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Chair’s letter for initial appointment as Research Assistant Professor

Begin with:

MMMM DD, 20YY

To: Kenneth S. Polonsky, MD

 Dean, Biological Sciences Division

From Firstname Lastname, Chair

Department of Medicine

Subject: Appointment of Firstname Lastame, Degree

By a vote of XX in favor, YY opposed, ZZ abstaining, and ZZ not returning a ballot, the Department of Deptname proposes appointment as Research Assistant Professor effective as of MMMM DD, 20YY for a term of [3 years maximum; if less, explain (e.g., coterminous with funding)]. Faculty eligible to vote were [name or describe]. We recommend an annual salary of $##,###, which will be supported from FAS account(s) #-#####. Accompanying this proposal are the candidate’s curriculum vitae and pertinent statements or other materials, which provide the basis for the proposal as follows:

Please address each of the following items. Overall, the text should not exceed 3 pages; 2 pages are probably ideal.

☐What is the rationale for appointing the candidate as a Research Appointee as opposed to as a staff member? [Typically this involves a need for an intellectual contribution.]

☐Analysis of the candidate's past research program and findings, as it portends future contributions to UChicago and qualifies the candidate for the proposed appointment.  [Discuss the work and the letters, *not* the candidate.]

☐Analysis of the candidate's expected accomplishments during the proposed term. Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

[We are simply looking for clearly-stated expectations whose attainment can be assessed at reappointment.]

☐Career development plan, including

1. Who will be responsible for mentorship and career development advice?
2. Describe the content of this advice and its frequency of delivery

Also include in electronic format:

 •Letters from references (combined alphabetically in a single PDF would be appreciated)

•The candidate’s combined CV and statements

•If relevant, no more than three exemplary works of published scholarship.
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Chair’s letter for triennial reappointment as Research Assistant Professor

[A complete letter of the form below is required every third year at this parenthetical rank. Chair’s letters for other reappointments may be (not must be) short format; see next section.]

Begin with:

MMMM DD, 20YY

To: Kenneth S. Polonsky, MD

 Dean, Biological Sciences Division

From Firstname Lastname, Chair

Department of Medicine

Subject: Appointment of Firstname Lastame, Degree

By a vote of XX in favor, YY opposed, ZZ abstaining, and ZZ not returning a ballot, the Department of Deptname proposes reappointment as Research Assistant Professor effective as of MMMM DD, 20YY for a term of [3 years maximum; if less, explain (e.g., coterminous with funding)]. Faculty eligible to vote were [name or describe]. We recommend an annual salary of $##,###, which will be supported from FAS account(s) #-#####; this represents an increase of #%. The department acknowledges that it and the candidate understands and agrees that total time as Research Assistant Professor may not exceed 9 years. Faculty eligible to vote were [name or describe]. Accompanying this proposal are the candidate’s curriculum vitae and pertinent statements or other materials, which provide the basis for the proposal as follows:

Please address each of the following items. Overall, the text should not exceed 3 pages; 2 pages are probably ideal.

☐What is the rationale for appointing the candidate as a Research Appointee as opposed to as a staff member? [Typically this involves a need for an intellectual contribution.]

☐Analysis of the candidate's research program and findings while a Research Assistant Professor, as it portends future contributions to UChicago and qualifies the candidate for the proposed reappointment.  [Discuss the work and the letters, *not* the candidate.] Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

[You are encouraged to compare these to the expectations stated in the original appointment proposal.]

☐Analysis of the candidate's expected accomplishments during the next 3 years (even if you will be appointing one year at a time). Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

[We are simply looking for clearly-stated expectations whose attainment can be assessed at the next triennial review.]

☐IF THIS IS A YEAR 3 REAPPOINTMENT: Will the above “expected accomplishments during the next 3 years”, if completed, suffice for promotion to Research Associate Professor at Year 6? If not,

 (a) What more is needed?

 (b) In what year do you guess it will be completed?

IF THIS IS A YEAR 6 REAPPOINTMENT:

 (a) In what way(s) does the candidate presently fall short of qualifying for promotion to Research Associate Professor? That is, what more needs to be done?

 (b) In what year do you expect the candidate to qualify for promotion to Research Professor?

☐Career development plan, including

1. Who will be responsible for mentorship and career development advice?
2. Describe the content of this advice and its frequency of delivery

☐Draft of letter to be given to the Research Assistant Professor after approval of reappointment at the 3rd and 6th year in rank:

