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• Scholarship

• Pathways, Areas of Endeavor, Ranks
Two Types of Pathways: 3 Areas of Endeavor in Each
Two Pathways

Academic Achievement & Scholarship Pathway

Excellence Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise
Investigation
Educational Leadership

Assistant Professor of Medicine
Associate Professor of Neurology
Professor of Pediatrics

Clinical Innovation & Expertise
Investigation
Educational Leadership

Assistant Professor of Clinical Medicine
Associate Professor of Clinical Surgery
Professor of Clinical Psychiatry
Two Pathways

Academic Achievement & Scholarship Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise
Investigation
Educational Leadership

Assistant Professor of Physiology
Associate Professor of Biochemistry
Professor of Microbiology

Excellence Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise
Investigation
Educational Leadership

Assistant Professor of Research in Medicine
Associate Professor of Research in Pediatrics
Professor of Research in Neurology
Two Pathways

Academic Achievement & Scholarship Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise
Investigation
Educational Leadership

Excellence Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise
Investigation
Educational Leadership

Assistant Professor of Medicine
Associate Professor of Pediatrics
Professor of Microbiology

Assistant Professor of Teaching in Medicine
Associate Professor of Teaching in Pediatrics
Professor of Teaching in Neurology
Two Pathways

Academic Achievement & Scholarship Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise → Investigation → Educational Leadership

Excellence Pathway

Clinical Innovation & Expertise → Investigation → Educational Leadership

Distinguished by extent of scholarship

unmodified
modified
What is Scholarship?

Creation of new knowledge

For knowledge to become genuine scholarship, it needs to be public (shared with peers), reviewed by peers and a platform on which others can build.

*Six standards common to all manner of scholarly work:*

- Clear goals
- Adequate preparation
- Appropriate methods
- Significant results
- Effective presentation
- Reflective critique

Four Types of Scholarship

• Scholarship of **discovery**
  – Original research that advances knowledge (traditional)
    • Eg. Discovery that *H. pylori* causes peptic ulcer disease (PUD; Warren and Marshall – Nobel Prize 2005)

• Scholarship of **integration**
  – Synthesis of information across disciplines, topics within disciplines, or across time
  – Making novel connections within preexisting knowledge
    • Eg. Demonstration that analysis of various strains of *H. pylori* influences likelihood of PUD and its treatment

Boyer, EL *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* Carnegie Foundation, 1990
Four Types of Scholarship

• Scholarship of **application**
  – Interaction and connections between research and practice with results that can be shared and evaluated (engagement with community)
    • Eg. Demonstration that antibody screening for *H. pylori* can reduce prevalence PUD as well as gastric cancer

• Scholarship of **teaching**
  – Systematic study of teaching and learning
    • Eg. Finding, through analysis of educational metrics, that teaching the microbiology of PUD improves student satisfaction, board scores, and residency outcomes

Boyer, EL *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* Carnegie Foundation, 1990
Evidence of Scholarship

- Peer reviewed publications
  - Scholarship is increasing collaborative or team-based
    - An individual’s contribution to collaborative/team scholarship must be clear
    - Position of authorship in such works may not be an indication of contribution
    - Annotate *Publications* and describe your role in important works in Statement of Key Contributions in your CV

- Grants, including scale and scope
  - Some forms of scholarship are not eligible for NIH, so NIH funding cannot be universally used as a metric

*Scholarship is defined broadly – beyond grants and papers*
Evidence of Scholarship

- Peer reviewed publications
- Grants, including scale and scope
- Invitations to speak
- Practice guidelines, position papers
- Clinical innovations (technology, device, treatment)
- Quality and practice improvement
- Curricula evaluation, assessment tools, educational products that are adopted elsewhere
- Study section participation, grant-review boards
- Editorial boards, manuscript reviews
- Leadership roles on committees and in academic societies
Questions?
## Clinical Innovation & Expertise

### Clinical Expertise & Innovation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition as a clinical expert</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional/National</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing clinical practice</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional/National</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Difference between pathways in scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Scholarship</th>
<th>Expected, but not at scholar level</th>
<th>Expected, but not at scholar level</th>
<th>Expected, but not at scholar level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Scholarship</td>
<td>Expected, First author</td>
<td>Expected, First/Senior author</td>
<td>Expected, First/Senior author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition as an Investigation Expert</td>
<td>Local/National</td>
<td>Regional/National</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference between pathways in scholarship</th>
<th>Written Scholarship</th>
<th>Written Scholarship</th>
<th>Written Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected, but not at scholar level</td>
<td>Expected, but not at scholar level</td>
<td>Expected, but not at scholar level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected, Corresponding author</td>
<td>Expected, Senior author</td>
<td>Expected, Senior author</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator on funded studies</td>
<td>Record of funding, usually PI</td>
<td>Sustained record of funding as PI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Educational Leadership: Scholar Pathway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Leadership</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Full Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition as an effective teacher and educational innovator</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional/National</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing involvement and responsibility</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Regional/National</td>
<td>National/International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scholarship Expectations

| Written Scholarship                                                                 | Expected, 1st author papers, educational materials in print or other media | Expected, Senior author papers related to education, materials adopted regionally or nationally | Expected, high impact papers, among the best in the nation, educational methods, curricula, policy |
Educational Career Pathways

The medical college makes a distinction between Teacher and Educational Leader.

