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Revised Policy on Secondary Appointments

One of the hallmarks of Stanford University is its focus on innovative initiatives that break down barriers across schools and departments. Joint, secondary and courtesy faculty appointments provide an important mechanism for developing and sustaining collaboration and interaction among and between basic science and clinical faculty members.

Reflecting the trend toward a vibrant interdisciplinary environment, the number of secondary appointments in the School has grown steadily and now stands at nearly 100. These appointments have brought many benefits but also some procedural challenges. For example, in some departments the number of faculty holding secondary appointments is now nearly equal to that of the primary faculty. In addition, the responsibilities and privileges associated with secondary appointments have gradually become less well-defined over time. While in some cases the secondary faculty member’s role in the department is indistinguishable from that of a primary faculty member, in others the title is more honorific. Since secondary faculty carry voting privileges, both their number and level of involvement, whether active or passive, become relevant in a department’s decision-making processes and governance.

Over the last ten months, these and related issues have been discussed with department chairs at Executive Committee meetings; holders of secondary appointments have also been surveyed for their perspectives and expectations about what it means to hold such an appointment. These discussions have resulted in a series of policy updates and revisions, which have been communicated to department chairs, as well as holders of secondary appointments, and are outlined below. We are asking faculty affairs administrators to become familiar with the revised policy and to work cooperatively with their department chairs to meet the stated timelines for implementation.
**Governing Principles**

Departments will be expected to reconsider their definition of secondary appointments, including criteria, responsibilities and privileges. In general, a faculty member’s level of participation in his or her secondary department should be significant enough to merit voting rights and involvement in the life of the department.

Standard secondary appointments for tenured faculty (or those on continuing term) will be for five-year renewable terms in order to (1) provide a mechanism for periodic evaluation and reconfirmation that the secondary appointment continues to be in the best interests of the faculty member and the department and (2) to provide departments with flexibility in making new secondary appointments for a fixed period of time in situations where the programmatic need is not anticipated to be open-ended. Exceptions to term appointments will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

In situations where engagement with a secondary department is less substantive and the programmatic need is less compelling, appointment to a courtesy position should be considered as an option. Formally (that is, in all appointment documents), the title should include the “by courtesy” designation; however, in everyday usage, this designation may be dropped.

**General Timeline for Implementation**

The following timeline is intended to provide guidance in implementing the changes described above. Departments have the option of accelerating implementation, as appropriate.

**January and February:** In accordance with established practices and procedures on governance issues, departments will hold discussions to set or reset criteria for secondary appointments. Written documentation on criteria will be provided to the Office of Academic Affairs.

**March and April:** Department chairs (or their designates) will engage in discussions with secondary appointment holders to determine their interest in continuing the secondary appointment under the condition of the stated departmental criteria and a five-year renewable term. In situations where an appointment without limit of time is most appropriate, a request for an exception to policy should be forwarded to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. In other cases, the option of a courtesy appointment should be explored (as indicated above under “Governing Principles”).

Any questions about the revised policy should be directed to Judith Cain.
Handbook Sections on Joint, Secondary and Courtesy Appointments Revised

Chapter Two (The Professoriate) of the School of Medicine Faculty Handbook has been revised to reflect the definition, titles, terms, responsibilities and privileges for Joint Appointments (2.10), Secondary Appointments (2.11) and Courtesy Appointments (2.12). Faculty affairs administrators are asked to familiarize themselves with these revised sections of the Handbook.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain.

Updated Handbook and Web Pages for Visiting, Consulting, Acting Faculty

The School of Medicine has a large and active population of Visiting and Consulting Faculty, with over 160 appointed and reappointed just in 2010. The Acting Faculty line allows prospective new faculty to come to Stanford and take up their responsibilities while their faculty appointments are under consideration and has thus been important in sustaining clinical and teaching programs and letting individuals start up their research programs as quickly as possible.

With this in mind, we have updated and revised Chapter 5, Other Teaching Titles, in the School of Medicine Faculty Handbook:
http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/handbook/chapt5.html

Chapter 5 contains up to date information about Acting Faculty, Visiting Faculty, Visiting Instructors, and Consulting Faculty, including criteria, appointment terms, and links to applicable University staff policies. (Note: the Instructors and Instructors (Affiliated) section will be updated soon.) It also includes links to the revised Acting, Visiting and Consulting Faculty pages, which give step by step instructions for appointments and reappointments.

New pages have been added to the Other Teaching Titles section of the OAA website:

- Acting Faculty Appointments
- Acting Faculty Reappointments
- Consulting Faculty with Salary
- Consulting Faculty without Salary
- Visiting Faculty with Salary
- Visiting Faculty without Salary
- Visiting Instructors with Salary
- Visiting Instructors without Salary

Each page gives step by step instructions on how to appoint and reappoint these short term faculty members (and process FTE changes when needed). They also include viewable
checklists and links to checklists, letter templates and all necessary forms for these actions.

All checklists have been revised and updated to correct and clarify the required elements for each action - and to specify which parts of the package go to OAA and which to Finance. Please be sure to use the new checklists and new letters in all future short term faculty actions.

The new web pages are accessible from the original Acting Faculty, Consulting Faculty and Visiting Faculty web pages.

Any questions should be directed to Rebecca Robinson.
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Staffing Plans during Ellie Saeidi’s Upcoming Leave

Ellie Saeidi will be going on maternity leave beginning on Monday, February 7th. During her absence, Ellie’s duties will be covered (with one exception noted below) by Jessica Mendonça, who can be reached by email (jessmen@stanford.edu) or by calling 3-5940. Jessica will be working every day of the week except Wednesday.

Please note that Visiting Scholar actions will be handled by Rebecca Robinson during this period.

Annual Counseling for Assistant and Associate Professors

University policy specifies that “deans, department chairs, or their delegates should confer annually with each junior faculty member in their department or school to review his or her performance in light of the criteria for reappointment or promotion.” The School requires that an annual counseling meeting documentation form be completed for all assistant and associate professors. The form requires the signatures of the chair, the mentor, and the faculty member and is essential in documenting your faculty members’ annual counseling.

Counseling should have occurred after September 1, 2010, and before August 31, 2011. Once all counseling sessions for your department have been conducted, we ask that you forward to the Office of Academic Affairs a memorandum attesting that each assistant and associate professor has received counseling and that you have on file in your department copies of the required annual counseling forms.

We encourage you to review your department’s progress to date and, in cases where counseling has not yet occurred, to work with your department chair to schedule these counseling sessions as soon as possible in order to be in compliance with University policy.
Further information regarding the annual counseling process, along with a copy of the annual counseling documentation form, is available on the OAA website.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain or Rebecca Robinson.

**Written Criteria Due on Secondary Appointments; Special Blue Form to be Released**

As detailed in the January Communiqué, we asked that discussions be held in departments during January and February to set or reset criteria for secondary appointments. **If such a discussion has not yet been scheduled in your department, we encourage you to confer with your department chair as soon as possible.**

Written documentation on criteria should be provided to Dr. David Stevenson, Vice Dean and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, by March 1, 2011.

During March and April, department chairs (or their designees) should engage in discussions with secondary appointment holders to determine their interest in continuing the secondary appointment under the condition of the stated departmental criteria and a five-year renewable term. Other options are available, including appointment without limit of time, transfer to a courtesy appointment or termination of the secondary appointment.

We ask that, to the extent possible, all secondary appointment actions be transmitted to the Office of Academic Affairs as a group, rather than individually. We are designing a special “blue form” that will provide the options outlined above (that is, from secondary appointment without limit of time to term appointment, from secondary appointment without limit of time to courtesy appointment, or termination of the secondary appointment). A “blue form” will not be necessary for those who will be maintaining a secondary appointment without limit of time. In such cases, the department chair will need to submit a request for an exception to policy to Dr. David Stevenson, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The special “blue form” will be announced in the March Communiqué and simultaneously posted to the OAA website. Once again, “blue forms” and requests for exceptions to policy should be forwarded as a group to the Office of Academic Affairs during the months of March and April.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain.
**New Requirement for Long Form: One-Page Summary of Didactic Teaching Performance**

In response to requests from the University’s Advisory Board, the Provost’s Office has asked that we begin to include in our professorial long forms a one-page summary overview of didactic (classroom) teaching performance.

This single sheet should be the first document encountered in the “teaching evaluations” section of the long form, with one brief summary for each course section taught. The idea is to provide a one-page “snapshot” overview of the more detailed individual course summaries that will follow.

There is some flexibility in how we present the information; however, the following formats would be a good starting point:

Course title; academic quarter and year; Candidate’s role.
Type of students and number solicited/number responded; overall course average/instructor average

For example:

**Biochemistry 101**, Spring 2009: Dr. [candidate] gave several lectures. Graduate students. 125 solicited/78 responded. Overall average for all lecturers: 4.1 of 5 possible; Dr. [candidate]’s individual average: 4.4 of 5 possible

**Genetics 201**, Autumn 2009: Dr. [candidate] was the course director. Medical and graduate students. 43 solicited/22 responded. Overall average for all lecturers [and/or for course itself]: 4.6 of 5 possible; Dr. [candidate]’s individual average: 4.5 of 5 possible

When it makes sense to do so, arranging this information in table form would likely be appreciated.

Note that this request does **not** apply to MedHub or E*Value clinical teaching evaluation forms, which may be uploaded in their usual summary form.

Please direct questions to [Craig Spencer](mailto:Craig.Spencer@university.edu) or [Rebecca Robinson](mailto:Rebecca.Robinson@university.edu).

**Clinician Educator and Instructor A&P Submission Deadlines**

Actions are handled as quickly and efficiently as possible and in the order received. Recommendations are queued for each month’s Clinician Educator Appointments and Promotions Committee agenda on the basis of the date received by OAA. Be advised that the volume of recommendations received and committee attendance may present constraints. A reasonable effort will be made to add recommendations received by the first day of a month on
that month’s agenda so that decisions are rendered before the proposed start date, but there is no guarantee that late submissions can be accommodated.

Allow a minimum of 30 days in advance of the effective date for completion of school review.

In addition, pay attention to these special deadlines:

   If the start date is to occur in June, submit to OAA by March 31, 2011.
   If the start date is to occur in July, submit to OAA by April 29, 2011.
   If the start date is to occur in August, submit to OAA by May 31, 2011.
   If the start date is to occur in September, submit to OAA by June 30, 2011.

Please address questions regarding these matters to Jane Volk-Brew.
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A&P On-Time Performance: A Shared Responsibility

As most of you know, Dr. David Stevenson recently sent a communication to department chairs (shown in its entirety below) regarding new expectations for the on-time completion of appointments, reappointments and promotions.

While the primary responsibility for completing actions on time rests with the department chair, all of us – from the candidate to the faculty affairs administrator to the Office of Academic Affairs to the Provost’s Office – have an important role to play in meeting that goal. With respect to the FAA’s role, we encourage you to follow the timelines posted on the OAA website for appointments and reappointments and promotions. We also encourage you to stay in close contact with your department chair, division chief or faculty lead as the process moves through the various steps and to alert him or her to any issues of concern.

Questions regarding Dr. Stevenson’s communication (including the spreadsheet that was attached) should be directed to Judith Cain.

Thank you for all that you do to ensure the integrity and timeliness of the A&P process.