|  |
| --- |
| Dear X,I have the pleasure of informing you that the Provost has approved recommendations of the department and dean that you be renewed as Research Assistant Professor for a term ending on X. The senior members of the department have asked that I convey to you our recognition of your more substantial accomplishments since joining us. I also want to take the occasion of your renewal to provide you with our assessment of where you need to concentrate your efforts in preparation for promotion. The bases for promotion to Research Associate Professor, which is normally required within 9 years total as Research Assistant Professor), are: (a) intellectual contribution to our research programs, typically evident through authorship of original publications in peer-reviewed journals, important contributions to successful grant applications, and other evidence of research and scholarly accomplishments; and (b) external standing and recognition, which may be documented in diverse ways.Your department's assessment of your strengths and weaknesses, and corresponding advice and offers of assistance, are as follows:***Intellectual contributions to research and scholarship:***STRENGTHS:••ª(add more bullet points as needed)WEAKNESSES•••(add more bullet points as needed) ADVICE/OFFERS OF ASSISTANCE•••(add more bullet points as needed)***Contributions to the success of grant applications:***STRENGTHS:••ª(add more bullet points as needed)WEAKNESSES•••(add more bullet points as needed) ADVICE/OFFERS OF ASSISTANCE•••(add more bullet points as needed)***External stature and recognition:***STRENGTHS:••ª(add more bullet points as needed)WEAKNESSES•••(add more bullet points as needed) ADVICE/OFFERS OF ASSISTANCE•••(add more bullet points as needed)Furthermore, it is our estimate that you will qualify in promotion in year YYYY. To achieve this target, we suggest the following ‘deliverables’ for the next 3 years (contingent on your reappointment):YEAR 1: ….YEAR 2: ….YEAR 3:…We recognize that the course of research is unpredictable, and that in consultation with your faculty supervisor you may deviate from these deliverables as appropriate. Do be aware, moreover, that your satisfaction of the BSD’s criteria for promotion will be judged by the department, external experts, and higher levels of review. Thus, please take this letter as a guide but not a checklist of items that, if satisfied, will result in promotion.The department has suggested the following career development plan: [quote from above]In summary, our assessment is that you need to maintain your current trajectory of growth in [areas]. but [slightly/significantly/dramatically] improve your trajectory of growth in [other areas] during the next term of appointment. I am always available to discuss with you any questions you may have about this assessment. Please know that your faculty colleagues consider it a pleasure to have you among us. We are invested in your success.Sincerely,  |

Also include in electronic format:

•The candidate’s combined CV and statements

•If relevant, no more than three exemplary works of published scholarship. If none are available, written works in progress, which may include manuscripts and grant applications, funded or unfunded.

[[Return to top/index]](#START)

Short form chair’s letter for non-triennial reappointment as Research Assistant Professor

[A complete letter as in the previous section is required every third year at this parenthetical rank. At other times (e.g., reappointments before the close of Years 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8), Chair’s letters reappointments may be (not must be) short format as described below. Departments are always encouraged to provide extensive feedback and consult the entire faculty.

Begin with:

MMMM DD, 20YY

To: Kenneth S. Polonsky, MD

 Dean, Biological Sciences Division

From Firstname Lastname, Chair

Department of Deptname

Firstname Lastname, Section Chief if applicable

Department of Deptname

Firstname Lastname, Faculty Sponsor/Supervisor

Department of Deptname

Subject: Reappointment of Firstname Lastame, Degree

On behalf of the faculty of the Department of Deptname, we propose reappointment as Research Assistant Professor effective as of MMMM DD, 20YY for a term of [often 1 year; explain (e.g., coterminous with funding)]. We recommend an annual salary of $##,###, which will be supported from FAS account(s) #-#####; this represents an increase of #%. The department acknowledges that it and the candidate understands and agrees that total time as Research Assistant Professor may not exceed 9 years. Accompanying this proposal are the candidate’s curriculum vitae and pertinent statements or other materials, which provide the basis for the proposal as follows:

A brief assessment of the Research Appointee’s performance during the present term and progress towards promotion is as follows:

[No more than one page]

Also include in electronic format:

•The candidate’s combined CV and statements

•If relevant, no more than three exemplary works of published scholarship. If none are available, written works in progress, which may include manuscripts and grant applications, funded or unfunded.
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Chair’s letter for appointment as or promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor

Begin with:

MMMM DD, 20YY

To: Kenneth S. Polonsky, MD

 Dean, Biological Sciences Division

From Firstname Lastname, Chair

Department of Medicine

Subject: Appointment/Promotion of Firstname Lastame, Degree as Research Associate Professor or Research Professor

By a vote of XX in favor, YY opposed, ZZ abstaining, and ZZ not returning a ballot, the Department of Deptname proposes the above appointment effective as of MMMM DD, 20YY. Faculty eligible to vote were [name or describe]. We recommend an annual salary of $##,###, which will be supported from FAS account(s) #-#####; this represents an increase of #%. Accompanying this proposal are the candidate’s curriculum vitae and pertinent statements or other materials, which provide the basis for the proposal as follows:

Please address each of the following items. Overall, the text should not exceed 4 pages; 2-3 pages are probably ideal.

☐Lay Summary [state the major research accomplishments and findings in language that an intelligent non-scientist could understand and appreciate, with a sentence each on education, institutional service, and clinical care delivery if any. This is at the Provost’s request.]

☐What is the rationale for appointing the candidate as a Research Appointee, as opposed to as a staff member? [Typically this involves a need for an intellectual contribution.]

