

GUIDELINES FOR SOM TRACK ASSISTANT PROFESSORS WITH CLINICAL RESPONSIBILITIES WHO WILL ADVANCE MAINLY FROM PEER-REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS*

These guidelines expand upon the BSD's guidelines [<http://tiny.cc/BSDPathways>].

i. For such faculty to be **appointed** as assistant professors SOM, they ordinarily have or have had a career development award (NIH K award or equivalent), or a well-developed plan with high likelihood of obtaining a career development award during the first 4 years.

ii. If their work is in an area in which grant support is customary and they are still unfunded at **reappointment**, protected time ordinarily ceases then.

iii. **Promotion** ordinarily requires a sustainable research program in terms of both publications and funding. Publications should be of the same quality as in the BSD track, with productivity commensurate with clinical duties.

Searches for such assistant professors should be consistent these guidelines, and will be reviewed accordingly.

Contingent letters of offer (CLOs) should include language such as:

The SOM track allows for multiple job descriptions. Your initial job description will be "physician-scientist", and we will initially protect a majority of your time for research. Continued protection of time ordinarily requires adequate progress: Reappointment as a physician-scientist ordinarily requires some peer-reviewed publication based on work done at Chicago and/or some extramural funding, or a high likelihood of these occurring imminently; a corresponding review ordinarily occurs early in the fourth year. An additional advisory review occurs generally in the year after first reappointment. Promotion as a physician-scientist ordinarily requires a sustainable research program in terms of both quality publications and extramural funding. Your job description may change as we mutually agree, with reappointment and promotion then linked to progress in your changed job description.

This language may be modified to accommodate those who to whom these guidelines apply but are not physician-scientists.* If these expectations are applied to an assistant professor SOM after the appointment begins, they should be clearly communicated in writing.

The 'letter to the candidate' in reappointment cases should include language such as:

Your present job description is as a physician-scientist. For you to be promoted on this basis, you will need to create a dossier of (a) high-quality peer-reviewed publications, (b) extramural funding, and (c) expectation that publication and funding will be continuing. That is, the expectations are similar to those of the BSD track, but with allowance made for your clinical time. We are confident you can meet these expectations (our projection of promotion is on this basis) and intend to support your effort.

Furthermore, as a physician-scientist you should expect an advisory review by the Committee on Assistant Professors next year or the year after.

A significant change in job description, should this ever become necessary, will require the mutual agreement of your department and higher levels, and a reformulation of your career development plan and promotion timeline.

This language may be modified to accommodate those who to whom these guidelines apply but are not physician-scientists.*

Typically early in the fifth year these faculty will undergo advisory review by the BSD Committee on Assistant Professors. Timing may be adjusted as circumstances dictate. The goal of this review is to advise departments and assistant professors if promotion will be feasible and timely, and hence if ongoing protection of time (if any) is warranted. Frequently-asked questions are answered at:

<https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/sites/bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/FAQsReappointment-mdsci2015.pdf>

[Although the language refers to “physician-scientists”, see the footnote below.]

Promotion to associate professor SOM will require (in addition to other requirements) a dossier of (a) high-quality peer-reviewed publications, (b) extramural funding if it is customary in the area of scholarship, and (c) expectation that publication and funding will be continuing. That is, the expectations are similar to those for the BSD track, but with allowance made for the clinical time. Ordinarily promotion occurs within 8 years or is imminent. If not and there is no compelling explanation, the job description may change or the appointment may end.

The job description (and expectations and protected time) may change. If so, the assistant professor will need to qualify for promotion by fully satisfying the relevant expectations, which may require adjustment of the promotion timeline.

* Usually faculty subject to these expectations will be “physician-scientists” and have a majority of their time protected for research (i.e., their clinical obligations are reduced). They may also pursue other forms of scholarship, such as educational, ethical, integrative, policy, statistical, informatic, and administrative/organizational. They may have little protected time. The unifying feature is that peer-reviewed publication will be a primary basis for promotion and, for scholarship for which grant support is customary, grants activity. “Clinical responsibilities” include patient care, veterinary care, and related activities (e.g., radiation physics, clinical electrophysiology). These expectations are not applicable to faculty who perform no clinical work (see <https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/page/pathways-successful-faculty-development-and-promotion#3evii> and <https://bsdacademicaffairs.uchicago.edu/page/pathways-successful-faculty-development-and-promotion#3exii>).

[after Clinical Chairs’ meeting 2015-10-06]