Communication from Dr. Stevenson to Department Chairs regarding On-Time Performance

“Over the last few years, departments have been asked to focus attention on completing reappointments and promotions on time. We have also requested that long forms for faculty candidates be completed within a reasonable period so as to eliminate or shorten the length of interim appointments. Beginning at a low point of 12% on-time performance in 2003-04, the School-wide average slowly climbed to 57% in 2008-09 as a result of various oversight techniques instituted by OAA and the focused attention of departmental leadership and staff. Unfortunately, the on-time performance rate dropped to 45% in 2009-10, and we have also detected some slippage in the timeliness of new appointments.
Given this poor showing – which stands in stark contrast to Stanford’s six other schools – and concerns that we are moving in the wrong direction, we have reached the conclusion that positive change will not come without reordering our priorities. As a result, effective immediately, departments will be expected to place the completion of reappointment and promotion actions, along with completion of long forms for faculty candidates, ahead of the initiation of new searches. Toward that end, please note the following:

1. A moratorium on the initiation of a new search or a waiver of search will be placed on a department when:
   
a. the final version of a reappointment or promotion long form has not been delivered to OAA four months before the end date of the faculty member’s appointment term;

b. the final version of a long form for promotion to full professor in the University Tenure Line has not been delivered to OAA eight months from the date on which the action was initiated;

c. the final version of a long form for an early promotion has not been delivered to OAA eight months from the date on which the action was initiated.

2. A moratorium on the initiation of a new search or a waiver of search will be placed on a department when:

   a. the final version of a long form for an assistant professor appointment has not been delivered to the Office of Academic Affairs within three months after the candidate has been identified (that is, from the date on which the search report [or search waiver request] and offer letter are approved);

   b. the final version of a long form for an associate or full professor appointment has not been delivered to the Office of Academic Affairs within five months after the candidate has been identified (that is, from the date on which the search report [or waiver request] and offer letter are approved).

In all situations cited above, the moratorium will be lifted as soon as the final version of the long form has been delivered to the Office of Academic Affairs.

While there will be a provision for extenuating circumstances, it is anticipated that, for the most part, very few exceptions will be granted.
A spreadsheet is attached that includes your department’s six-year on-time performance rates, reappointments/promotions currently on an extension, reappointments/promotions currently in process, appointment long forms currently overdue, and other appointment long forms currently in process. Actions that have already been extended will not be subject to the moratorium; however, all new extension requests (or late long forms) will result in a hold on the initiation of searches or waivers of search. With respect to new appointments, if the final long form for any of your candidates is now overdue, you will not be able to initiate any new searches or waivers of search until the final long form is received. These cases are highlighted on the spreadsheet. (Any questions regarding entries on the spreadsheet should be directed to Judith Cain.)

The Office of Academic Affairs will, of course, continue to work with you and your staff in providing whatever assistance we can to help improve your management of appointment, reappointment and promotion actions. While such managerial improvements will be welcomed, the most important thing that we can do is to provide our colleagues who are being considered for reappointment or promotion (or who are anxious to join the faculty) with timely reviews that are reflective of a supportive environment for their professional development.”

**OAA to Hold Workshop for First-Term Assistant Professors on Preparation of the Curriculum Vitae and Candidate’s Statement**

Later this month, the Office of Academic Affairs will hold a workshop for first-term assistant professors on “The Reappointment Review: Preparation of the Curriculum Vitae and Candidate’s Statement.” The session will be led by Dr. Maurice Druzin, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and Associate Professors William Fearon and Upinder Singh, both of the Department of Medicine.

In anticipation of the workshop, we would very much appreciate hearing about the questions you are asked most frequently regarding preparation of these materials. Your input will go a long way toward ensuring that we cover the areas that are of most interest and use to this group of assistant professors.

Please send your comments to Rebecca Robinson.

**“Blue Form” Process for Modifications of Secondary Appointments**

In the February Communique, we announced that a special “blue form” would be released for use in processing changes to secondary appointments. Since that time, we have learned that the Provost’s Office would prefer that we work within the confines of the standard form. As a result, we ask that you follow these steps in implementing the revised policy on secondary appointments:
1. **Written documentation on criteria for secondary appointments was due on March 1st.**
   If your department chair not yet submitted this description, this should be done no later than March 15.

2. Secondary appointments without limit of time will be granted by exception only. In such cases, your department chair should submit a memorandum to Dr. Stevenson requesting an exception to policy and providing the rationale for the recommendation.

3. For a recommendation to change a secondary appointment from without limit of time to a five-year term, select “Change of Appointment Dates,” and enter the dates of the five-year term along with the note “previously a secondary appointment without limit of time in the Department of __________.”

4. For a change from a secondary appointment to a courtesy appointment*, select “Courtesy appointment in department/school” and write in “Change from secondary appointment to courtesy appointment without limit of time in the Department of __________.”

   or

   Select “Courtesy appointment in department/school” and write in “Change from secondary appointment to courtesy appointment for a term of years in the Department of __________;” select “Change of appointment dates” and enter dates, as appropriate.

   *Please note that at the discretion of the department and with approval of the School, courtesy appointments for tenured faculty members (or those on continuing term) may be made for a term of years (normally five years) or without limit of time. For all other faculty, the term should be consistent with that of the faculty member’s primary appointment.

5. For a recommendation to terminate the secondary appointment, select “Change of appointment dates” and enter the end date for the secondary appointment and note the department in which the secondary appointment was held.

We ask that, to the extent possible, all secondary appointment actions – that is, the request for an exception to policy for a secondary appointment without limit of time (#2 above) and all blue forms (#3, 4 and 5 above) be transmitted to the Office of Academic Affairs as a group, rather than individually during the months of March and April.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain.

**Satisfying Minimum Requirements for the CECCE Forms**

The School of Medicine expects use of the Clinical Excellence Core Competencies Evaluation assessment tool (https://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/administrators/forms.html) to
measure clinical performance in the context of academic reviews for members of the professoriate. Our review committees and the Dean have expressed their appreciation for the helpful information gathered using this tool.

The form instructions include a table of requirements for solicitation and receipt of forms: http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/administrators/clinexdocs/ClinicalExcellenceEvaluationFormInstructions111910.doc.

We have modified the requirements such that the last category, “4 – 6 fully qualified physician colleagues,” may now include respondents from the “internal referees” and/or “health care providers who consult with, or refer patients to, the candidate” categories.

This change should make the minimum requirements easier to satisfy, and we expect that each professorial long form will include at least the minimum number of CECCE forms specified for each category in the instructional table. In cases where a particular category may not be applicable, such as a candidate who does not work with physician extenders, the long form will need to include an explanation.

Please direct questions about this to Craig Spencer.
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**Workshop on “The Reappointment/Promotion Review: Evaluation of Clinical Excellence”**

Over the last two years, the Office of Academic Affairs has held a series of workshops designed to provide useful information to faculty as they prepare for their reappointment or promotion reviews.

Recently, we have invited assistant and associate professors to our next workshop, which will focus on the topic “The Reappointment/Promotion Review: Evaluation of Clinical Excellence.” The session will be held on Tuesday, April 12, from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. in M106. The workshop will open with remarks by Dean Philip Pizzo, who will discuss the importance of and expectation for excellence in clinical care activities. Dr. David Stevenson, Vice Dean and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Ann Leung, Professor of Radiology and member of the School’s Appointments and Promotions Committee, will then discuss the criteria for excellence in clinical care, the ways in which excellence is measured, and the broad mix of professional colleagues who will be solicited for commentary.

We still have spaces available for the workshop and will be sending out a reminder soon. But we would also appreciate it if you would encourage your faculty to take advantage of this opportunity to learn more about the evaluation of clinical excellence. They may register via [http://www.stanford.edu/~rrobinso/cvworkshop412.fb](http://www.stanford.edu/~rrobinso/cvworkshop412.fb).

Rebecca Robinson or Judith Cain are available to answer any questions about OAA’s series of workshops.

**Announcement Regarding Annual Meetings for Senior Faculty**

Last month, Vice Dean and Senior Associate Dean David Stevenson sent communications to department chairs and senior faculty members regarding the initiation of annual meetings for senior faculty members. (Senior faculty members are defined as those without appointment end dates, that is, tenured full professors and full professors in the Medical Center Line and Non-Tenure Line who are on a continuing term.)
The rationale and process are outlined below. Please note that, as for annual counseling meetings for assistant and associate professors (and professors on term appointments), a form has been designed to guide discussions. Also, as for counseling meetings, we will need to hear from you every year that senior faculty annual meetings have taken place.

Judith Cain is available to answer any questions you might have regarding these communications and/or the new policy.

Communication to Department Chairs from Dr. David Stevenson

I am writing to follow up on the discussions that have taken place at Executive Committee meetings over the last several months regarding the initiation of annual meetings between senior faculty members and their department chairs (or designates). As you will recall, the discussions yielded a wide range of opinions and also touched upon the ways in which some departments have already made this standard practice in their departments. In the end, there was a general consensus that we should move forward with requiring annual meetings for all senior faculty across the School.

Therefore, effective April 1, 2011, departments will be expected to hold annual meetings with their senior faculty members, who are defined as tenured full professors and full professors in the Medical Center and Non-Tenure Lines who hold continuing term appointments. (Assistant and associate professors will continue to receive annual counseling from their department chairs [or designates] in compliance with School and University policy.) In the current year, meetings should occur between April 1 and December 31. In subsequent years, the meetings should occur during each calendar year.

We ask that a documentation form (attached) be completed for each senior faculty member at the conclusion of his or her annual meeting. We have also prepared the attached list of “Resources for Senior Faculty,” which you may want to share during your meetings. (Both the form and the resources document are posted on OAA’s website.) By January 15, 2012, please forward a memorandum to me attesting that all annual meetings have taken place and that you have on file in your department copies of the annual meeting documentation form. Should serious issues arise during an annual meeting, I suggest that you be in contact with me to discuss all available options.

I am attaching a copy of the communication that is being sent to senior faculty members informing them of this new policy.

Many thanks for your cooperation in implementing annual meetings with senior faculty in your department.
Communication to Senior Faculty Members from Dr. David Stevenson

A few years ago, Dean Pizzo established the Senior Faculty Transitions Task Force, whose charge was to develop policies, procedures and resources through which advice and guidance could be provided to senior faculty about career and life planning. Dean Pizzo recognized that, while there is broad consensus about the importance of mentoring and counseling at the early stages of one’s career in medicine and science, mentoring and career guidance is helpful – and indeed important – throughout one’s career. Given that many scientists and physicians are living longer – and working longer – the lack of such guidance was perceived as a problem, or at least a challenge. To address this, the Task Force recommended the initiation of annual meetings between senior faculty members and their department chairs (or designates). After discussion with the School’s Executive Committee late last year, this recommendation was accepted by Dean Pizzo and is being implemented by the Office of Academic Affairs under the direction of Dr. Gary Schoolnik, Associate Dean for Senior Faculty Transitions.

Our collective goal will be to work toward guided discussions focused on the topic of individual transitions, broadly defined. For many of our senior faculty, a personal transition, whatever form it takes, will be associated with new opportunities and challenges, such as changing the scope of their research, assuming administrative duties, taking on different roles in education, or moving from a phase of intense research activity to one of lesser intensity due to a short- or long-term loss of funding. For others, the focus will be on reducing clinical loads, ramping up scholarly activity after stepping out of an administrative role, or transitioning from active duty to emeritus status. Annual meetings have the potential to provide a forum for these conversations to occur in a systematic way. They also provide an opportunity for a faculty member’s longer term plans to be discussed within the context of the department’s programmatic needs and integrated into strategic planning efforts.