☐Analysis of the candidate's research program and findings since the end of postdoctoral training, as it portends future contributions to UChicago and qualifies the candidate for the proposed appointment.  [Discuss the work, *not* the candidate.] Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

☐Analysis of the letter case (not all may be necessary/relevant):

1. 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; why did you include them anyway?
2. Who did not respond to your request?  Do the non-responses reflect unfavorably on the candidate?
3. Which letters are unreservedly positive [just list the names of their writers]?  Of those with reservations, how do you respond to the reservations?
4. Are there points of concern or disagreements with the internal analysis? How should the Provost understand those?
5. Are there reputations or outlooks of the referees that the Provost should know about that would help him to assess their comments more completely?
6. Does the Chair weigh some observations (internal and external) more heavily than others and why?

☐Analysis of the candidate's expected accomplishments during the proposed term. Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

[We are simply looking for clearly-stated expectations whose attainment can be assessed at the end of the proposed term.]

Also include in electronic format:

•Any letters. We are looking not for simple endorsements, but for close, analytical judgments of the value of the candidate's work.

•The candidate’s combined CV and statements

•If relevant, no more than five exemplary works of published scholarship.
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Chair’s letter for reappointment as Research Associate Professor or Research Professor

[A complete letter of the form below is required every fifth year at this parenthetical rank. Chair’s letters for other reappointments may be (not must be) short format; see short form for Research Assistant Professor. Please contact the Office of Academic Affairs if a complete letter is due in 2012; an extension may be possible.]

Begin with:

MMMM DD, 20YY

To: Kenneth S. Polonsky, MD

 Dean, Biological Sciences Division

From Firstname Lastname, Chair

Department of Medicine

Subject: Reappointment of Firstname Lastame, Degree as Research Associate Professor or Professor

By a vote of XX in favor, YY opposed, ZZ abstaining, and ZZ not returning a ballot, the Department of Deptname proposes the above appointment effective as of MMMM DD, 20YY. Faculty eligible to vote were [name or describe]. We recommend an annual salary of $##,###, which will be supported from FAS account(s) #-#####; this represents an increase of #%. Accompanying this proposal are the candidate’s curriculum vitae and pertinent statements or other materials, which provide the basis for the proposal as follows:

Please address each of the following items. Overall, the text should not exceed 3 pages; 1-2 pages are probably ideal.

☐Lay Summary [state the major research accomplishments and findings in language that an intelligent non-scientist could understand and appreciate, with a sentence each on education, institutional service, and clinical care delivery if any. This is at the Provost’s request.]

☐What is the rationale for appointing the candidate as a Research Appointee, as opposed to as a staff member? [Typically this involves a need for an intellectual contribution.]

☐Analysis of the candidate's research program and findings since the start of appointment at the present rank, as it portends future contributions to UChicago and qualifies the candidate for the proposed reappointment.  [Discuss the work, *not* the candidate.] Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

☐Analysis of the candidate's expected accomplishments during the proposed term. Please speak to:

1. Research contributions
2. Publication activity
3. Grants activity
4. External stature-establishing activity (external speaking and service)

[We are simply looking for clearly-stated expectations whose attainment can be assessed at the end of the proposed term.]

Also include in electronic format:

•The candidate’s combined CV and statements

•If relevant, no more than five exemplary works of published scholarship.
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Solicitation letter for initial appointment as Research Assistant Professor

[Normally the candidate will arrange for letters to sent to the search. If the department wishes to solicit letters or guide the candidate / letter writers on letters that will be most helpful, the following language can be used or adapted.]

Date

Dear Doctor \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_:

The Department of (department) is considering the appointment of (candidate) as Research Assistant Professor. As you know, one of the important sources of information for making such decisions is outside letters from leading figures in the candidate's field such as yourself. We would very much like to have you write such a letter for us about the candidate.

At the University of Chicago, Research Appointees are appointed to advance the research program of a member of the faculty. Research Appointees conduct research in collaboration with other investigators or groups of investigators. They also may provide the experience, expertise and leadership needed for the efficient running of core laboratories, and may have command of novel and technically demanding research technologies, making them available to a broad range of faculty. Scientific independence, while allowed and credited, is not required.

Initial appointment as Research Assistant Professor in our system is based on the expectation that:

(a) The candidate will make outstanding intellectual contributions to faculty research programs on campus.

(b) The candidate will qualify for promotion to Research Associate Professor within 9 years of the start of the appointment. The basis for this promotion will be authorship of original publications in peer reviewed journals, important contributions to successful grant applications, though not necessarily as the Principal Investigator, other evidence of research and scholarly accomplishments, and external standing of the candidate

The following matter most to our evaluation:

(1) What is your assessment of the scientific training and work done to date? Please credit collaborative scholarship, even if the candidate is not first or last author, if you are able to distinguish the candidate's contribution to the collaborative work.

(2) In your opinion, will the candidate meet our two expectations as outlined above?

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from prominent professionals in the field such as yourself. We deeply appreciate your help and can only promise to reciprocate when your institution has similar needs. You may be sure that your comments will be treated confidentially.  We would appreciate receiving your comments no later than (date). We would readily accept your comments in the form of (a) a letter, (b) an email to us at (email), either as plain text or an attachment, or (c) fax (our fax number is fax [but not a public fax machine]). We thank you in advance for your interest and help in this matter and would very much appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Doe, M.D., Ph.D.

