### Academic Advancement Work Group

**Meeting Minutes**

Friday, January 22nd, 2016 2:00pm – 3:30pm

**Meeting Location:** ASC Cube

---

#### Agenda:

1. Review minutes from 1-22-2016
2. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor & Professor
3. Revised Tool for Evaluation
4. Next Steps

#### Materials:

- 1-8-2016 Meeting Minutes
- Tool for Evaluation of Candidates
- Scenarios

**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/)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Comments/Minutes</th>
<th>Action/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. L. Thorndyke | Dr. Thorndyke asked the AAWG to review the minutes  
- Consensus item from 1/8/16 should be changed to reflect promotion to “Associate Professor” rank | Minutes approved with minor change |
| 2. L. Thorndyke | Dr. Thorndyke reviewed proposed changes to the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. Changes included (1) the evaluation should take into account the assignment/distribution of effort across the mission areas, and (2) an ‘exception clause’ to provide a mechanism for the RARE instance when a candidate proposed for promotion might not meet the required criteria (such as the expectation to teach). A third issue was raised which needs further discussion before being added to the criteria for promotion which is: are the requirements for promotion of tenure track/tenured faculty different (higher) than for non-tenure track faculty?  
Discussion included:  
- The same criteria should be required for all faculty on the tenure-track, regardless of area of distinction.  
- In a clinical department where there’s a charge to hire a physician scientists, a different set of requirements for promotion of tenure track faculty could result in negative consequences (a disincentive or a deleterious effect) on physician scientists on the tenure track because they would be required to meet a higher standard than a non-tenure track clinical faculty member. Thus, it would be harder for them to get promoted, and take a longer period of time.  
- General agreement/consensus was achieved regarding the concept that evaluations should be made on the distribution of effort of the individual faculty member.  
- Within some basic science departments, the expectations for the tenure-track faculty are different than for those on the non-tenure track—principally in the requirement for obtaining R01 grant funding. | Handouts here  
Agreement upon the concept: Faculty should be evaluated for promotion taking into consideration their assignment of effort. |
| 3. L. Thorndyke | Revised Tool for Evaluation  
Dr. Thorndyke reviewed the changes made to the evaluation tool. These included a short statement in each criterion area as well as a rating of that area, and a final recommendation that is not tied to a particular number of ‘strong’ or ‘moderate’ ratings.  
Discussion included:  
- General agreement with/approval of the changes to the Evaluation Tool.  
- Will there be a requirement to use the tool?  
  - It will not be required, but committees need something to operationalize the agreed upon principals and to guide the DPAC letter of recommendation. | |
4. **L. Thorndyke**

**Criteria for Appointment**

**A. Entry Level appointments (Instructor/Assistant Professor)**

Dr. Thorndyke reviewed the current criteria for entry level positions (Instructor & Assistant Professor). These criteria are working well and the new description of proposed criteria are relatively unchanged. The AAWG discussed the document with the proposed language for appointment at Instructor & Assistant Professor. Discussion included:

**Instructor:**
- Clinical fellows: should any fellows be provided appointments? Should all fellows be provided appointments? Need to check restrictions from ACGME regarding faculty appointments.
- What is a ‘small proportion’ of effort? Less than 10% FTE. Is this adequate for a faculty appointment?
- Incorporate language about individuals who are transitioning and achieving a greater level of independence—which might include both clinical (fellows) and basic scientists.
- Clinical fellows might be included in one of the other categories if the department wants to put them forward for an Instructor appointment.

**Assistant Professor:**
- What is a “substantial” proportion of effort? This term should be replaced by a “greater” proportion of effort (as opposed to a small proportion of effort defined as less than 10%.
- Level of training required: recommend “must have completed post-doctoral training (or equivalent) as appropriate” in order to accommodate individuals who either do not generally complete post-doctoral training (economics or biostatistics) or have other (industry) experience in lieu of a post-doc.

**B. Voluntary Faculty appointments**

Dr. Thorndyke reviewed a draft outlining various types of faculty appointments.

A proposed new category for voluntary faculty is called “affiliate” faculty. The rank for affiliate faculty would be dependent upon the combination of the proportion of effort contributed to UMMS missions AND the credentials (CV) of the individual.

Discussion included:
- Recommend changing the effort requirement to less than 10% for Instructor and greater than 10% for Assistant Professor, Associate Professor & Professor. Consensus agreement.
- Recommend a minimum of 50 hrs/yr in order to qualify for a voluntary faculty appointment.
- Agreement that Affiliate Faculty is a useful term for the voluntary faculty.

5. **L. Thorndyke**

**Next Steps**

1. Tenure: Definition, Guarantees, Criteria for award

**Next meeting: 2/23/2016 8:00am in S2-310**
## 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” |
| Definition of how educational materials are disseminated needs to be further clarified | |
| “Double dipping” - can one activity be counted towards different criteria? | |
| Name of “Clinical Practice” - renamed. Clinical Medicine? Clinical Activities? | • Suggest a title that better encompasses these faculty |
| Time in rank needed before advancement in rank? | • Current APP stipulated in general 6 years needed before eligible for advancing in rank. |

## 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 model</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>Promotion to Professor in all areas of distinction requires national and/or international reputation</td>
<td>11/23/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in educational activities is expected of all faculty</td>
<td>11/23/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship should be assessed in the context of effort assignment.</td>
<td>12/14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expectation for scholarship should be “strong” for promotion to Professor.</td>
<td>12/14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the term “minimal” rather than weak.</td>
<td>12/14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the term “Clinical Medicine” rather than “Clinical Practice”</td>
<td>12/14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require a minimum of “moderate” rating in education for promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td>1/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With implementation of the revised APP, training will be needed for Chairs, DPACs and PAC. Faculty development (from chairs, mentors, and the OFA) will be needed for the faculty.</td>
<td>1/8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria to Associate Professor: “strong in the area if distinction and one other area” or “strong in the area of distinction and moderate in at least 2 other areas”</td>
<td>1/22/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>