We understand that some departments have already established annual meetings as standard practice and, if you are in one of those departments, little will change. However, if your department does not currently have such a practice in place, you will be hearing from your department chair soon about the implementation of this policy. In the current year, meetings should occur between April 1 and December 31. In subsequent years, the meetings should occur during each calendar year. Two documents have been posted on the OAA website that might be of interest and use to you: “Guide to Annual Meetings with Senior Faculty” (this is the form that will be used to document meetings) and “Resources for Senior Faculty,” which provides links to Dean’s Office resources, Senior Faculty Transitions, Leaves, and Consulting and Conflict of Interest policies.

Should you have questions regarding annual meetings or any other aspects of the Senior Faculty Transitions program, please contact Dr. Schoolnik.
FAST|FAC B1, B5 Long Forms: Streamlining the Search Section

After the search report for the final candidate has been approved and the new appointment action started in FAST|FAC, the data contained in the search report must be entered into various sections of the Candidate’s Action. There has been some confusion about what should be included. For example, it hasn't been completely clear whether information should be removed from the search report narrative (which is added into FAST|FAC Section 2B) and instead put into the data fields (for example, taking the definitive pool candidate list and discussion out of the report and putting it - or a shortened version - in the Finalists table) or whether it should appear in both places.

We ask you to leave the narrative section intact and to enter the information into the fields as well. It is vital that the search report (in Section 2B) explain the timeline of the search (start date, ad and letter dates, when applications were being reviewed, when the definitive pool was chosen, etc), describe the interview process, and include a detailed discussion of the entire definitive pool. However, some of the data must also appear in other sections in order to comply with long form instructions. Here are guidelines on how to fill out the information in the tables to achieve completeness as efficiently as possible. These instructions will be posted to the Help link for Forms B1 and B5, Sections 1 and 2.

1B POSITION AND SEARCH AUTHORIZATION

Search/Waiver Dates

Search (or Waiver) Request – if a search, enter either the date on which the search initiation was requested by the department or the date that permission to search was granted by the Dean’s Office. If a waiver, enter the date on which the department sent forward the final waiver request packet to the Dean’s office.

Search (or Waiver) Decision – if a search, enter the date the search report was approved at the conclusion of the search. If a waiver, enter the date on which the waiver approval was granted by the Provost.

Request Documents

Initial Search Request - add a pdf of the original search initiation request memo

Search Extension Request – rarely needed; add a pdf of the department’s request to extend a search

Search Re-initiation Request – rarely needed; add a pdf of the department’s request to re-initiate a search
Decision Documents

**Initial Search Decision** - add a pdf of the email from Craig or Rebecca approving the search report.

**Search Extension Decision** - rarely needed; add a pdf of the school’s approval to extend a search.

**Search Re-initiation Decision** - rarely needed; add a pdf of the school’s approval to re-initiate a search.

Waiver Documents

**Waiver Request** – add a pdf of the department’s memo requesting the waiver of search.

**School Waiver Decision** - add a pdf of the email from Craig or Rebecca approving the waiver.

2A Search and Evaluation Committees

**Evaluation Committee Membership**
If an individual was a member of both the Search and the Evaluation Committees, do not enter his/her name via the Search Committee “Add Member” link. Instead, skip to the Evaluation Committee Membership subsection and begin entering data by selecting the “Add Member” link.

If the member was chair of the Evaluation Committee chair, click on the box provided to indicate this. If he/she was also a member of the Search Committee, click on the box provided to indicate this.

Enter the date on which Evaluation Committee membership began (normally the Action Commenced date appearing in page’s header area).

Enter the date the Search Committee membership began, if appropriate (it must precede the date on which the Search Committee met and voted).

Disclose the committee member’s relationship with the candidate from the pick list of values provided.

**Evaluation Committee Meeting Dates**
If a separate Evaluation Committee was convened and met, enter the date(s) on which the Committee met and the vote pertaining to the final candidate. If the Search and Evaluation Committees were the same, the earliest date on which the Evaluation Committee meeting and vote may occur is the Action Commenced date appearing in the page’s header area, that is, the date that the long form action was launched in FAST|FAC.
If your committee actually met before the FASTIFAC launch date, enter the FASTIFAC launch date as the initial meeting date, and be sure to capture the earlier meeting date in the evaluation process narrative description.

Search Committee Member(s)
For each individual who is a member of the Search Committee only, press the “Add Member” link.

If the member was chair of the Search Committee, click on the box to indicate this.

Enter the date on which the committee membership began (must precede the date on which the Search Committee met and voted).

Disclose the committee member’s relationship with the candidate from the pick list of values provided.

Search Committee Meeting Dates
The date of the meeting at which the final candidate was selected by vote, and the vote count, are required. It is a best practice to add all of the dates on which the Search Committee met.

2B Description of the Process
Add the search report here. If there was a separate Evaluation Committee, add a description of the evaluation process here also.

2C ADVERTISEMENTS AND SOLICITATIONS

Advertisement Journal
Click on “Add Advertisement Journal” and select from the choices to enter names and issues of individual journals, or enter “see search narrative” or select “uploading a document?” to add a representative list.

Advertisement Other Posting
The add link here also allows the entry of individual site names and URL’s or the addition of a document comprising a representative list.

Sample Advertisement
Add the advertisement here. If the content of the advertisement varied, add a sample of each instance.

Solicitations
If there is a short list (fewer than 5) of institutions solicited, add them individually here. For a more extensive list, include a representative selection along with the sample solicitation letter.
2D APPLICANT POOL INFORMATION

Include the grid generated by the Provost’s Office’s Faculty Applicant Self-Identification system (FASI).

2E FINALISTS

Enter all of the required data, indicated with red asterisks, including name, dates, gender, ethnicity, degree, current institution and manner identified for all definitive pool candidates (definitive pool candidates are those who were interviewed).

The narrative search report must provide comprehensive information describing the background, achievements, and selection/ranking rationale for the definitive pool candidates. You may simply enter "see narrative" in the “Selection Rationale” column of the Finalists table. It is critical that comprehensive information be provided about candidates in the definitive pool. However, this descriptive information need not be entered in more than one place.

Offer Letters Updated to Include
Training Tutorial on “Avoiding Financial Conflicts of Interest”

All offer letter templates for the Professoriate, for Clinician Educators, and for Instructors have been updated to include the following paragraph:

“All new faculty members must complete the training tutorial titled Avoiding Financial Conflicts of Interest. This is a self-paced, web-based module designed to provide an overview of the high-risk situations that can lead to financial conflicts of interest for faculty. Additional information about the module can be found at the COI website http://www.stanford.edu/group/coi/training/training.html. It is available to all members of the Stanford community with SUNet IDs through the Stanford Training and Registration System (STARS).”

Including the Medical Services Office on Departure Notifications

Please include the Medical Services Office (contact: dwreden@stanfordmed.org) when informing OAA and Faculty Compensation of the departure of all persons with an academic appointment, including non-employee affiliates.

Access to the Faculty Information Tool (FIT)

The Provost’s Office database (STF-FAAS) contains current and historical information on members of the Professoriate that may be helpful as a supplement to the School-based FASTIFAC, Faculty Billets and ReportMart1’s Individual Roster. The Faculty Information Tool (FIT) provides access to the data in STF-FAAS. If you are interested in having access, please contact Jane Volk-Brew.
An Important Note about A&P and Housing Processes

Improving A&P Processes

Full Agendas for Upcoming Review Committees

An Important Note about A&P and Housing Processes

We are joining with the Provost’s Office to ask for your assistance in ensuring that the A&P and housing processes go smoothly for all parties. Toward that end, we ask that you advise faculty candidates, including Clinician Educators who may be eligible for housing benefits, that while they may fill out the initial paperwork for loans with the Faculty/Staff Housing Office, the paperwork will not be processed and the loan application will not proceed until the Faculty/Staff Housing Office is notified that the appointment has been given final approval.

We also ask that you let the candidates know that the processing of appointment files will not be accelerated because there is a loan arrangement or other housing issue pending. Therefore, candidates should not contact the Dean’s Office or the Provost’s Office for information on the status of their files.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain for professoriate candidates and to Jane Volk-Brew for Clinician Educator candidates.

Improving A&P Processes

Dr. David Stevenson, Vice Dean and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, recently sent a communication to department chairs (with copies to directors of finance and administration and faculty affairs administrators) regarding ongoing efforts to improve processes for appointments, reappointments and promotions. His communication is presented below in its entirety:

“I am writing to discuss several issues relevant to our ongoing efforts to improve processes for appointment, reappointment and promotion actions.
Let me begin by expressing my appreciation for your renewed efforts in completing these actions on time. Since I wrote to you in February, we have already seen improvements resulting from expanded faculty involvement in overseeing reviews and the allocation of incremental staff to handle faculty affairs functions. In addition to improving management, I also want to acknowledge the continuing high quality of the candidates who are being proposed for appointment, reappointment and promotion. As I noted in my recent Executive Committee presentation, last year the Advisory Board and/or Provost approved all of the School’s 156 recommended actions, and we are anticipating a similar outcome this year. We should all take pride in this outstanding record, which has been built upon high standards, commitment to excellence and hard work at the departmental level.

In my February communication, I closed by noting that the Office of Academic Affairs will continue to work with you and your staff in providing whatever assistance we can to help improve your management of and ensure positive outcomes for your A&P actions. Toward that end, we have developed the following documents, which we hope will be useful to your faculty review committees and staff:

**Best Practices: Roles and Primary Responsibilities in Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Reviews**

This attached document (note: document is at the end of this communication) outlines the responsibilities of the candidate, department chair, division chief, faculty lead, and divisional/departmental staff in A&P reviews. Please note that the department chair has ultimate responsibility for several tasks including, most importantly, the confidentiality of the process, timeliness of the action and overall quality of evidence submitted in the long form.

**Red Flags: Issues that may lead to concerns at the School and/or University levels**

From observing and staffing the School’s Appointments and Promotions Committee and Assistant Professors Review Committee, and from receiving feedback from the Provost and/or Advisory Board, the Office of Academic Affairs has identified a series of issues that may lead to concerns at the School and/or University levels. By paying special attention to these “red flags,” which are outlined in the attached document (note: document is at the end of this communication), departments may avoid or minimize concerns that could lead to tabling (or, in the most severe cases, rejection) of long forms.

**Internal Candidates**

During my Executive Committee presentation, I noted that over the last five years, about one-third of faculty hired in our School had a previous Stanford affiliation. About three-quarters of these internal hires were either Instructors or Clinician Educators, and 46% were women. Some were hired via a waiver of search, but most emerged from national searches.

To varying degrees, most schools of medicine across the country look to their own M.D. and M.D/Ph.D. fellows and trainees for faculty candidates. Reasons include small pool sizes nationwide, the use of training grants to identify and nurture the next generation of academic
researchers, the opportunity to bring diversity to the faculty, and the obvious benefit of being able to assess a candidate’s strengths first hand. Challenges surrounding internal hiring, however, include the danger of becoming inbred and the importance of having the junior person achieve independence from his or her research mentor.

I believe we have struck the right balance with our mix of internal and external hiring. One area in which we could improve, however, is in ensuring that when a national search is conducted, it is comprehensive and rigorous and that the playing field is level for all candidates. Among other things, this means that advertisements should not be tailored to fit a specific candidate and that mentors or collaborators of any known candidate (internal or external) who is likely to be a top choice in the search should recuse themselves from the search and selection process. Careful attention to these areas makes the review process smoother and more straightforward, particularly at the University level.

Another area for improvement is in bolstering the case for faculty candidates who have received their residency or fellowship training at Stanford. Going forward, we ask that you include information in the appointment file about the pool from which the candidate of choice was drawn when selected for training at the earliest stage of his or her career at Stanford. We believe that the combination of the national search narrative and information about the competitiveness of the earlier pool will add value to our appointment recommendations, especially when reviewed at the University level.