Chair, Department of (Department)

enc.

suggested enclosures:

updated CV and bibliography

pertinent candidate’s statements

selected reprints
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Solicitation letter for initial appointment as or promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor

The Department of (department) is considering the appointment of (candidate) as Research Associate/Full Professor. As you know, one of the important sources of information for making such decisions is outside letters from leading figures in the candidate's field such as yourself. We would very much like to have you write such a letter for us about the candidate.

At the University of Chicago, Research Appointees are appointed to advance the research program of a member of the faculty. Research Appointees conduct research in collaboration with other investigators or groups of investigators. They also may provide the experience, expertise and leadership needed for the efficient running of core laboratories, and may have command of novel and technically demanding research technologies, making them available to a broad range of faculty. Scientific independence, while allowed and credited, is not required.

Appointment as Research Appointee at this rank in our system is based on the demonstration that the candidate has made outstanding intellectual contributions to faculty research programs on campus, typically evident through authorship of original publications in peer reviewed journals, important contributions to successful grant applications (though not necessarily as the Principal Investigator), other evidence of research and scholarly accomplishments, and external standing.

The following matter most to our evaluation:

(1) What is your assessment of the scientific work done to date? We are looking not for simple endorsements, but for close, analytical judgments of the value of the candidate's work. Please credit collaborative scholarship, even if the candidate is not first or last author, if you are able to distinguish the candidate's contribution to the collaborative work.

(2) What is your assessment of the candidate’s stature and recognition outside the University of Chicago?

We know that this process imposes a time-consuming task upon you, but there really is no adequate substitute for informed judgments from prominent professionals in the field such as yourself. We deeply appreciate your help and can only promise to reciprocate when your institution has similar needs. You may be sure that your comments will be treated confidentially.  We would appreciate receiving your comments no later than (date). We would readily accept your comments in the form of (a) a letter, (b) an email to us at (email), either as plain text or an attachment, or (c) fax (our fax number is fax [but not a public fax machine]). We thank you in advance for your interest and help in this matter and would very much appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

John W. Doe, M.D., Ph.D.

Chair, Department of (Department)

enc.

suggested enclosures:

updated CV and bibliography

pertinent candidate’s statements

selected reprints
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**Statement for external evaluators**

**Guidelines1 for Research Appointees : Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

 *Job description*: Research Appointees are appointed to advance the research program of a member of the faculty. Research Appointees conduct research in collaboration with other investigators or groups of investigators. They also may provide the experience, expertise and leadership needed for the efficient running of core laboratories, and may have command of novel and technically demanding research technologies, making them available to a broad range of faculty. Participation in the other missions of BSD is not required and may be precluded by stipulations of the funding source or effort allocation. Scientific independence, while allowed and credited, is not required.

 *Quality:* Research Appointees should have the technical knowledge, expertise, experience and accomplishment in research to make meaningful, original, intellectual contributions to research programs. This aspect and the necessity for associated due diligence distinguish them from Research Professionals, where the focus is on technical contributions to the research.

*Distinct from faculty*: Research Appointees cannot be promoted to the UChicago faculty tracks. Research Appointees who believe themselves to be qualified may compete in national searches for open faculty positions.

*Process*: Departments recommending appointments and promotions will evaluate the candidate’s satisfaction of the relevant criteria (see below), and obtain at least three assessments of the candidate’s satisfaction of the relevant criteria, and vote on the recommendation. The department chair is responsible for preparation of a letter describing the evaluation and the process leading to it. The Dean’s evaluation is transmitted to the Provost for final action.

More specific criteria for appointment and promotion to each rank in the series are

set forth below.

**A. Research Assistant Professor**

Appointment at this rank requires that research training be complete, and that the appointee has the aptitude and motivation to advance to Research Associate Professor in due course. Where promotion or work towards it is not desirable or feasible, the position of Research Professional should be used. Terms are for a maximum of three years, and reappointment requires evidence of adequate progress towards Research
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**CV + Statements**

Dear Candidate for Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, or Research Professor

This document replaces the ‘e-form’ previously in use.

Instructions:

1. For the most part, this is a Microsoft Word document that you may modify to be applicable to your particular circumstances.
2. Please overwrite the current content with your own information. Please preserve the major headings and format as much as possible. The imagined information presently in the CV portion is intended to give you guidance as to what is expected.
3. If you have nothing to enter in a section or it is not applicable, please either delete it or overwrite the imaginary entries with ‘Not applicable’. Only a few Research Associates will have information pertinent to every section. You may also re-order the sections to conform to your priorities. That is, you may put the scholarship sections first or last depending on your track and your role here.
4. Please delete this page before finalizing.

