Reputation to state “Spokesperson for the school or university on areas of clinical expertise that advances the reputation of the academic department and/or school.” • Reputation should be same across all areas- raise the bar for clinical practice or lower it for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quality of Publications Determine Scholarship—Not Necessarily Quantity

**Professor**
- If we expect sustained for promotion to Professor, is there a timeliness quality to scholarship that should be required?

**Investigation**

**Associate Professor**
- Associate Professor should have “sustained” record or “recent evidence”

**Professor**
- Recommend using the word “strong” not just “sustained” for reputation.
- Some sort of timeline of what equals “sustained” (over several years, over a number of years)
- How to address a lag in productivity
- Recommend not including examples. Some examples were confusing

**Other discussion included:**
- Advising and mentoring graduate students - should be included in every area of distinction
- Some criteria fit into every area of distinction
- Recommend harmonizing language between all three areas of distinction
- Recommend consistency across areas of distinction, with regional for Associate Professor and National for Professor

### V. Next Steps: Agenda for Next Meeting

- Finalize Criteria in each area of distinction
- Assessment of Teaching/Educational Activities
- Entry Level Appointments

Next meeting: 11/23/2015 8:00am in S2-351
## Parking Lot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Name of fourth area of focus- Population Health, Policy & Community Engagement | • Suggest to simplify the name  
• Since it’s new, wanted to be as descriptive as possible  
• Delete “Population Health” and leave it as Policy & Community Engagement. Population Health can fall into either Investigation or Policy  
• “Health Policy & Community Engagement”  
• There can be an intersection of Population Health and Policy and Community Engagement. Community Engagement is so vague, but Population Health can be at the community level, at the policy level and the clinical level. Population Health adds more detail.  
• The word that is most vague is “engagement”                                                                                     |

- Need to reach a consensus for the requirement/expectation for teaching and definition of teaching
- Definition of how educational materials are disseminated needs to be further clarified
- Need to revisit the name of the model: Single Pathway model or Single Path model or Pathway for Promotion?

## Consensus Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consensus Items</th>
<th>Date of Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removal of modifiers</td>
<td>8/27/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of scholarship</td>
<td>10/13/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency of the AAWG to faculty through the website</td>
<td>10/13/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single pathway as a model for academic advancement</td>
<td>10/13/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include a fourth area of academic focus to include activities of population health, policy and community engagement</td>
<td>10/13/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change ‘areas of academic focus’ to Area of Distinction</td>
<td>11/13/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>