Waivers of Search

As I mentioned during my Executive Committee presentation, under normal circumstances waivers of search will only be considered for eminent senior scholars who are clearly one of the very top leaders in their field (especially women and underrepresented minority scholars); candidates at the assistant and associate ranks who would bring diversity to the faculty; candidates whose spouses or partners have been or will be appointed to the faculty; and candidates who are changing faculty lines.

While other cases may be proposed for consideration, it is anticipated that exceptions will be granted infrequently.

School-level Streamlining

We understand that there is continuing frustration with the bureaucratic aspects of A&P processes. The Advisory Board has had and will continue to have discussions that may lead to streamlining in the near future. However, in the meantime and as outlined below, I believe that there are a few things that the School can do to lighten the burden of assembling long forms without sacrificing the quality of evidence or integrity of the review process.
Review by the Office of Academic Affairs

As mentioned above, based on the broad perspective gained from reviewing long forms across the School, the Office of Academic Affairs provides important assistance to departments in strengthening the quality of the case being made for a given action. However, there has sometimes been a lack of clarity regarding whether such critiques are recommendations or mandated revisions. Some have also questioned the utility and efficiency of multiple requests for revisions.
To provide clarity, and to streamline the process going forward, we will be proceeding as follows:

1. Administrative Issues: feedback to the faculty affairs administrator

   The department will be expected to provide missing information, correct inconsistencies and fix significant typographical errors. In most cases, once these issues have been brought to the department’s attention, there will be no further review of revisions by the Office of Academic Affairs.

2. Substantive Issues: feedback to the department chair

   The Office of Academic Affairs will identify significant issues that in our assessment could result in tabling or rejection of the file at the School or University level unless addressed by the department. For example, this might include significant negative evaluations or comments by referees or trainees that have not been addressed in the departmental commentary. On behalf of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, OAA staff will provide recommendations for addressing such issues and will be available for further consultation with the department chair or his/her designate. Once the revised long form has been submitted, further address of significant issues will be at the discretion of the Senior Associate Dean.

3. Optional Issues: feedback to the department chair, division chief and/or faculty lead

   The Office of Academic Affairs will make recommendations for strengthening the quality of the case; these may be presented in the context of any substantive issues. The responsibility for accepting such recommendations is at the discretion of the department chair or his/her designate. Under normal circumstances, once OAA has communicated such recommendations, there will be no further follow up on these issues.

While authorship and ownership of the long form rests appropriately with the department, the Office of Academic Affairs will always be available to provide counsel and guidance.
Shorter, More Focused Transmittal Memoranda

The Advisory Board has noted that redundancies might be minimized by shortening transmittal memoranda. Toward this end, we are recommending that such memoranda be brief (generally one to two pages) and avoid repeating information contained in other parts of the long form (e.g., Candidate’s Statement, Role of the Candidate, Evaluation of Candidate, or quotes from referees). Instead, the memoranda should be a focused argument in favor of the action by the department chair that includes a succinct description of the candidate’s background and areas of focus as well as an explanation about why his or her work is important to the field and to the department.

There should be a discussion of any significant negative evidence uncovered in the review process and, if applicable, how it is being addressed (e.g., through counseling or mentoring). Voting results at all levels should be reported.


Independent Letter for UTL/NTLR Assistant Professor Long Forms

Originally intended to provide external validation of a candidate’s trajectory, letters from independent referees for UTL and NTLR assistant professor appointments have either proven difficult to get or, in some cases, have not provided substantive and value-added evaluation. As a result, this is no longer a requirement for new assistant professor appointments but an option that a department chair may choose to exercise on a case-by-case basis.

I hope that the attached documents and the streamlining outlined above will be helpful to departments. We would welcome any suggestions about how to further improve our A&P processes.”
BEST PRACTICES:
ROLES AND PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITIES
IN APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Role of the Candidate
Provides up-to-date curriculum vitae.
Provides Candidate’s Statement.
Suggests potential referees (with input normally limited to three-five names; candidates do not have input regarding comparative peers).
Provides list of trainees.

Role of the Department Chair, Division Chief or Faculty Lead
Determines action in compliance with appropriate criteria (e.g., reappointment or promotion).*
Appoints search or evaluation committee members.*
Assumes overall responsibility for integrity of the search or evaluation process.*
Selects external and internal referees (input from candidate limited to suggesting a short list, as noted above) and trainees for letter solicitation.*
Selects comparative peer set (if applicable).*
Authors (or delegates authorship to an appropriate senior faculty member) the section of the long form on the “Candidate’s Role,” including scholarly work, teaching and clinical activities (as applicable).
Authors “Evaluation of the Candidate” long form section (in some cases, this section of the long form will be the report from the A&P Committee or divisional evaluation committee).
With assistance from divisional/departmental staff, oversees the collection and summarizing of teaching (and, if applicable, clinical) performance evaluations.
Authors draft counseling memorandum (if applicable).
Considers recommendations from the Office of Academic Affairs to strengthen the quality of the proposed action.
Applies appropriate criteria to reach a recommendation on the appointment, reappointment or promotion based on the evidence gathered.
Authors transmittal memorandum, which should address any negative issues in the long form and explain the rationale for the department chair’s positive (or negative) recommendation.*
Assumes overall responsibility for confidentiality of the process, timeliness of action and quality of evidence submitted in the long form.*

Role of the Divisional/Departmental Staff
Manages completion of divisional/departmental document assembly and review processes in compliance with established OAA time lines.
Documents the search or evaluation process and provides that information to the faculty lead.
Gathers background information on proposed external referees and submits referee grid to OAA. Ensures that referee “relationship to candidate” information is accurate.
Proofreads entire long form, but particularly the curriculum vitae and candidate’s statement, and ensures currency and compliance with School guidelines.
Ensures that all sections of the long form are complete and in satisfaction of minimum evidentiary requirements. Provides draft of long form to OAA and works with faculty lead to incorporate recommended revisions.

Role of the Departmental Appointments and Promotions Committee

Understands the criteria and expectations for application of criteria for appointment, reappointment and promotion as outlined in Chapter 2 of the School of Medicine Faculty Handbook. Determines the relative weight to be given to information and opinions gathered and exercises its independent judgment within the context of School guidelines. When appropriate, requests additional information to inform recommendation. Votes on the action and provides a recommendation to the department chair. In some departments, authors the “Evaluation of the Candidate” section of the long form.

*While some duties may be delegated to the division chief or faculty lead, the department chair has ultimate responsibility for these tasks.

APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION REVIEWS:
SOME RED FLAGS THAT MAY PROMPT CONCERN
AT SCHOOL AND/OR UNIVERSITY LEVELS

Search issues in all lines and at all ranks:

Internal candidate, small candidate pool, mentors or collaborators on the search committee, lack of clarity around process, insufficient description of affirmative action efforts, overly specific requirements for position in advertisement/solicitation letter.

For appointment to Assistant Professor in the UTL, NTLR and MCL:

• Insufficient protected time for research. In the MCL, at least 20% FTE must be allocated to scholarship. In the UTL and NTLR, it may be a cause for concern if the candidate has a large clinical or administrative component, for example, more than about 30% FTE.
• Lack of recent publication record.
• Mentor not identified in transmittal memo.
• Referee letters which simply recap CV or candidate’s statement without substantive evaluation of relevant performance areas.

For reappointment to Assistant Professor in the UTL, NTLR and MCL – see list for appointment, and add:

• Unclear scholarly trajectory toward satisfaction of line-specific criteria for promotion to Associate Professor
• Mediocre or poor clinical or teaching performance
• Insufficient evidence (usually evaluations) of clinical and teaching excellence
• Draft counseling memo which lacks guidance looking to possible future consideration for promotion
• Interpersonal/respectful workplace issues
• Not addressing any negative commentary (from referees, trainees, or evaluations) in transmittal memo or evaluation section, as well as draft counseling memo.

For appointment or promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the UTL:

• Lack of clarity regarding specific major advances contributed by the candidate since completing training (after reading the file, and ideally after reading only the external referee letters, it should be easy to answer the question, “what has s/he done, since completing training, to move the field forward as an independent scientist?”)
• Lukewarm or negative assessments by external evaluators
• Apparent lack of investigative independence (e.g., still publishing with mentor, lack of “senior author” publications, does not have own extramural funding as PI, referees do not affirm impact of contributions since completing training)
• References in the file to a small, fledgling, or struggling field (it helps to realize that Stanford is essentially making a decision about whether to tenure the field, broadly defined, as well as the candidate)
• Eclectic or unfocused pattern of publication suggesting unclear trajectory
• Lack of, or poor, teaching contributions
• Interpersonal/respectful workplace issues

For appointment or promotion to Associate Professor in the NTLR:

• Lack of clarity regarding specific major advances contributed by the candidate since completing training (after reading the file, it should be easy to answer the question, “what has s/he done, since completing training, to move the field forward as an independent scientist?”)
• Lack of independent extramural grant funding (NTLR explicitly requires grant funding)
• Lukewarm or negative assessments by external evaluators
• Apparent lack of investigative independence (e.g., still publishing with mentor, lack of “senior author” publications, does not have own extramural funding as PI)
• Eclectic or unfocused pattern of publication suggesting unclear trajectory
• Lack of, or poor, mentorship contributions (formal teaching not required in this line)
• Interpersonal/respectful workplace issues

For appointment or promotion to Associate Professor in the MCL:

• Less than excellent clinical performance (problematic regardless of clinical FTE)
• Poor teaching performance
• Scholarly productivity below the expectations associated with field and scholarly FTE
• Eclectic or unfocused pattern of publication suggesting unclear scholarly trajectory toward future promotion to Professor
• Interpersonal/respectful workplace issues
For appointment or promotion to Professor in the UTL -- see list for promotion to Associate Professor, and add:

- For promotions, ambiguous evidence that the candidate has compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure review.
- Lack of clarity regarding the candidate’s status as one of the very best in a broadly defined field.
- Lack of, or poor, assessments of classroom teaching or investigative mentorship
- Interpersonal/respectful workplace issues.

For appointment or promotion to Professor in the NTLR – see list for promotion to Associate Professor, and add:

- Lack of clarity regarding the candidate’s status as one of the very best investigators in the field. Lack of senior-authored publications (or other similarly substantive contributions in written scholarship).
- Lack of evidence regarding the candidate’s ability to obtain sustained external funding.
- Poor, or ambiguous, evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students.
- Interpersonal/respectful workplace issues.

For appointment or promotion to Professor in the MCL – see list for promotion to Associate Professor, and add:

- Unclear national recognition
- Lack of clearly identifiable investigative program, with investigative peer-reviewed publications as primary author and/or collaborator with clearly central intellectual contributions

Questions should be directed to Judith Cain, Craig Spencer or Rebecca Robinson.

**Full Agendas for Upcoming Review Committees**

Information about space available on the agendas of all of the School of Medicine review committees is available on OAA’s home page, [http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/](http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/).

Please note that agendas are full for May meetings of the School of Medicine A&P Committee. We urge you to be in touch with Craig Spencer or Rebecca Robinson as soon as possible to
schedule any actions for the June meetings of the School’s A&P Committee or Assistant Professors Review Committee.