**John Smith, M.D., Ph.D.**

The University of Chicago

Department of Toe Transplantation

Section of Immunology

KCBD 1234

900 East 57th Street, MC 4123

Chicago, IL 60637-1234

Office: (773)-702-4321

Fax: (773)-834-4321

Email: jsmth27@bsd.uchicago.edu

Web page: http://toetransplant.bsd.uchicago.edu/faculty/smith.htm

**ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS**

2007-2008 Lecturer, Department of Immunology, Peer University, Peer City, CA

2009- Research Assistant Professor, Department of Toe Transplantation, Section of Immunology, University of Chicago

**ACADEMIC TRAINING**

1985-1989 B.A., Biology. Swell College, Swell, CA

1989-1990 M.S., Immunology. Great State University, Great State, CA

1990-1997 Medical Scientist Training Program, Peer University, Peer City, CA

1996 Ph.D., Molecular transplantation, Transplant Institute, Peer University, Peer City, CA

1997 M.D., Peer University Medical School, Peer City, CA

1997-1998 Residency, Division of Toe Transplantation, Peer Hospital, Peer City, CA.

1998-1999 Postdoctoral Fellow, Walk-Planck-Institute for Experimental Transplantation, Rozenzweig, Germany

**SCHOLARSHIP**

*(a) Peer-reviewed publications in the primary literature, exclusive of abstracts:*

1. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2001. Effect of A and B on toe transplantation. Science 124:5-6. http://sciencemag/124/5-6

2. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2003. Effect of C and D on toe transplantation. Nature 124:5-6. http://naturemag/124/5-6

3. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2005. Effect of E and F on toe transplantation. NEJM 124:5-6. http://nejmmag/124/5-6

4. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2007. Effect of G and H on toe transplantation. JAMA 124:5-6. http://jamamag/124/5-6

*(b) Peer-reviewed works in 'non-traditional' outlets:*

1. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2009. Software package for statistical analysis of toe transplant success. http://toetranssoc.org/stats/successpkg. Server operated by American Society of Toe Transplantation, which reviews posted content. 1100 downloads to date.

2. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2010. Software package for statistical analysis of toe transplant success. IEEE Toe Transplantation Meeting Platform Presentation. Among 200 of 1500 submissions selected for presentation. Tradition in this field is that works are not published.

3. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. US Patent 123456. Method for suppressing toe transplant rejection.

(c) Peer-reviewed works accepted or in press

1. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. In press. Effect of I and J on toe transplantation. Journal of Clinical Investigation 124:5-6. http://jcimag/124/5-6.

(d) Non-peer-reviewed original articles

1. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. 2006. Toe transplantation for the masses. Unreviewed Medical Advances 124:5-6. http://medadvancemag/124/5-6

(e) Books:

*As author:*

1. Smith, J. 2010. *Toe Transplantation*. 450 pp., Prestigious Academic Publisher, Chicago, IL.

*As editor:*

1. Smith, J., and Joes, Q. 2009. Advances in Toe Transplantation. 15 chapters, 450 pp., Prestigious Academic Publisher, Chicago, IL.

(e) Book chapters:

1. Smith, J. 2009. Immunologic aspects. In: Smith, J., and Joes, Q. 2009. Advances in Toe Transplantation. 15 chapters, 450 pp., Prestigious Academic Publisher, Chicago, IL.

(f) Other works that are publically available (websites, interviews, publications in the popular press, testimony, computer programs, protocols, reagents, inventions, patents not listed above, etc.)

2008 Interview on NPR Science Friday: "Toe transplantation"

2009 Toeoma cell line

(g) Clinical trials that are ongoing and unpublished

1. Toe Transplant Trial Group A: Phase 3 Trial of Neosporatin A. Role: Designer and leader. Status: complete.

1. Toe Transplant Trial Group A: Phase 2 Trial of Neosporatin B. Role: enrolling patients. Status: in progress.

(j) Works in review, in preparation, etc. not yet publically available [list ONLY if available for BSD review]

1. Hiill, S. and J. Smith. In preparation. Effect of R and S on toe transplantation. Manuscript.

**FUNDING**

*(a) Past:*

1.NIH K08-12345. PI: J. Mentor. My role: Mentee. Title: "Effect of A on B". Total direct costs: $123,456. Annual salary recovery or effort: 25%. Project period: 1/2/03-1/2/05.

2.NIH P01-12345. PI: J. Bigshot. My role: PI of Subproject. Title: "Effect of A on B". Total direct costs: $123,456. Annual salary recovery or effort: 25%. Project period: 1/2/07-1/2/09.

*(b) Current:*

1. NIH R01-12345. PI: J. Smith. My role: PI. Title: "Effect of C on D". Total direct costs: $456,789. Annual salary recovery or effort: 35%. Project period: 1/2/09-1/2/15.