Although they teach, most clinical faculty do not conduct educational scholarship, and they are, therefore, better served by the excellence or scholarship pathway within Clinical Expertise and Innovation.
Is the scholarship peer reviewed, widely disseminated, and adopted outside the local environment?

For the Academic Achievement and Scholarship Pathway, ask:

- Does the faculty member devote most of their effort to scholarship?

- Are the contributions a significant advancement from pre-existing knowledge? **Breaking new ground**

- Do the contributions significantly impact preexisting knowledge or practice? **Transformative**

**Written scholarship is a key metric.**
Different levels of scholarship

Is the scholarship peer reviewed, widely disseminated, and adopted outside the local environment?

For the *Excellence in Pathways*, written scholarship is required, but the magnitude and emphasis are less that expected for *Academic Achievement and Scholarship pathway*, ask:

- Is the faculty member recognized as a Clinical Expert?
- Have they influenced practice?
- Do they contribute to research studies, teaching, mentoring?
Questions?
Steps for Creating a Promotion Profile

Step 1: Identify an Area of Endeavor
- Clinical Expertise & Innovation
- Investigation
- Educational Leadership

Step 2: Evaluate Teaching Activities

Step 3: Provide Additional Supporting Activities
- Education of Patients & Community
- Clinical Expertise
- Investigation
- Administration or Institutional Service
Given the importance of the educational mission of WCM, it is expected that, with rare exception, all faculty will engage in teaching. Faculty will be evaluated for contributions to teaching and educational activities at WCM, WCM-Q, and WCM affiliates.
### Teaching Criteria for Appointment & Promotion

Teaching may take the form of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Didactic Teaching</th>
<th>Mentorship</th>
<th>Clinical Teaching</th>
<th>Administrative Teaching Leadership Role(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellence in <strong>one</strong> teaching activity on a continuous basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellence in <strong>at least two</strong> teaching categories on a continuous basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Professor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellence in <strong>at least two</strong> teaching categories on a continuous basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose and record activities
Mentorship

- Longitudinal, collaborative learning relationship to help the mentee succeed

- Provided within many formats - one-to-one, small groups, large group workshops – covering topics related to career development

Revised WCM CV includes the following:

- List trainees and faculty that you have **formally supervised** in a research, teaching or clinical setting – those whose careers you have had a **substantial impact**.

- Include products *arising directly from the mentoring*
  - Publications
  - Awards
  - Grants
  - Development of new clinical programs or course
Steps for Creating a Promotion Profile

Step 1: Identify an Area of Endeavor
- Clinical Expertise & Innovation
- Investigation
- Educational Leadership

Step 2: Evaluate Teaching Activities

Step 3: Provide Additional Supporting Activities
- Education of Patients & Community
- Clinical Expertise
- Investigation
- Administration or Institutional Service
Many faculty make substantial contributions *outside* their area of excellence.

These significant supporting activities *supplement* accomplishments in the area of excellence, allowing the *total of an individual’s achievements* to be considered in the evaluation for promotion.
Approximate time-line*

* Intervals are approximate; appointments are not time-constrained except for individuals who are tenure-eligible.
Promotion Timeline

Timing of promotion is based on achievement of metrics

Appointments are not time-constrained except for individuals who are tenure-eligible
Turnaround Times - WCM only
2018-19 Candidates

**Turnaround Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>OFA receives request for evaluation</em></td>
<td>10.2 wk</td>
<td>9.1 wk</td>
<td>1.6 wk</td>
<td>26 wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFA gathers letters; when required number of letters received, forwards letters to dept for review</td>
<td>14.1 wk</td>
<td>8.9 wk</td>
<td>4.6 wk</td>
<td>83.1 wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFA receives recommendation to appoint/promote and prepares dossier for review by COR (Committee of Review)</td>
<td>10.9 wk</td>
<td>7.1 wk</td>
<td>&lt; 1 wk</td>
<td>75.3 wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR reviews recommendation and, if approved, it is forwarded to Faculty Councils (EFC/GFC), then Dean for approval</td>
<td>5.4wk</td>
<td>4.7wk</td>
<td>1.6 wk</td>
<td>19.9 wk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median time from date of initial *request for evaluation* to date reviewed by COR was **34 weeks**.
Questions?