Please also note that the May and June agendas of the Clinician Educator A&P Committee are full; files are being assigned to the July meeting. The web site will be updated periodically to indicate that space is diminishing, so please check the website frequently.
 Approval of MCL Assistant Professor Reappointments Delegated to the School
Summer Advisory Board Agendas are Full; An Update on School Review Committee Agendas
Introducing Audio Tutorials
Reminder: Annual Counseling for Assistant and Associate Professors
Policy Regarding Concurrent Trainee and Clinical Instructor Appointments
Visas for and Employment of Foreign Nationals
Professional Licensure

Approval of MCL Assistant Professor Reappointments Delegated to the School

The following communication has been sent to chairs of clinical departments by Dr. David Stevenson, Vice Dean and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs:

“As part of the University’s continuing efforts to streamline processes associated with faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions, the Provost has delegated responsibility to the School for approval of MCL assistant professor reappointments.

Review processes within the School will remain the same, that is, departmental recommendations for MCL assistant professor reappointments will be reviewed by the Assistant Professors Review Committee (APRC), which is advisory to me. I will then make a recommendation to the Dean, who will render a decision on behalf of the School. Although the Provost will no longer be reviewing and approving these actions, the reappointment will not be considered final until signed by the President.

This new process will be carried out on a trial basis for six months. If everything goes well, it will become permanent on January 1, 2012.

The Provost’s confidence in the School’s ability to evaluate its junior MCL faculty at the pivotal time of reappointment is something in which we should all take pride. I look forward to working with you to ensure that his confidence is well placed.”

If you have any questions, please direct them to Rebecca Robinson.
Summer Advisory Board Agendas are Full; An Update on School Review Committee

Agendas

We have been informed by the Provost’s Office that the agendas for the remaining University Advisory Board meetings for this summer are now full. If the Provost’s Office not yet received a file that will require Advisory Board review, it is unlikely, unless space unexpectedly opens up, that the Board will be able to review it prior to the new Board starting in September. The Board has just two more meetings in June, one meeting in mid-July, and one meeting in mid-August. Because of the high volume of files still requiring review, please note that priority is being given to new appointments and to reappointments/promotions conferring tenure. Term reappointments and promotions and promotions of already tenured faculty to full Professor will be put last in the queue unless there are compelling reasons for moving them up.

It is also anticipated that review of MCL files will take longer than usual simply due to high file volume.

The schedule for OAA review committee meetings is available on our home page. As is the case with the Advisory Board, many of our upcoming meetings have full agendas. As you will see, A&P Committee meeting agendas are full through the middle of July. The agendas for the June and July Assistant Professors Review Committee meetings are full. These crowded agendas are due to an influx of late long forms that have been submitted in order to avoid a moratorium on new searches, as well as the usual surge of files that are submitted in spring quarter.

Questions regarding the status of specific files and forecast timing of the review process should be directed to either Craig Spencer or Rebecca Robinson. Please direct inquiries regarding the timing of Clinician Educator file reviews to Jane Volk-Brew.

Introducing Audio Tutorials

In order to lessen confusion about filling out the "green form" for appointment and reappointment of Visiting and Consulting Faculty, a new audio demonstration has been added to the following web pages:

- Consulting Faculty with Salary
- Consulting Faculty without Salary
- Visiting Faculty with Salary
- Visiting Faculty without Salary
- Visiting Instructors with Salary
- Visiting Instructors without Salary

Look for the green "Watch Demo" button and select it to see the 2 1/2 minute explanation of the green form, some fields that often cause confusion, and why you are asked to fill in particular fields.
We intend to create more of these in the future and would be very happy to receive your comments on this demo or suggestions for others that you think might prove useful.

**Reminder: Annual Counseling for Assistant and Associate Professors**

University policy specifies that “deans, department chairs, or their delegates should confer annually with each junior faculty member in their department or school to review his or her performance in light of the criteria for reappointment or promotion.” The School requires that an annual counseling documentation form be completed for all assistant and associate professors. The form requires the signatures of the chair, the mentor, and the faculty member and is essential in documenting your faculty members’ annual counseling.

Counseling should have occurred after September 1, 2010, and before August 31, 2011. Once all counseling sessions for your department have been conducted, we ask that you forward to the Office of Academic Affairs a memorandum attesting that each assistant and associate professor has received counseling and that you have on file in your department copies of the required annual counseling form.

**We encourage you to review your department’s progress to date and, in cases where counseling has not yet occurred, to work with your department chair to schedule these counseling sessions as soon as possible in order to be in compliance with University policy.**

Further information regarding the annual counseling process, along with a copy of the annual counseling documentation form, is available on the [OAA website](#). Any questions should be directed to [Rebecca Robinson](#).

**Policy Regarding Concurrent Trainee and Clinical Instructor Appointments**

The policy on concurrent trainee and Clinical Instructor appointments has been updated in collaboration with the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, the Office of Graduate Medical Education, Bechtel International Center, and the Compliance Department of Stanford University Medical Center. The policy will be republished as Section 8.2.E.3.3 of the School of Medicine Faculty Handbook Chapter 8 on Clinician Educators.

A key provision of the policy is that when a department recommends a concurrent academic appointment for a trainee, it is essential that the training program of the candidate not be compromised and that there be a clear and documented distinction between his or her assignment as a trainee and his or her duties as an attending physician appointed as a Clinical Instructor.

If your department has submitted a Clinical Instructor appointment for a candidate who will also be a non-ACGME Resident or Fellow, please review the policy below. If the submitted recommendation needs modification, please contact [Jane Volk-Brew](#).
If you are not sure whether the Clinical Instructor candidate also needs an appointment through the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs and/or the Office of Graduate Medical Education, please take note of Section 8.2.E.3.a.1 as well, which when compared with Section 8.2.E.3.3, distinguishes between an attending physician receiving occasional supervision and a trainee who has incidental attending physician duties. In particular, please note differences with respect to immigration, licensure and hospital compliance issues. Questions may be directed to Jane Volk-Brew, Rania Sanford, or Ann Dohn.

8.2.E.3. Specific/Supplemental Criteria for Clinical Instructors

a. Appointment as Clinical Instructor of (Subject)

1. Individuals appointed as Clinical Instructors will have completed their clinical training; this rank typically will be the first appointment for someone finishing that training. They should have demonstrated exceptional qualities and promise to become outstanding clinicians and clinical teachers. If these individuals have not had formal teaching experience, they should have demonstrated a commitment to develop the skills necessary for outstanding teaching. They must have demonstrated excellence or promise of excellence in a combination of clinical performance and clinical teaching appropriate to the programmatic need upon which the appointment will be based. The initial term of appointment is up to three years.

An attending physician appointed as a Clinical Instructor may receive occasional supervision from a more experienced physician on clinical procedures, however he or she is not a trainee. Such advanced training in a clinical subspecialty differs from a fellowship (see section 3 following) when all the following conditions are met:

a) There is no curriculum associated with the candidate’s role and responsibilities;

b) the candidate was not identified by means of a trainee match;

c) he or she does not have a concurrent Fellow appointment;

d) he or she will not appear on a call schedule as a Fellow;

e) there will be no teaching attestation(s) signed by a
more experienced physician for the Clinical Instructor and the Clinical Instructor must bill for the supervised services being performed by him or her;

   f) he or she will not receive a trainee certification from the department, the School of Medicine or Stanford University; and

   g) he or she is not seeking board eligible training and/or a Certificate of Added Qualification (“CAQ”) through the Clinical Instructor activity.

If the candidate for a Clinical Instructor position is a foreign national, he or she cannot hold a J visa.

2. Individuals fulfilling a Locum tenens role may also be appointed as Clinical Instructor to meet temporary clinical programmatic need.

3. Under exceptional circumstances, it may be appropriate to recommend the concurrent part time appointment of a non-ACGME Resident or Fellow for a one year appointment as a Clinical Instructor or, if not paid by Stanford, as a Clinical Instructor (Affiliated). Such circumstances may include the appointment of the Chief or Senior Resident (or Fellow serving in that capacity) in recognition of his or her contribution to the teaching program or of an advanced trainee on a clinical service for the purpose of recognizing his or her contribution to the clinical program of a department in a capacity other than that as a trainee.

In recommending such an appointment, it is essential that the training program of the candidate not be compromised and that there be a clear and documented distinction between the assignment as a trainee and the assignment as an appointee to the staff. The following guidelines are provided to assure that all of these conditions are met:

   a) The Resident or Fellow must have completed all requirements, with the exception of practice requirements, for the Board and/or Certificate in the specialty in which he or she will practice as a Clinical Instructor.

   b) The percent time of appointment as a Clinical Instructor must be consistent with the percent time of the fellowship, grant or other support received by the Resident or Fellow. The combined total may not exceed 100% full
time effort (FTE).

c) The Resident or Fellow must receive written notice that his or her appointment as a trainee will be modified and the purpose of the change described. Separate and dated periods of appointment as a part-time Resident or Fellow and as a part-time Clinical Instructor must also be specified in writing to the trainee. Appointment as Clinical Instructor must be coterminal with the period during which the trainee is formally released from training status for the purpose of the appointment.

d) Funds for the appointment of a Resident or Fellow as a part-time Clinical Instructor must have been included in the department budget and are to be derived from the appropriate Stanford Hospital or Clinics and/or Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital accounts or other non-general funds source.

e) A document describing the services to be rendered as a Clinical Instructor, identifiable as separate and distinct from the duties required as part of the Resident’s or Fellow’s training program, must be supplied to the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office of Graduate Medical Education. For Clinical Fellows the document must identify the codes for which the Clinical Instructor can bill for clinical services or the codes from which the Clinical Instructor is prohibited from billing. Information about billing codes is available from the Office of Graduate Medical Education.

f) As a condition of appointment as a Clinical Instructor the candidate must sign the letter of agreement to transmit professional fees to appropriate Stanford Hospitals and Clinics and/or Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital accounts. All billable activity must be outside the area in which the candidate is training and in compliance with Stanford Hospital and Clinics’ policy 7.01.01 http://portal.stanfordmed.org/depts/ComplianceDepartment/pages/complianceProFee.aspx.

g) Membership on the Medical Staff of Stanford Hospital and Clinics and/or Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital must be obtained and maintained by the candidate if he or she will be responsible for the care of patients.
h) The candidate must hold a California medical or professional license. The candidate may not apply for a California Business and Professions Code Section 2113 registration from the Medical Board of California. (See Professional Licensure topic appearing later in this Communiqué.)

i) Residency and clinical fellowship Certificates are issued only by the Office of Graduate Medical Education and/or the Office of Postdoctoral Affairs. Departments and clinical programs do not have the authority to issue Certificates upon completion of training.

j) If the candidate is a foreign national and the graduate of an international medical school, he or she must be on an ECFMG sponsored J-1 visa.

k) An identical description of the candidate’s position and intended role and responsibilities must be identical for purposes in which it is used, e.g. appointment, licensure, immigration.

Visas for and Employment of Foreign Nationals

Departments are reminded that if the candidate for an academic appointment is a foreign national, the candidate and the department must comply with the applicable policies and procedures appearing in Administrative Guide Memo 28.1, http://adminguide.stanford.edu/ch2contents.html, and on the Bechtel International Center website, http://icenter.stanford.edu/scholars/atstanford/classification.html#faculty.

Professional Licensure

Before a clinician is permitted to assume responsibilities for the care of patients at Stanford Hospital and Clinics and/or Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital or at an outreach site of Stanford Hospitals and Clinics, he or she must have or obtain a professional license from the State of California. Information about obtaining a professional license from the State of California may be obtained from the Department of Consumer Affairs http://www.dca.ca.gov/, including the Medical Board of California http://www.medbd.ca.gov/, the Osteopathic Medical Board of California http://www.ombc.ca.gov/, the California Board of Psychology http://www.psychboard.ca.gov/, the Veterinary Medical Board http://www.vmb.ca.gov/, as well as from the Graduate Medical Education, http://med.stanford.edu/gme/current_residents/ca_md_license.html/.