*(c) Pending:*

1. NIH R01-12345. PI: J. Smith. My role: PI. Title: "Effect of E on F". Total direct costs: $456,789. Annual salary recovery or effort: 25%. Project period: 1/2/13-1/2/15. Notification expected: 1/2/12

**HONORS, PRIZES, AND AWARDS**

1984 National Merit Scholarship

1989 Magna cum laude, Swell College

1989 Distinction in Biology, Swell College

1996 Plotnik Research Prize, Peer University Medical School, Peer City, CA

2003 Research Foundation Young Investigator Award

2005-2007 Trustee Scholar, Department of Toe Transplantation, Section of Immunology, University of Chicago

2007 Best Poster Presentation, International Society of Toe Transplantation Annual Meeting

2008 Plotnik Medal for Distinguished Research by a Young Investigator

2009 Distinguished Junior Fellow, Plotnik Institute

2010 Scientist of the Year, Department of Toe Transplantation

**INVITED SPEAKING**

2005 Research seminar, Peerage University, London, UK

2006 Research seminar, 'Advances in toe transplantation', Peer University, CA

2007 Plenary lecture, International Society of Toe Transplantation Annual Meeting

2008 Visiting professorship, Peer University Medical School, Peer City, CA

2009 Invited speaker, Millstone Research Conference on Transplantation, Millstone, CO

2010 Invited speaker, 'Best practices in toe transplant education', International Society for Medical Education

**INVITED, ELECTED, OR APPOINTED EXTRAMURAL SERVICE**

2005 Organizing Committee, International Society of Toe Transplantation Annual Meeting

2006 Organizing Committee, Chicago Transplant Day

2007 LCME Review Committee, Peer University Medical School

2008 Vice President, Midwest Transplantation Society

2009 Member, Toe Transplant Study Section, NIH

2009 Editorial Board, PLoS Transplantation

2009 Examiner, American Board of Transplantation

2009 Testimony before the US Senate Select Committee on Transplantation Practices

Various Manuscript reviewer for Science, Nature, Cell, JAMA, NEJM, and Advances in Toe Transplantation

**PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES**

*Elected or invited membership:*

American Academy of Transplantation

The Horton Society

*Other:*

American Association for the Advancement of Science

American Genetic Society

Society for Transplantation

**SERVICE**

**University of Chicago**

*Committee membership:*

2005-2008 Committee on Research Practices

2006- Committee on Transplant Biology Curriculum Committee

2006- Transplant Scientist Training Program Steering Committee

2008 Transplant Trials Review Committee

2010 University Committee on Honorary Degrees

2010 Pritzker School of Medicine Curriculum Committee

*Other:*

Various Interviewer of medical school applicants, Pritzker School of Medicine

2009 Application reader, Honors Scholarship selection, The College

2011 Volunteer member, University of Chicago relief team to care for victims of the typhoon in Krakosia

**Extramural (not indicated above)**

*Leadership roles:*

2007-2008 Organizer, Chicago Transplant Day

2008- Organizer, Walk for Toe Transplantation

*Other:*

2000 Resident selection committee, Peer University Medical School

2005-2008 Community volunteer, Chicago Outreach

**SCHOLARSHIP STATEMENT**

*(a) Past and current [2-page limit]:*

The page limit is intentional. Nominations to the National Academy of Sciences, for example, must describe the scholarship in 250 words or less. “I developed the theory of natural selection” or “I invented PCR” or “I discovered the cure for dengue fever”, for example, speak for themselves. Your department or you may wish to prepare a longer statement to submit to external letter writers, but that is a separate matter.

Our initial experience with these statements is that they need to be written for scientists who are not biologists. That is, if your statement is written to impress specialists in your field, it is likely to be lost on the reviewers who really matter. The statements work best when they explain the ‘big picture’, overarching significance, and broad theme/context of your research.

Often the statements for beginning Research Assistant Professors will be shorter than the limit.

*(b) Proposed and future [1-page limit]:*

The page limit is intentional. Your department or you may wish to prepare a longer statement to submit to external letter writers, but that is a separate matter. Often the statements for beginning Research Assistant Professorswill be shorter than the limit.

**EXEMPLARY ACHIEVEMENTS:** For the foregoing listings of publications and products, please list no more than five (total) performed while at your present rank that you consider your most significant achievements. Three would be appropriate for Research Assistant Professor. For each:

a. Please enter the reference/citation (If any are available online, it would be helpful to include their URLs.)

b. Please state the major finding in 1-2 sentences.

c. If you are not the sole author, please describe (1) each author, e.g. a senior faculty collaborator, a fellow working with my collaborator X, and (2) what each author (including yourself) contributed to the work. Explain, for example, which author(s) originated the project, did the work, wrote the publication, made intellectual contributions, made technical contributions, provided reagents, provided grant support and nothing else, are included by courtesy, and/or had any other role that may be relevant.

If you have nothing to enter in some/all boxes, leave blank.

**#1**

|  |
| --- |
| Reference:  |
| Major finding:  |
| Roles of authors:  |

**#2**

|  |
| --- |
| Reference:  |
| Major finding:  |
| Roles of authors:  |

**#3**

|  |
| --- |
| Reference:  |
| Major finding:  |
| Roles of authors:  |

**#4**

|  |
| --- |
| Reference:  |
| Major finding:  |
| Roles of authors:  |

**#5**

|  |
| --- |
| Reference:  |
| Major finding:  |
| Roles of authors:  |

**CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN [for Reappointment as Research Assistant Professor only]** *[1-page limit]:*

 *(a) Past and current:*

Please describe the progress you have made and are making towards promotion, and the advice/mentorship you are receiving. If you are 100% happy with your progress, just end there. If not, please describe any obstacles to your development during the current, soon-concluding term. These might be personal, material (facilities and support), collegial, or unanticipated issues in your research or funding. To the extent these are in the past, describe what you are doing to get back on track. To the extent these are ongoing and/or anticipated, describe how you intend to deal with them.

