

Minutes from P&T Task Force

2.8.24

Present: Ann Botash, Greg Conners, Rebecca Garden, Patty Kane, Stacy Mehlek, JoAnne Race, Palma Shaw, Steve Taffet, Susan Wojcik

Excused: Jay Brenner, Jayne Charlamb, Margaret Maimone, Paul Massa, Siphon Mbuqe, Chris Morley, Terry Pudney, Anthony Tracey, Peggy Turk, Grace VanNortwick, Richard Veenstra, Richard Wojcikiewicz

Admin: Kelly Donovan

Discussion: Framework of Criteria:

- Advancement of knowledge criteria are inclusive and can be used for clinicians who must “integrate knowledge,” “apply,” etc. Further opportunities for dissemination that are not classic research (big R) include QI and teaching (clinicians can show scholarship in teaching while still being promoted on the clinician, not educator track).
- This new framework distills criteria to requiring every promotion to show **scholarship** and **leadership**. Examples for scholarship can be specific to area of distinction.
- Candidates would have to show “Excellence in” their area of distinction.

Discussion on Proficiency:

- It was noted that scholarship is required for each area of distinction. Proficiency in scholarship is expected of assistant professors, but our system does not require “promotion” to assistant professor, other than that the faculty member must have a terminal degree. Consensus to remove requirement for proficiency in scholarship, since we require excellence in scholarship for each area of distinction and it would be redundant.
- Each area of distinction will have **expectations for proficiency in service and teaching**. Although these may overlap with areas of distinction, they are not criteria for excellence and, if not required as proficiency, someone could get promoted without being an effective teacher or providing some civic duty to the institution/dept/professional societies, etc.

Discussion about levels of recognition for leadership and scholarship:

- Need to review other academic medical center promotion criteria for models (Ann to find links); National recognition should represent not just geographic level of work, but rigor of the scholarship and leadership—beyond local region.
 - Discussed idea that we should have some way to recognize local accomplishments that go beyond—showing breadth and depth of the work
 - Idea presented that someone could have breadth but not depth, but also have a rigorous service portfolio that could support level of promotion

Discussion about portfolios:

- Area of distinction would dictate specific portfolio requirement. Templates could be encouraged but not required.

Minutes from P&T Task Force

2.8.24

- One portfolio per area of distinction required, plus personal statement highly encouraged. If greater than 20% FTE on research, it would be recommended to also have a research portfolio--- [NOTE from AB added while writing these minutes—why just research? Should someone who is a clinician educator (and goes up for promotion on the Health Care Delivery pathway) have an educator portfolio if they have greater than 20% education FTE. Similarly, an educator may also have greater than 20% in some other area? This seems complicated and maybe the PS should be used for these situations, not an additional portfolio.]
- Personal statements could be used as a way to tell the story of their trajectory, particularly useful if the pathway is not linear.
 - CV is for supporting documentation—note, the template could be expanded with a few sentences to allow for proficiency documentation in service and teaching.
 - Portfolio is a deeper dive
 - Personal statement can show how the areas of work intersect—the story of how your career led to meeting promotion criteria

Discussion re: Tenure requirements: A subcommittee will be formed, and will report back to the larger Task Force.

Next meeting on February 29th at 4pm

- Documentation requirements to be discussed (including more about portfolios)
- 3 extramural letters—should we broaden to accept letters from leaders of community coalitions, policymakers, and other community partners? Or, are these expected to be letters of support for those pursuing non-traditional scholarship paths?
- McHale article on Team Science from the Journal of Translational research (see table below—where are we in this?)

Sample template for policy:

Area of Distinction:

Proficiency Area	Expectations	Examples
Teaching		
Service		

Criteria	Expectations	Examples
Scholarship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advancement of Knowledge • Dissemination • Recognition/Impact 		
Leadership		

Minutes from P&T Task Force
2.8.24

Table 3. Example policy excerpts describing expectations for independent versus team science for tenure-eligible versus non-tenure-eligible tracks within the same institution

Tenure-eligible	Non-tenure eligible
<p><i>"... demonstrate a career commitment to scholarly pursuit and have documentation of their endeavors by way of significant publication, grant support, peer recognition for outstanding research national and international recognition."</i></p>	<p><i>"an important supportive role in the genesis, conduct and reporting of research findings; considered an essential member of the team carrying out the research in a supportive or fundamental role and may be a PI, Co-PI... Co-Investigator or Key Personnel on funded grants"</i></p>
<p><i>"... expected to develop an extramurally funded program of research that is internationally recognized.... Such research should be original, creative, transformative, and it should substantively advance the discipline of the faculty member ... prepared to seek independent, peer-reviewed research support."</i></p>	<p><i>"Research funding as co-investigator from federal, foundation, or industry resources ... Authorship on multi-authored journals articles and/or documentation of a major, substantial contribution by the candidate to a collaborative, multidisciplinary project and publications."</i></p>
<p><i>"Candidates must have a national reputation for outstanding independent work in their area of scholarship ... [candidate] will have a history of having been awarded several independent research grants ..."</i></p>	<p><i>"... faculty provide critical expertise to a program or group of research teams as a co-investigator with contributions that do not necessarily require or result in independent grant funding, but some faculty on this track may serve as principal investigator on related research ..."</i></p>
<p><i>"Leader ... original papers that must clearly highlight the individuals' role in advancing the field; investigator driven [grants], most as PI or one of multiple PIs"</i></p>	<p><i>"Collaborator and sometimes leader ... original papers as either a project leader or collaborator ... collaborative and sometimes investigator-driven"</i></p>

Co-PI, co-principal investigator; PI, principal investigator.