California Business and Professions Code Sections 2100 et seq. apply to the applications of
graduates of medical schools located outside the United States or Canada. In particular, Section 2113 applies to a person who does not immediately qualify for a physician and surgeon’s certificate and who is offered by the dean of an approved medical school in the State of California a full time faculty position.

Section 2113 describes the requirements for applying for a certificate of registration to engage in the practice of medicine only to the extent that the practice is incident to and a necessary part of the person’s duties as approved by the Medical Board of California in connection with the faculty position. Section 2113 registration is for full time faculty positions only. A clinical fellowship shall not be submitted as a faculty service appointment.

Below is a comparison of 2113 and 2111 registrations prepared by the Office of the General Counsel and the Office of Graduate Medical Education. Additional information regarding this legislation is available from the Division of Consumer Affairs, Medical Board of California at http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=bpc&group=02001-03000&file=2100-2115 and from the Graduate Medical Education (GME), http://med.stanford.edu/gme/current_residents/ca_md_license.html/.

The “Notice of Separation Under Business and Professions Code Sections 2111 and 2113”, used to notify the Medical Board of California that the faculty appointment of a 2113 registration holder has ended, is available on the GME’s web site.
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Departmental Materials for New Faculty Members

The Faculty Development and Diversity Office (an affiliate of the Provost’s Office) holds an annual New Faculty Orientation featuring presentations by University leaders that provides an array of information, from teaching and research programs to personal and family resources. In preparing for this year’s New Faculty Orientation, which will be held on September 14, Faculty Development and Diversity is reevaluating the materials distributed at past sessions. To avoid duplication of effort, we have been asked to provide a list of materials that is provided to new faculty members in our School.

Since such orientations usually take place at the departmental level, we are asking for your help. Please send an email rrobinso[at]stanford.edu supplying a list of orientation materials by July 22nd. If it would be more convenient to provide us with a sample packet of materials, please send them to Rebecca Robinson by that date.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain at jpcain[at]stanford.edu.

Small Applicant Pools and Permission to Proceed

As you manage your faculty searches, please remember that consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs needs to take place if your applicant pool is five or fewer. As outlined in the Guide to Faculty Searches (http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/facultysearch/toc.html):

“Small applicant pools often raise questions about overly narrowly defined position descriptions, about qualified applicants not applying because of the perception that a pre-identified Stanford candidate would get the position, and about the ability to calibrate the qualifications of a proposed candidate in the absence of a larger applicant pool.

In cases where the total applicant pool is five or fewer, the search committee chair should consult with the Office of Academic Affairs to discuss the committee's efforts to obtain as large and diverse an applicant pool as practicable under the circumstances, as well as the possible reasons
for the small number of applicants. After this discussion, the department will either be asked by the Senior Associate Dean to expand its search strategies or will be given permission to proceed to the next step in the process.”

**Clinician Educator A&P Committee Review**

A list of actions assigned to upcoming Clinician Educator A&P Committee meetings is available (discretely) by clicking on the Committee’s name on the OAA web page. The list will be updated weekly to enable department and division FAAs to determine when an action is scheduled for review. Assignment to a meeting does not guarantee that the action will be decided at a given meeting; the Committee reserves the right to table an action for additional information.

**Clinician Educator and Instructor Offer Letter Templates Revised**

The Clinician Educator and Instructor offer letter templates have been revised. When creating an offer letter, please start with the versions on the OAA web site (http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/CEs/) to minimize review time and the number of edits.

**Notice Needed for Departing Clinician Educators and Instructors**

Please notify OAA (jessmen[at]Stanford.edu and volkbrew[at]Stanford.edu), Faculty Compensation (bjelland[at]stanford.edu), and the Medical Services Office (dwreden[at]stanford.edu) when it is determined that the appointment of a Clinician Educator or Instructor will end. The Medical Services Office has asked to also be notified when the appointment of a Clinician Educator (Affiliated) or Instructor (Affiliated) is ending.

**Practice Policy Exemption Form**

The Practice Policy for Physicians and Psychologists in the School of Medicine governs all clinicians in the School of Medicine and the revenue generated by them. If a clinician has clinical income unrelated to his or her Stanford commitment, he or she must have an exemption approved in writing by his/her Division Chief (if appropriate), Department Chair, and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. A statement confirming the exemption must be included in the appointment letter issued by the Office of Academic Affairs. (See Section II.B.3.(b).(ii) of the Practice Policy for Physicians and Psychologists in the School of Medicine (http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/documents/rules-of-practice.pdf)). The form to request an exemption is available in Chapter 10 of the School of Medicine Faculty Handbook (http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/handbook/chapt10.html#practice).
Benefits Orientation for New Faculty

Stanford Benefits is sponsoring four orientation workshops for new faculty. The workshops on August 17 and September 15 are classroom sessions; the workshops on July 14 and September 7 are Web sessions. Please encourage your new faculty to participate.

For more detailed information, go to http://benefits.stanford.edu/cgi-bin/overview/benefits_calendar/.
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OAA Staffing Update

As many of you know, the Clinician Educator Line has grown dramatically over the last few years, and this growth is expected to continue in the future. In order to meet this increased and increasing demand, the Office of Academic Affairs has been granted an incremental position to manage the CE and Instructor lines. This position will report to Jane Volk-Brew, who will provide oversight, especially in the area of CE-related policy development and implementation. Jane’s primary duties, however, will be in managing FASTFAC, including continue to provide user support, complete the online help, and work on future phases, such as the faculty search management system.

We are working with Human Resources on the job description and classification for this new position and expect to have it filled during autumn quarter. In the meantime, we are very pleased that Jessica Mendonça will be taking over responsibility for the CE and Instructor lines on an interim basis. Please continue to include Jessica (jessmen[at]stanford.edu) on all correspondence pertaining to CEs and Instructors, including A&P matters, CE professional development leave matters, signed offer letters, departure notifications, licensure and immigration issues, and policy and procedure questions.

We also wanted to let you know that Ellie Saeidi, who has been on maternity leave since February, has decided not to come back to work. We want to take this opportunity to thank Ellie for her six years of service, which included many wonderful contributions to the School.

We are updating the job description for this position and hope to have someone in place during autumn quarter. Beginning this week, Andy Kim will be joining OAA as interim administrative associate. After an orientation period, you will be hearing from him regarding areas previously handled by Ellie, including appointment letters, resignation notifications and Visiting Scholar appointments.

We will keep you posted on our progress in filling these two key positions permanently, and thank you for your patience and understanding during this transition period.
Second CECCE Qualtrics Training Session Scheduled for September 21

On August 3, 2011, we held a training session to launch the (optional) use of the new Qualtrics online version of the Clinical Excellence Core Competency Evaluation forms. We’re pleased to note that feedback since then has been generally quite positive; however, we have identified a couple of things that needed adjustment.

Accordingly, a slightly revised instruction manual and Powerpoint overview have recently been uploaded to the OAA website "forms" page. Changes are as follows:

(1) An alternate Qualtrics portal has been added. It has come to our attention that some SUNet IDs may only be able to access Qualtrics through an alternate portal at http://stanfordmedicine.qualtrics.com (instead of http://stanforduniversity.qualtrics.com). Either portal will allow you to access the Qualtrics software use our online CECCE template. However, note that you can only collaborate with people who have an account set up in the same portal. Accordingly, you will want to make sure you use the same portal as others with whom you will collaborate with on CECCE or other surveys. See pp. 2 -3 of the instruction manual for context.

(2) Use extra caution when saving the downloaded “.qsf” template file. Specifically, pay attention to the “Save as type” or “Save as” file option in the pop-up window. Be sure to save the file type as “All Files”. DO NOT select “Text Document” or “.QSF document” – these file types are usually the default choices. Make sure you select “All Files.” (It may be tempting to select “.QSF document,” and the name and extension of the resulting saved file may look normal, but we’ve seen some subtle problems with function when the file is saved this way.) See the bottom of page 3 of the new instruction manual for context.

For those who couldn’t attend the August meeting, we will hold another training session on Wednesday, September 21, 2011 from 10:00 to 11:30 (morning this time) in the Li Ka Shing center’s LK101 studio classroom. Please RSVP to Craig if you’ll be attending.

Status of Review Committee Agendas

As indicated on OAA’s home page, agendas for the September meetings of the A&P Committee and the Assistant Professors Review Committee are full. Agendas are also full for the September, October, November and December meetings of the Clinician Educator A&P Committee.

If you have files that need to be considered during autumn quarter, we urge you to complete those files sooner rather than later and to work closely with Craig, Rebecca or Jessica in scheduling them for review.
Number of Copies Reduced for Some Professoriate Long Forms

The Provost’s Office has reduced the number of copies needed for certain long form actions. As a result, the School is asking for fewer copies. These reductions are reflected on our [home page](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/fsh/CE/) (see top of right-hand column) and are effective immediately.

Advisory Board Membership and Schedule

Two School of Medicine faculty members have been elected to the 2011-12 University Advisory Board: Philip Lavori, Professor of Health Research and Policy, and Lucy Shapiro, Professor of Developmental Biology. The Advisory Board reviews and makes recommendations for most Academic Council appointments, promotions and reappointments, and for the creation and dissolution of departments. The Board also reviews faculty dismissals and some disciplinary cases that are not satisfactorily resolved through typical university procedures, as well as matters submitted to it by the president or provost for advice.

Beginning September 13, 2011, the Advisory Board plans to meet twice each month in the fall and winter quarters, depending upon file volume, moving to weekly meetings in spring and early summer when volume increases. As has been the Board’s practice in recent years, just one meeting is anticipated in July and one in August.

Clinician Educator Housing Program

Changes were made to the Clinician Educator Housing Program effective September 1, 2011. Information about the enhanced Clinician Educator Deferred Interest Program and the Clinician Educator Housing Allowance Supplement, as well as the new Clinician Educator – Arranged Mortgage, is available on the Faculty/Staff Housing website [http://www.stanford.edu/dept/fsh/CE/](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/fsh/CE/) (there is also a link to this website on OAA’s CE webpage).

The Clinician Educator offer letter template available on OAA’s CE webpage has been revised to incorporate language about the Clinician Educator Housing Program. Please use it to minimize the number of edits needed.
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Provost’s Office Announces Changes to Long Form Submissions

Included below is a communication that schools have received from Scott Walters, Director of Faculty Appointments and Promotions in the Office of the Provost, regarding a series of changes “aimed at both streamlining the narrative sections of the files and reducing the volume of material in the files.” We ask that you read this message carefully and pass on its contents to your department chair, division chief or other faculty leaders who are involved in appointments and promotions processes.

“I write to you on behalf of the Provost and my colleagues in Faculty Affairs in the Office of the Provost. As you know, the Advisory Board has recommended changes to the forms for appointments, reappointments and promotions aimed at both streamlining the narrative sections of the files and reducing the volume of material in the files. We are continuing to explore a number of long term changes that we expect will make your work easier, including on-line submission of forms and possible conflation of the current five forms into a single form adaptable for all actions.