*(b) Proposed and future:*

On what basis and when do you expect to be promoted? What will you do differently during your next term as Research Assistant Professor), if anything, with respect to scholarship, grant support, education, and institutional citizenship? What assistance do you need from your colleagues, department or section, the Division, or other units of the University for the successful culmination of your Research Assistant Professorship)?
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**Guidelines1 for Research Appointees : Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

 *Job description*: Research Appointees are appointed to advance the research program of a member of the faculty. Research Appointees conduct research in collaboration with other investigators or groups of investigators. They also may provide the experience, expertise and leadership needed for the efficient running of core laboratories, and may have command of novel and technically demanding research technologies, making them available to a broad range of faculty. Participation in the other missions of BSD is not required and may be precluded by stipulations of the funding source or effort allocation. Scientific independence, while allowed and credited, is not required.

 *Quality:* Research Appointees should have the technical knowledge, expertise, experience and accomplishment in research to make meaningful, original, intellectual contributions to research programs. This aspect and the necessity for associated due diligence distinguish them from Research Professionals, where the focus is on technical contributions to the research.

*Distinct from faculty*: Research Appointees cannot be promoted to the UChicago faculty tracks. Research Appointees who believe themselves to be qualified may compete in national searches for open faculty positions.

*Process*: Departments recommending appointments and promotions will evaluate the candidate’s satisfaction of the relevant criteria (see below), and obtain at least three assessments of the candidate’s satisfaction of the relevant criteria, and vote on the recommendation. The department chair is responsible for preparation of a letter describing the evaluation and the process leading to it. The Dean’s evaluation is transmitted to the Provost for final action.

More specific criteria for appointment and promotion to each rank in the series are

set forth below.

**A. Research Assistant Professor**

Appointment at this rank requires that research training be complete, and that the appointee has the aptitude and motivation to advance to Research Associate Professor in due course. Where promotion or work towards it is not desirable or feasible, the position of Research Professional should be used. Terms are for a maximum of three years, and reappointment requires evidence of adequate progress towards Research

1 This document is designed to aid faculty, Research Appointees, Department chairs and appointment and promotion committees in outlining expectations of Research Appointees that will lead to successful career development and promotion at the University of Chicago. Our intention is to provide guidelines, meaning that significant room is left for reasonable expert judgment. Thus the document intentionally does not spell out every rule in detail. Just as prior documents that addressed these issues, the University Statutes and the Johnson Report, articulate general principles and are interpreted by the body of law that follows them, these will too.

 Associate Professor. Where terms are shorter than three years, typically because they need to be coterminous with funding, review of adequate progress towards Research Associate Professor is required every third year. Appointments beyond 9 years in rank normally will not be approved.

**B. Research** **Associate** **Professor**

*1. Criteria.*

•Compelling rationale for an academic appointment (versus staff position).

•Intellectual contribution of the candidate, typically evident through

a. Authorship of original publications in peer reviewed journals. The number of publications is considered; however, of more importance is the quality of the body of work as evidenced by the sources of publication and by the national and international impact of the contributions. This scholarly recording of the investigator’s work is the major criterion that establishes academic credibility. Research Associate Professors are expected to have significant intellectual contributions to this work but are not expected to have initiated and lead the research effort.

b. Contributions to programs that have extramural peer-­‐reviewed financial support for basic and/or clinical investigation. Research Associate Professors are expected to have made important contributions to successful grant applications, though not necessarily as the Principal Investigator. Obviously, success as a Principal Investigator receives considerable credit.

c. Other evidence of research and scholarly accomplishments that may be

considered include authorship of textbooks, book chapters and scholarly reviews acknowledged in the specialty, as well as authorship of “nontraditional” educational materials (such as health agency publications and computer programs) or research materials (such as development of databases and research software).

•External standing of the candidate, typically documented by one, some, or all of the following or by other indicators:

a. Invitation as a speaker or visiting professor at other academic institutions, and invited presentations at meetings.

b. Presentations that were selected based on competitive peer-­‐review at national and regional meeting.

c. Election to membership and positions of leadership in professional societies.

d. Editorial board memberships and other editorial review assignments.

e. Consultative positions with various government and private agencies (e.g.,

study sections, foundations, American Cancer Society, etc.).

f. Organizer of regional, national, and international meetings or meeting sessions.

g. Intellectual contribution (see above) recognized outside the institution.

Administration and teaching (including mentoring) in departmental, divisional, program, or University activities are not obligatory responsibilities for Research Associate Professors but can nonetheless be considered as a positive factor in promotion.

*2. Process.*

At least three assessments of the candidate’s satisfaction of the above criteria will be sought from “at arm’s length” experts outside the institution. The Dean may seek the

advice of the BSD Committee on Appointments and Promotions (COAP) in evaluating the proposal.

Terms are up to 5 years, and are renewable with continued satisfaction of the above criteria.

**C. Research** **Professor**

Appointment or promotion as Research Professor is an honor that requires careful evaluation. A Research Professor at UChicago should be nationally recognized for investigative excellence in his/her specialty or subspecialty, as well as for other activities described above.

