

*Summary: For non-clinicians and physician-scientists, a BSD review of research progress will ordinarily occur at the beginning of the fifth year; i.e., after reappointment has already occurred.*

*Q: In light of this change, what is reappointment review intended to accomplish?*

A: For all assistant professors, reappointment review will focus on career development activity and planning, and whether educational quality and effort have been adequate and can be expected to support eventual promotion. The same is true for clinical activity when it is part of the job description. There is a check for minimum progress (or a compelling explanation for its absence): at least a peer-reviewed publication of work done while an assistant professor, a peer-reviewed funded grant, or both.

*Q: Will COROAP (Committee on Reappointment of Assistant Professors) perform the fifth-year review?*

A: No, because it is after reappointment. We have a new committee, CAP (Committee on Assistant Professors).

*Q: Why not continue review of research progress/promise on the present schedule?*

A: The timing of reappointment is specified by the Statutes, and is too soon in most cases for a robust “look forward” of whether the research/scholarship trajectory will suffice for eventual promotion, tenure, and/or continuation of protected time for research/scholarship.

*Q: Will reappointment cases still be reviewed?*

A: Yes, but by the department, dean, and provost. As usual, in positive recommendations the department is primarily responsible for the assessment, with the dean and provost reviewing the assessment. If a department’s recommendation is negative, the dean and provost review only the process of decision-making.

In other cases the assistant professor will not have done these but have a compelling explanation and clear evidence of being “on track” nonetheless. These are “normal”. If there has been no productivity and no compelling explanation but a department is recommending reappointment anyway, the dean may not endorse the recommendation.

*Q: Will there ever be a review of research progress before the promotion decision?*

A: Yes, but normally early in the fifth year (i.e., after reappointment).

*Q: Why from a CV plus a 1-page supplement? Can’t CVs be misleading?*

A: We do not want to burden assistant professors with producing a more extensive document. If the CV raises a concern (or, for that matter, no concerns), the preliminary findings would be discussed with the department chair rather than accepted blindly in any event.

*Q: What’s the point, if reappointment has already been approved at this time?*

A: An objective external assessment of likelihood of promotion can be valuable

--To the assistant professor, because (a) departments can be mistaken in their assessment, and (b) the assistant professors can use this information as reassurance, impetus to focus their efforts more productively, seek guidance from colleagues, take on additional clinical duties, and/or to begin a search for a position elsewhere while there’s still time.

--To the department, in guiding the assistant professor

*Q: Can this later review be used to shorten the second term of the assistant professorship?*

A: No. Once the provost has approved a second term, it can be shortened involuntarily only under the very limited circumstances stated in the Statutes.

# FOR PHYSICIAN-SCIENTISTS IN THE SOM TRACK

## CURRENT

Year of assistant professorship

First term				Second term			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8



Based on this time period

**Dept**  
 Reappointment review  
 (a) Likelihood of promotion  
 (b) Career development support  
**COROAP review**  
 (a) Likelihood of promotion  
 (b) Career development support

**Dept**  
 Promotion review  
**COAP review**  
 (typical times; no clock. Tenure not linked, but could be)

## NEW

Year of assistant professorship

First term				Second term			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8



option



default



Based on this time period

Based on this time period

**Dept**  
 Reappointment Review  
 Career development planning & support  
**CAP review**  
 Only if Dean Insists (i.e., not routinely)

**CAP**  
 Review of justification for continuing to protect time for research/scholarship and likelihood of promotion based mainly on research/scholarship. Advisory to candidate, dept., and Dean.

**Dept**  
 Promotion review  
**COAP review**  
 (typical times; no clock. Tenure not linked, but could be)

\*Triage:

1. Keep up the good work. While nothing is guaranteed, things seem to be on track. Suggestions.
2. A midcourse correction (to be specified) is strongly advised
3. While there is still time, things seem not to be working out as hoped. It would be prudent to begin looking for positions elsewhere as a back-up, or considering additional clinical activity in lieu of research.

## SAMPLE

As you know, your appointment began 7/1/2011 - 12/31/2011 and your second term of appointment ends 6/30/2019. I am writing to inform you that henceforth we will be performing an additional review of research/scholarship early in the fifth year for all physician-scientists in the SOM track.

This review cannot be used to abbreviate your final term as assistant professor, so have no fear of that.