In the interim, I am pleased to announce the following changes to long form submissions that you may begin implementing immediately (some schools have already implemented some of these changes):

Cover Memoranda:

• The cover memorandum from the dean may be a brief transmittal memorandum and should focus primarily on the value it adds to the file, rather than recapitulating information already contained in the departmental cover memorandum or in the file.
• The cover memorandum from the department chair (for those schools with departments) should generally be limited to describing who the candidate is, what he or she does, and discussing any unusual issues or negative evidence uncovered in the review process.
Search and Evaluation Process

- All extraneous material – multiple copies of advertisements and/or solicitation letters, lists of contacts, transmittal or other tangential correspondence with outside sources, etc. – may be omitted from the file as long as the information is maintained by the department to be made available upon request. A single copy of the advertisement and solicitation letter is sufficient to include in the file.

[Note from OAA: This change has been in effect in the School of Medicine for the last few months; see the May Communiqué for details.]

Candidate’s Statement

- The Advisory Board has determined that three pages is usually sufficient for a candidate to convey his or her scholarship, teaching, and other activities, and urges brevity in these statements.

Referee Letters

- While the guidelines for solicitation of external referee letters for tenure decisions indicate a range of from 8-12, the Advisory Board has determined that 8 letters are usually sufficient for the file. You may wish to modify your solicitation of letters accordingly. As always, all letters received should be included in the file.
- Tangential correspondence with referees that does not add materially to the file, such as transmittal memoranda, does not need to be included in the file, but should be maintained by the school to be made available upon request.

Trainee Letters

- Tangential correspondence with trainees that does not add materially to the file, such as transmittal memoranda, does not need to be included in the file, but should be maintained by the school to be made available upon request.
- For candidates with undergraduate teaching responsibilities, the range of letters to be solicited from undergraduates may be reduced from the current range of 6-12 to a range of 4-6.

Teaching and Clinical Evaluations

- A summary table at the beginning of this section should list courses, dates, enrollments and mean scores. Many schools already use such summary tables, including those available through the Registrar’s Office. This summary should be used in place of voluminous individual evaluations; summary data for individual courses may still be appended to the comprehensive summary table and included in the file. It is also no longer necessary to include samples of evaluation instruments. All such evaluations and instruments, however, should be maintained by the School to be made available upon request.
- Voluminous comments accompanying teaching evaluations should now be replaced by a representative (not random) sample of 10-12 individual comments. All evaluations and comments, however, should be maintained by the School to be made available upon request.
[Note from OAA: The above point refers to teaching evaluations from large courses, which in most cases is not applicable to the School of Medicine. Reporting of comments garnered from clinical excellence forms will remain the same.]

Counseling Memoranda

• No changes; however, a template for junior rank counseling recommended by the Advisory Board will soon be posted on the Faculty Affairs Web site.

Department or School Approval

• No changes, but please be reminded that the summary of votes should always clearly account for all positive votes, negative votes, abstentions, and recusals.

Finally, we also encourage Schools to convey to their chairs, search and evaluation committee members, and faculty affairs staff the Advisory Board’s appreciation for brevity and conciseness in narrative sections of the files. If material has been sufficiently covered in one part of the file, it need not be repeated in another.

I am also pleased to announce two other significant changes to the appointments, reappointments and promotions process:

First, effective January 1, 2012, Schools need no longer submit reappointments at the Assistant Professor rank for review by the Provost’s Office. Schools will be responsible for review of these files, but they will no longer be reviewed by the Provost or Advisory Board. Please note that reappointments coupled with a promotion must still be reviewed by the Provost and the Advisory Board. As university policy gives the President final authority on all appointments, reappointments and promotions, Schools will be asked to forward a copy of all files approved at the School level, and these reappointments will continue to be reported to the President and to the Board of Trustees via the President’s Report to the Board. I will be conferring with you and providing more information in the coming weeks regarding the process for implementing this change.

[Note from OAA: This expands the authority that was delegated to the School in June for reappointments of assistant professors in the Medical Center Line as announced in the June Communiqué. Note that all reappointments for a term of years will now be delegated.)

Second, effective October 15, 2011, please begin using the revised version of the Recommendation for Amendment of Appointment, a.k.a “the Blue Form.” The revised version of this form has been posted in the Faculty Handbook at: http://www.stanford.edu/dept/provost/faculty/policies/handbook/c.html and on the Faculty Affairs Webpage at http://facultyaffairs.stanford.edu/ (from this webpage, Faculty Affairs staff logs into the Faculty Affairs staff section on right hand side).
This revised form includes the following changes:

- Addition of checkboxes to indicate faculty line, and an added space to indicate medical center affiliation for all MCL actions.

- Addition of a section addressing changes in tenure deadline. Use this section to note any actions that affect the tenure deadline of currently untenured tenure-line faculty members.

- Addition of a section entitled **New Administrative Title**. Use this section to indicate changes in the following positions: Vice Dean, Senior Associate Dean, Department Chair and Independent Lab Directors. These are the senior administrative appointments that must be approved by the Provost; the other options in the list – Dean, Vice Provost, and Institute/Program Director are approved directly by the Provost and are for internal Provost’s Office use. (Other administrative positions not listed here can be approved in the schools, and do not require a blue form). PROCESS: Approval should be obtained from the Provost prior to offering the position to the faculty member. Deans may request approval for the appointment from the Provost by email, with a copy of the email to the Faculty Affairs Officer in the school. The Provost will respond by email. A Faculty Affairs Officer in the school will attach the email or correspondence to the blue form, obtain the relevant signatures and send to our office. The appointment start and end dates must be included on the form for the request to be approved (otherwise it will be returned to your office).

- Re-ordering of the list of options for amendment and other minor adjustments to clarify the text.

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the above. We believe the above changes to the process will help facilitate your preparation of the files and forms, and we greatly appreciate any feedback you may offer as you begin to implement these changes.”

Any questions should be directed to Craig Spencer or Rebecca Robinson.

**Revised School of Medicine Faculty Handbook Chapter on Clinician Educators and Appointment Evidence Requirement Changes**

The School of Medicine Faculty Handbook chapter on Clinician Educators has been revised and published at http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/handbook/chapt8.html.

Section 8.1.C provides defines Clinician Educators (Affiliated), distinguishes them from Clinician Educators and describes the circumstances under which a Clinician Educator (Affiliated) appointment is expected.

Section 8.1.J contains changes to the duration of appointment for Clinical Assistant Professor and Clinical Assistant Professor (Affiliated). Appointment modifications may be needed for individuals in one of these ranks. Section 8.1.J also allows for the possibility, in rare and
exceptional circumstances, of continuing term at the time of reappointment as Clinical Professor or Clinical Professor (Affiliated).

A new criterion for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor appears in Section 8.2.E.5.b, specifically, that “[i]n special cases, other factors may be considered for appointment for those individual who do not have regional prominence, including extraordinary contributions in broadly defined areas as teaching and clinical excellence, clinical innovation, program building and/or administrative activities. A similar criterion has been added to Section 8.2.E.6.c for promotion to Clinical Professor.

Chapter 8 also links to the policies applicable to Clinician Educators appearing in other Stanford University web pages, including the Administrative Guide, the Practice Policy, and the Stanford Industry Interactions Policy.

The Office of Academic Affairs’ web page, http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/CEs/ has been redesigned to provide information about the evidentiary requirements for appointment files (some of which are new) and best practices identified by the Clinician Educator Appointments and Promotions Committee that are in effect for actions commencing on or after October 1, 2011.

Departments are asked to share David Stevenson’s messages announcing these changes (the first to departments/divisions, [Chapter on Clinician Educators](http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/CEs/), and the second to Clinician Educators and Clinician Educators (Affiliated), [Announcement to Clinician Educators](http://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/CEs/) with the appropriate colleagues at Stanford’s affiliated hospitals (e.g., Santa Clara Valley Medical Center, Kaiser Permanente Santa Clara, and the Veterans Affairs Palo Alto Health Care System).

Questions should be directed to [Jessica Mendonça](mailto:jessica.mendonca@stanford.edu).

**Office of Academic Affairs to Sponsor Faculty Workshops**

We direct your attention to the following announcement, which was carried in the October 10th edition of the Dean’s Newsletter:

“One of our most important goals is to provide a supportive environment in which faculty can succeed and flourish in their clinical, teaching and research activities. This is particularly true for assistant and associate professors who are looking ahead to the pivotal milestone of reappointment or promotion. For these faculty members, departmental and School leaders have a special obligation to ensure that the criteria for such reviews are clear, consistent, transparent and well understood.

Toward that end, over the last two years the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) has sponsored a series of workshops aimed at demystifying reappointment and promotion criteria, policies and processes for faculty members whose reviews are on the horizon. Over 200 faculty members have attended these sessions, which have covered topics ranging from preparation of the curriculum vitae and candidate’s statement to the evaluation of clinical excellence to rank- and line-specific criteria for reappointment and promotion.
During the 2011-12 academic year, OAA will sponsor eight workshops for faculty in the University Tenure, Medical Center and Clinician Educator Lines. The first session is designed for Clinical Assistant Professors, scheduled for November 16 and entitled “Preparing for the Promotion Review,” and will be led by Dr. Maurice Druzin and Dr. Nancy Morioka-Douglas, Chair and Vice Chair, respectively, of the Clinician Educator Appointments and Promotions Committee. The second session is designed for assistant professors in the Medical Center Line, also on November 16, and will focus on “Building a Regional Reputation: Preparing for Promotion to Associate Professor.” Session leaders will include Dr. Druzin, chair of the School’s Assistant Professors Review Committee; Dr. Cheryl Gore-Felton, Co-Chair of the Appointments and Promotions Committee in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences; and Dr. Deirdre Lyell, Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology. Subsequent workshops will be held from January through May.

We hope you will take this opportunity to visit the OAA website to register and/or learn more about the workshops being offered in the coming months.”

We hope that faculty affairs administrators will spread the word about the availability of these workshops to their assistant and associate professors, as applicable. Unfortunately, owing to space considerations, the sessions will be restricted to faculty participation only.

**Funding Deferred for the Faculty Search Management System**

Last spring, the Office of Academic Affairs, in collaboration with IRT, began exploring the development of an online applicant tracking system through which individuals could apply for posted faculty positions in the School. Some of you joined with us in interviewing vendors, and your feedback was very helpful.

Unfortunately, due to competing priorities, our proposal for project funding was not approved for the 2011-12 academic year. The proposal, however, was well received, and the project – which represents the next phase of FASTFAC – will be given consideration next year.

Please continue to use the Provost’s Office Faculty Applicant Self-Identification system https://facultyaffairs.stanford.edu/fasi. If you will be coordinating a search for which a large number of applicants are expected, please let us know; we will connect you with colleagues who have recently done so.

Any questions should be directed to Jane Volk-Brew.

**Additional A&P Committee Meeting Scheduled for October**

In order to address an unusually heavy volume of long forms and to keep approvals moving along in a timely manner, an additional A&P Committee meeting has been scheduled for October 17th.

Tentative agendas have been set for the October 17th and 24th meetings; if you have any questions, please be in touch with Craig Spencer.
Policy Change for Visiting Scholar ID Cards

Per current University policy, the Office of Academic Affairs will no longer distribute paper cards for Visiting Scholars. A Visiting Scholar who desires a Stanford ID card may now apply directly to the Stanford Card Office (Forsythe Hall, Room 135, 275 Panama Street) using his/her letter of invitation along with a government-issued picture ID (e.g., passport, driver’s license) to receive a Visiting Scholar ID card ($20 one-time fee). The Visiting Scholar ID Card provides access to Stanford University Libraries and most campus recreational facilities.


*Please note that eligibility for a Stanford ID Card requires that the Visiting Scholar’s appointment be at least 90 days in length.

Questions should be directed to Andrew Kim.

Kudos: Annual Counseling

We would like to acknowledge outstanding management of the annual counseling process by the following departments and faculty affairs administrators who achieved 100% compliance during 2010-11:

Anesthesia (Virginia Tse)
Chemical and Systems Biology (Jean Kavanagh)
Genetics (Margaret Mahoney)
Neurology (Kelli Santini)
Neurobiology (Kelli Santini)
Neurosurgery (Kelli Santini)
Orthopaedic Surgery (Kara Sjoblom-Bay)
Radiology (Kendall Yi)
Surgery (Deepa Basava)

Thanks to all of you for your efforts in ensuring that your assistant and associate professors received annual counseling in compliance with School and University policies. We greatly appreciate your work!

Note to departments that have not yet been in contact with OAA: The reporting deadline for 2010-11 was August 31st. Since the School and University expect compliance from all departments, please make it a priority to confirm that annual counseling has taken place in your department.

Questions should be directed to Rebecca Robinson.
OAA Seeks Administrative Associate

The Office of Academic Affairs has an opening for a full time Administrative Associate. S/he will provide support to an office of four faculty deans and eight staff members who serve a total faculty population of approximately 3,000. Primary administrative duties include preparing official appointment letters, filing and managing file archives, organizing and distributing materials for standing committee meetings (approximately four per month), maintaining and ordering supplies, maintaining equipment and providing backup support for the Associate to the Senior Associate Dean. The Administrative Associate also manages Visiting Scholar appointments, conducts preliminary screening of visiting faculty appointments, and tracks visiting, consulting and Visiting Scholar appointments. S/he handles logistics and preparation of materials for special activities (e.g., faculty workshops, quarterly division chief workshops, group meetings, tutorials for faculty affairs administrators). Other duties include updating website content and improving its organization and design.

Further information is available under “Job Opportunities” on the Human Resources website (position 45005).

If you have any questions, please contact Judith Cain.
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Update: The New Qualtrics Online CECCE Survey

Those of you who have used the new Qualtrics online CECCE survey have likely noticed that the reports – while extremely efficient to generate – are quite lengthy. Beyond reducing the font size, this is not something that we can change in the template. However, in an effort to reduce page volume and departmental workload for many long forms:

In cases where the overwhelming majority of the CECCE information received is positive and complimentary (a judgment call at the department level), departments are now encouraged to consider including the comprehensive “All Responses” report in lieu of the individual respondent category reports. The “All Responses” report is easily accessed in the same way as the respondent category reports – please see the instruction manual at: https://med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/administrators/forms.html for details.

Please note that significant frequency and/or severity of negative assessment in a comprehensive “All Responses” report may prompt reviewers at the School or University level to request breakdown of this information by respondent type. In such cases, the individual respondent category reports should be easy to generate from the system as needed.

Please direct questions about this to Craig Spencer.

Documentation for Senior Faculty Annual Meetings Due in January

As announced in the April Communique, effective April 1, 2011, departments were expected to hold annual meetings with their senior faculty members, who are defined as tenured full professors and full professors in the Medical Center and Non-Tenure Lines who hold continuing term appointments. Meetings were expected to take place between April and December. (In subsequent years, the meetings should occur during each calendar year.)

Please take this opportunity to review the annual meetings guidelines and senior faculty resources that are included on the Senior Faculty Transitions pages on our website. By January 15, 2012, department chairs should forward a memorandum to Senior Associate Dean David Stevenson attesting that all annual meetings have taken place and that annual meeting documentation forms are on file in the department.

Any questions should be directed to Judith Cain.
Clinical Assistant Professor Extensions Transitioning to the New Appointment Terms

The changes announced in October included some changes to the duration of Clinical Assistant Professor appointments. Initial time as Clinical Assistant Professor, whether by appointment or promotion, was changed from three years to four. Reappointment as Clinical Assistant Professor was increased from four years to six.

For those individuals whose actions were submitted before the changes were announced and await review by the Clinician Educator A&P Committee, Jessica Mendonça is contacting departments to ask whether the recommended term length should be changed.

However, if there are Clinical Assistant Professors in your department or division for whom a review has not yet begun and for whom the current term is deemed to need lengthening, please submit the first page of an appointment form and the Clinical Assistant Professor’s FAST/FAC Person History. Please select “Extend Current Appointment” as the reason and add to it “per October 2011 term changes”. OAA will issue an approval notification and prepare an amended appointment letter.

Any questions should be directed to Jessica Mendonça.

Clinical Assistant Professor Seventh Year in Rank Counseling

The Chapter 8 revisions released in October expect that Clinical Assistant Professors and Clinical Assistant Professors (Affiliated) will receive counseling during the seventh year in rank. Guidelines and a form are available on OAA’s Clinician Educator web site at med.stanford.edu/academicaffairs/CEs/documents/CounselingForm.doc.

How do departments and divisions handle the rule that counseling is expected in a Clinical Assistant Professor’s or Clinical Assistant Professor (Affiliated)’s seventh year in rank?

An individual who is his or her first four year reappointment as a Clinical Assistant Professor or Clinical Assistant Professor (Affiliated) should receive counseling when the department/division requests that the current term be lengthened (see the preceding section of this Communiqué). A record that counseling occurred should be retained by the department.

If a Clinical Assistant Professor or Clinical Assistant Professor (Affiliated) is in his or her first four year reappointment and the department/division decides not to lengthen the current term at this time, the counseling should occur if he or she is to be reappointed again in the same rank at the next review.

The department or affiliated hospital has the discretion to review the trajectory of a Clinical Assistant Professor who was previously reappointed more than once. Counseling may be a best practice for this circumstance, but it is not required.

Any questions should be directed to Jessica Mendonça.
OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

COMMUNIQUÉ
DECEMBER 2011

Contents:

Mihaela Bozdog Joins OAA
Jessica Mendonça Promoted to Clinician Educator and Instructor Manager
On-time Performance Rate Rises to 65%
Clinician Educator Upcoming Actions
A Reminder about Faculty FRIP Recalls
External and Internal Referee Solicitation Letters Revised
Search Report Documentation on Internal Candidates
Workshop Slides and Handouts Available on the OAA Website

Mihaela Bozdog Joins OAA

We are very pleased to announce that Mihaela Bozdog has been appointed Administrative Associate in the Office of Academic Affairs. She comes to us from administrative associate positions in the Division of General Medical Disciplines in the Department of Medicine and in the Stanford Faculty Development Center.

In addition to other duties, Mihaela will be responsible for managing Visiting Scholar appointments and conducting preliminary screening of visiting faculty appointments. Effective immediately, please send such appointment materials to her. She will also be the point of contact for questions regarding appointment letters as well as content on OAA’s website. Mihaela can be reached at mihaelab@stanford.edu or at 3-5940. Please join us in welcoming her to OAA.

We want to take this opportunity to thank Andrew Kim for filling the Administrative Associate role on an interim basis. We are glad that he will remain with us for another few weeks to provide assistance on special projects.

Jessica Mendonça Promoted to Clinician Educator and Instructor Manager

We are also very pleased to let you know that Jessica Mendonca, a valued staff member in the Office of Academic Affairs since 2009, has been promoted to Clinician Educator and Instructor Manager. In this role, which she has been filling on an interim basis since September, she will manage all issues related to CEs and Instructors, including A&P matters, staffing the CE A&P Committee, CE professional development leave matters, signed offer letters, departure notifications, licensure and immigration issues and policy and procedure questions.
Please join us in congratulating Jessica on this well-deserved promotion. Also, please join us in extending a sincere thanks to Jane Volk-Brew for having taken on management of the CE line in addition to all of her other duties for a much longer period of time than originally anticipated. In addition to managing and overseeing the next phase of FASTFAC, Jane will continue her work as a member of the Provost’s Office Systems Working Group, which seeks to identify shared faculty information system needs across the University and propose and participate in developing solutions, as a member of Human Resources’ applicant tracking system replacement project and on the School of Medicine’s Business Intelligence Data Governance Group.

**On-time Performance Rate Rises to 65%**

The on-time performance rate for reappointments and promotions rose to 65% last year, the highest percentage in seven years. We are grateful for this significant turnaround, which reflects well on the School but, most importantly, on the diligence and hard work carried out in the departments, especially given workloads and competing priorities. In particular, we send our thanks and appreciation to the following departments that recorded 100% on-time rates in 2010-2011:

- Anesthesia (Virginia Tse)
- Comparative Medicine (Anne Lum, Barbara Conly)
- Dermatology (Newsha Firoozye)
- Developmental Biology (Sue Elliott)
- Genetics (Margie Mahoney)
- Health Research and Policy (Jessica Negrette)
- Neurobiology (Kelli Santini)
- Ophthalmology (Charlotte Rendon)
- Orthopaedic Surgery (Kara Sjoblom-Bay)
- Otolaryngology (April Prasad)
- Psychiatry (Heather Kenna)
- Radiology (Kendall Yi)
- Surgery (Deepa Basava)
- Urology (Marjorie Powell, Patrice McNealy)

**Clinician Educator Upcoming Actions**

This month there were very few expiring Clinician Educator actions for which reminders were needed. We would like to express our appreciation for your proactively getting candidates’ files in on time. Thanks!

**A Reminder about Faculty FRIP Recalls**

The new Faculty Retirement Incentive Program ("FRIP") provides for an emeritus recall for one or two years at 50% FTE. (The length of the recall is dependent on the faculty member's age at the time of retirement). The Provost is not supporting additional recalls except in rare and unusual circumstances. We wanted to bring this situation to your attention since this aspect of
FRIP presents a significant change from the old FRIP program where Departments could continue to recall emeritus faculty members on an annual basis for as long a period as needed.

Any questions should be directed to Ellen Waxman.

**External and Internal Referee Solicitation Letters Revised**

The Office of the General Counsel has asked schools throughout the University to use standardized language regarding confidentiality in both internal and external referee solicitation letters. As a result, referee solicitation letters in all lines have been modified to include the following sentence: “It is the policy and practice of Stanford University to treat your response as confidential in the faculty review process.”

Please begin using these revised templates immediately.

Questions should be directed to Rebecca Robinson.

**Search Report Documentation on Internal Candidates**

We would like to take this opportunity to remind you about an item that was included in the May Communiqué:

In national searches, advertisements should not be tailored to fit a specific candidate and mentors or collaborators of any known candidate (internal or external) who is likely to be a top choice in a search should recuse themselves from the search and selection process. Careful attention to these areas makes the review process smoother and more straightforward, particularly at the University level.

Another area for improvement is in bolstering the case for faculty candidates who have received their residency or fellowship training at Stanford. Going forward, we ask that you include information in the appointment file about the pool from which the candidate of choice was drawn when selected for training at the earliest stage of his or her career at Stanford. We believe that the combination of the national search narrative and information about the competitiveness of the earlier pool will add value to our appointment recommendations, especially when reviewed at the University.

Questions should be directed to Rebecca Robinson or Craig Spencer.

**Workshop Slides and Handouts Available on the OAA Website**

As announced in the October Communiqué, OAA is sponsoring a series of faculty workshops to provide information on various facets of the reappointment and promotion process.

Two workshops were held in November – one for MCL assistant professors on “Building a Regional Reputation: Preparing for Promotion to Associate Professor in the Medical Center
Line” and the other for clinical assistant professors on “Preparing for Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor in the Clinician Educator Line.” Slides and handouts from these workshops are now available on the OAA website.

A workshop on Clinician Educator policy and appointment process changes was offered in November as well for associate department chairs, division chiefs, chairs of departmental Clinician Educator A&P Committees, members of departmental CE mentoring committees and others involved in the Clinician Educator appointment, reappointment and promotion process. Slides for this workshop are available on OAA’s Clinician Educator web page.