Process is identical to that for Research Associate Professor.
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**Research Appointees: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

2017-02-27

**Enabling Statute:** 11.2.4.1 <https://trustees.uchicago.edu/sites/trustees.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/UniversityOfChicagoGoverningDocuments.pdf>

**University policy**: [http://provost.uchicago.edu/handbook/academic-appointments/appointment-and-promotion](http://tiny.cc/JohnsonReport)

**BSD guidelines:**  [http://tiny.cc/RA\_Guidelines](https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/sites/bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/RA_guidelines%202017%20Updates%28%20mfe%20-%20pva%29.docx)

**Benefits**: <http://hrservices.uchicago.edu/benefits/>

**Webpage with links to .docx containing model CVs and appointment/promotion materials**:

<http://tiny.cc/BSD_RA>

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rank: | **Research** **Assistant Professor** | **Research Associate****Professor** | **Research Professor** |
| Jobcode: | X061 | X062 | X063 |
| Faculty? | No (but may apply for vacant faculty positions) |
| Job description: | Advance the research program of one or more faculty; conduct research in collaboration with other investigators or groups of investigators; also may provide intellectual direction of core laboratories, and/or be a specialist in novel and technically demanding research technologies. Career trajectories that incorporate leadership of research projects or programs and appropriate autonomy are encouraged but not required. |
| PI eligibility | Automatic |
| Minimum term | Coterminous with funding |
| Maximum term | 3 years | 5 years | 5 years |
| Maximum time in rank: | 9 years | No limit | No limit |
| Decision not to reappoint must be communicated | > 3 months prior to end of term |
| Departmental or Sectional faculty review of progress and goals; vote | Every third year in rank | Every fifth year in rank | Every fifth year in rank |
| Decision not to reappoint in wake of this review must be communicated | >6 months prior to end of term |
| Letters for appointment or promotion | Normally 3 | Normally 3-5 | Normally 3-5 |
| Must letters be “at arm’s length”? | No | Yes, except when justified in Chair’s letter | Yes |
| **Requirements**: |
| Departmental or Sectional faculty review and vote at initial appointment? | Yes |
| Training complete? | Yes |
| Salary support assured? | Yes |
| Intellectual contribution to research program(s)? | Expected or evident | Yes |
| Achievement: | Capable of advancing to Research Associate Professor within 9 years in rank | (a) Compelling rationale for academic appointment; (b) Intellectual contribution, typically evident through publications and contri- butions to grants activity; (c) External standing | Same as Research Associate Professor, plus national recognition for these activities and investigative excellence in the area of scholarship |

\* Titles for Research Associates with Parenthetical Ranks of (Assistant Professor), (Associate Professor), and (Professor) were amended to Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor effective 1/1/2017.
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Change log

2012-06-27

**Chair’s letter for initial appointment as Research Associate (Assistant Professor)**

From:

Also include in electronic format:

 •Letters from outside referees (combined alphabetically in a single PDF would be appreciated)

 •A list of all external scholars invited to submit evaluations of the candidate. This list should note who selected the external referees, why the particular referees were chosen and, if a referee declines, the reasons given for such refusal.

•A sample copy of the letter sent to external referees soliciting an evaluation of the candidate.

•Any internal letters from faculty colleagues, whether within the appointing unit or in related areas elsewhere on campus. We are looking not for simple endorsements, but for close, analytical judgments of the value of the candidate's work.

To:

Also include in electronic format:

 •Letters from references (combined alphabetically in a single PDF would be appreciated)

**Chair’s letter for reappointment as Research Associate (Assistant Professor)**

Added:

[A complete letter of the form below is required every third year at this parenthetical rank. Chair’s letters for other reappointments may be (not must be) short format; i.e., from only the department chair, section chief (if appropriate), and supervisor/sponsor, and consist only of a brief progress report/assessment. Please contact the Office of Academic Affairs if a complete letter is due in 2012; an extension may be possible.]

**Short form chair’s letter for non-triennial reappointment as Research Associate (Assistant Professor)**

Added

**Solicitation letter for initial appointment as Research Associate (Assistant Professor)**

Added:

[Normally the candidate will arrange for letters to sent to the search. If the department wishes to solicit letters or guide the candidate / letter writers on letters that will be most helpful, the following language can be used or adapted.]

**MODEL CV**

**SCHOLARSHIP STATEMENT**

Added:

Often the statements for beginning Research Associate (Assistant Professors) will be shorter than the limit.

2013-06-10

**Chair’s letter for reappointment as Research Associate (Assistant Professor)**

Specify expected year of promotion and what more must be done in triennial review; corresponding language in letter to candidate.

2014-10-25

**Chair’s letters**

Asks for compensation amount, source, and % increase if a reappointment.

Link to Provost’s document revised: <http://facultyhandbook.uchicago.edu/sites/facultyhandbook.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/OAA_guidelines.pdf>

2017-02-27

**Title Change**

All references to Titles with parenthetical ranks were changed to Research Appointees. New titles and ranks are as follows: Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor.