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Outline of Topics

• Searches and red flags during searches
• Selection of referees, peers, and trainees
• Expediting appointment of the candidate
• Annual counseling and counseling memo
• Requirements for transmittal memo
• Investigative independence
• The new long form
Faculty Preeminence

• Our shared goal is to recruit the most outstanding teachers, clinicians and scientists to Stanford Medicine

• We want to work with the departments to continue to improve the search and appointment processes
Searches

• Goals
  – To identify and address “red flags” sooner rather than later
  – To streamline assembly of long form
  – To align the School’s processes closely with those of the rest of the University
Search Issues

- Small applicant pool size
- Ad that is not broad or is targeted to a particular individual (internal candidate)
- Insufficient outreach to increase pool size and to encourage diversity of applicants
- Search committee members not recused when known candidates with mentoring or collaborative relationships have been identified
Search Issues Cont’d

• Failure to disclose a known candidate or candidates at the time the search is initiated
• Searches that are opened and closed very quickly especially when an internal candidate is selected
• Lack of diversity in the definitive pool
• Disparate treatment of internal and external candidates during the interview process
Rolling Searches

• Only available for MCL (not UTL, NTL)

• If your department plans to hire multiple MCL faculty and can plan a broad advertisement, talk to Vice Dean about possible rolling search

• Allows the selection of several MCL candidates from one search
Selection of Referees for Associate and Full Professor Appointments

- Confidential letters from experts in the field are a major part of the evaluation process
- The overwhelming majority of the referees will be independent
- They should come from top-tier institutions with a broad geographic mix
- Their rank should be the same or higher than that of the candidate
- Candidate may recommend only 3 referees
Referees for Associate and Full Professor Appointments

• Distinction of the referees must be documented in the grid (awards, leadership positions, memberships in societies such as NAS, etc.)

• For tenured appointments, the referees must have tenure at an institution comparable to Stanford
Named Peers

• For tenure line, the peers must be leaders in the broad field and have tenure at a top-tier institution
• Distinction of the peers must be documented in the grid
• For NTL-R, the peers can be in a narrower field but must be leaders in that field
Trainees

• For assistant professor reappointments and promotion to associate professor, all current and former trainees should be asked to write
  • All trainees are given the option of a confidential conversation instead of a letter
  • For other A&P actions, the list of trainees can be selected at random from all trainees (current and former are required)
Early Solicitation of Full Referee Letter Sets

- For assistant professor candidates, letters are already solicited during the search.
- In order to compress the overall timeline for senior appointments, all referee letters should be solicited early in the process, that is, before submission of the search report or search waiver request (need approval of grid).
Faculty Appointment Start Dates

• Once the candidate of choice has been identified and as the draft offer letter, search report and referee letters are being prepared, the long form should be started

• This will shorten the time from selection of the candidate to appointment on the faculty
On Time Submission of Appointment Long Forms

• Assistant Professor Appointments
  – Final version should be submitted to OAA within two months from the date on which the search report/offer letter were approved

• Associate/Full Professor Appointments
  – Final version should be submitted to OAA within three months from the date on which the search report/offer letter were approved
New Appointments

New Appointments – Assistant Professors
- Search report/offer letter approved by OAA
- Long form assembly in department
- Final long form to OAA
- School review of final long form
- Final long form to University
- University review of final long form
- Search report/offer letter approved by OAA
- Long form assembly in department
- Final long form to OAA
- School review of final long form
- Final long form to University
- University review of final long form
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Going Forward

• Improving the Quality of Draft Long Forms
  – Our goal is to work with departments in improving the quality of draft long forms, which will reduce the sometimes lengthy revision process with OAA

• Reappointment and Promotion Timelines
  – Reappointment and promotion long forms are due six months from launch date
Promotions and Reappointments

Promotions (and reappointments to tenure/continuing term)

- Fast/Fac launch
- Long form assembly in department
- School review
- Final long form to OAA
- Final long form to University

In Months

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Reappointments (to term)

- Fast/Fac launch
- Long form assembly in department
- School review
- Final long form to OAA

In Months
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Counseling Memo

• Required for all reappointments except for those conferring tenure (but may be helpful)
• Required for all promotions except for those conferring tenure
• Address the candidate’s performance
• Make recommendations for improvement
• Include the full text of criteria for future advancement
Transmittal Memo

• Required for all Ad Board files (UTL and NTL actions) and for MCL continuing term
• Also required if there are issues to address in the file (negative referee comments, low clinical or teaching scores, concerns about scholarly productivity, etc.)
• Should address these and provide a plan
Investigative Independence

- Absolutely required for successful promotion in UTL and NTL; in addition, may have a mix of collaborative publications
- Team science is important but need to demonstrate ability to lead an investigative team and have impact in a broad field
Investigative Independence for MCL

• Investigative independence is expected when the highest proportion of time is devoted to scholarship

• For regional and national recognition, MCL must be able to demonstrate (and referees must state) their impact on the field
Questions?

• Questions on best practices?
New Long Form

• The University has designed a new (shorter) long form
• We anticipate use of the new long form in January
• FastFac will not be used with it, and the University will develop an on-line system eventually
Highlights of New Long Form

• One narrative section (maximum of 5 pages) for both description and evaluation of
  – 1. scholarship
  – 2. teaching role
  – 3. clinical role (if any)
  – 4. leadership role (if any)
Summary of teaching evaluations with full materials in an appendix
Differences c/w Current Long Form

• Current long form has a candidate’s role section which is descriptive for scholarship, teaching and clinical care.
• There is a separate section for evaluation of scholarship, teaching and clinical care.
• In the current long form, there is often repetitive information in these sections and in the transmittal memo.
New Long Form: Scholarship

• Describe scholarship: describe one published work and its significance and impact
• Evaluate the candidate’s scholarship: consider the comments and peer rankings by the referees and trainees, the candidate’s trajectory, any issues needing to be addressed (negative comment by a referee, etc.)
• One paragraph for each unless issues to address
New Long Form: Teaching

• Describe the teaching role: classroom teaching, mentoring, and/or pedagogical innovations

• Evaluate the candidate’s teaching: from trainee assessments and teaching evaluations
New Long Form: Clinical Care

• Describe the clinical responsibilities: in-patient, clinic days, time in OR, etc.

• Evaluate the candidate’s clinical care: from clinical evaluations and comments on clinical performance by referees and trainees
• Please make every effort to be as succinct as possible while conveying the information and evidence necessary for reviewers to make an informed evaluation

• No need to quote from referee letters; all file reviewers will read the letters

• To counter a negative referee comment, general statements and concepts from more positive referees may be referenced
Improve the A&P Process

• Open communication between OAA and departments and institutes
• Involve OAA early before major issues arise
• Provide feedback on how we can help and how the overall A&P process can be improved