The new review grows out of the realization that the reappointment/COROAP review is usually too soon to provide any realistic estimation of your chances of satisfying the promotion requirements, and corresponding advice. In fact, we will refocus the reappointment/COROAP review away from research assessment and towards career development planning effective immediately.

The new review comes at a time when we believe that we can realistically provide you advice such as the following:

1. Keep up the good work. While nothing is guaranteed, things seem to be on track. Suggestions.

OR

2. A midcourse correction (to be specified) is strongly advised

OR

3. While there is still time, things seem not to be working out as hoped. It would be prudent to begin looking for positions elsewhere as a back-up.

To perform this review, we will need the following from you as a single PDF by [date, bearing in mind that the department will need to transmit materials to the Dean's Office by early November 2015]:

(a) A current curriculum vitae, which should report current/pending (i) publications and manuscripts, (ii) invited speaking and service, and (iii) grant support. Educational, clinical, and citizenship statements are not required

(b) In lieu of a research/scholarship statement, a one-page statement of what the future promotion case is expected to contain as the research accomplishment (i.e., what will have been discovered, realized, integrated, developed, invented, theorized, etc.), and what the impact of this accomplishment is expected to be (i.e. how will it move its field and/or change the way peers think or practice). As this is a prospective statement and research seldom progresses exactly as anticipated, the statement will not be considered in future promotion/tenure review and therefore must not be considered as a list of deliverables.

(c) Names and contact information for three leading scholars outside UChicago (excluding collaborators and former trainees/supervisors) who can be telephoned or emailed for a brief assessment – folks with 'gravitas'.

(d) Unpublished manuscripts and Specific Aims (or equivalent) statements you would like considered.

Your department will be responsible for transmitting these materials to the Dean's Office along with no more than a page of commentary including (a) the time burden of duties other than research and (b) the department's view of the appropriate summary advice. A newly-formed BSD committee, the Committee on Assistant Professors (CAP), will review these materials and provide its own summary advice, which will be shared with you and your department. During this review, CAP intends to invite you to meet with it briefly to explain your expected promotion case. Whether/how to implement CAP's summary findings and advice will be up to you and your department.

Everyone realizes that reviews are a burden. The BSD has sought to minimize this burden in the materials needed from you, and in turn hopes to provide you with valuable realistic advice on the progression of your research/scholarship program.

## SAMPLE

### MESSAGE ON MEETING WITH CAP

As you know, this autumn the Committee on Assistant Professors (CAP) will provide an advisory review for your use. It cannot be used to shorten your term of appointment and it is not a promotion decision. Rather, it is advice on planning your next steps.

As part of this review, CAP strongly encourages you to meet with it before it finalizes its advice. These meetings will have the following ground rules:

(a) 20 minutes total

(b) Prepare to speak for 8 minutes, no more. You will not be allowed to run over.

(c) You may project images as follows:

No more than 3

No data (your materials previously submitted to CAP may include data)

The ideal presentation would comprise textbook-style diagrams illustrating the state of the art before you became an independent investigator, and how the work you expect to complete while an assistant professor will have changed it.

A board will be available for your use in case you wish to do this as a 'chalk talk'.

(d) Advice: Be clear about the scientific challenge or opportunity that you are pursuing, provide an overview of how you see getting there, point out the risks and barriers, and identify the impacts if they are successful. The more you demonstrate maturity and insight along with the usual commitment and enthusiasm, the better this will go.

The meeting is not about your productivity. CAP will assess this from the CV.

As far as the "level" of presentation, you should be aware that the committee has already reviewed your cv, learned a bit about you, and scanned your papers. Also, assume that everyone on CAP will be from outside your area and hence will not appreciate the significance of your work unless you explain it to them.

You will be interrupted by questions. This is good if this is because you are getting people excited, but bad if you are simply confusing the group. In turn, if you get no questions, that means you are boring everyone. Be aware that interruptions might come as soon as the first sentence you speak, and that you may not get to finish your prepared presentation during the twenty minutes. Thus, you should skip the appetizers, get right to the main course and not save the best part for dessert.

You are welcome to consult with anyone in preparing for this appearance: your colleagues here or elsewhere, your mentors, your lab group, etc. Please feel free to reach out to me if you have questions.