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Principles of Good Practice:
Supporting Early-Career Faculty

**Improving Tenure Processes**
1. Good practice communicates expectations for performance
2. Good practice gives feedback on progress
3. Good practice enhances collegial review processes
4. Good practice creates flexible timelines for tenure

**Encouraging Collegial Relations**
5. Good practice encourages mentoring by senior faculty
6. Good practice extends mentoring and feedback to graduate students aspiring to be faculty members
7. Good practice recognizes the department chair as a career sponsor

**Easing Stresses of Time and Balance**
8. Good practice supports teaching, particularly at the undergraduate level
9. Good practice supports scholarly development
10. Good practice fosters a balance between professional and personal life
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Principles of Excellence in Work and Family

These “Principles” developed by the Boston University Work & Family Roundtable can guide organizations through a self-assessment process:

1. The employer recognizes the strategic value of addressing work and personal life issues.
   - Business is practiced with sensitivity to the employee’s personal life needs.
   - Work/personal life solutions are aligned with business goals.
   - The employer’s commitment to addressing work/personal life issues is viewed as a long-term investment.
   - Work/personal life strategies are flexible to meet changing organizational and employee needs.

2. The work environment supports individual work and personal life effectiveness.
   - The employer’s informal culture supports a healthy work/personal life balance.
   - The employer provides meaningful work/personal life programs and policies.
   - The employer is committed to ongoing education of key stakeholders – employees, management, and the community.
   - The employer strives for continuous improvement through ongoing evaluation and assessment.

3. The management of work and personal life effectiveness is a shared responsibility between employer and employee.
   - Managers and employees are empowered to develop solutions that address both business and personal objectives.
   - Managers and employees are held accountable for their behavior in support of these objectives.

4. The employer develops relationships to enhance external work and personal life resources.
   - Partnerships are formed to maximize value of employer and community resources available to employees and community members.
   - The employer serves as an active role model.
   - The employer is open to working with the public sector to strengthen policy that benefits both employers and individuals.
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Statement of Principles on Family Responsibilities and Academic Work

The statement that follows was approved in May 2001 by the Association’s Committee on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession and its Subcommittee on Academic Work and Family. In June 2001 the Association’s Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure endorsed the substance of this statement. The committee noted that the statement is a departure from the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, but one that provides an important relief for probationary faculty in their child-rearing years. In November 2001 the AAUP Council adopted this statement as Association Policy.

In 1974 the Association issued a statement, Leaves of Absence for Child-Bearing, Child-Rearing, and Family Emergencies, which presciently called for

[a]n institution’s policies on faculty appointments [to be] sufficiently flexible to permit faculty members to combine family and career responsibilities in the manner best suited to them as professionals and parents. This flexibility requires the availability of such alternatives as longer-term leaves of absence, temporary reductions in workload with no loss of professional status, and retention of full-time affiliation throughout the child-bearing and child-rearing years.

Since 1974 there have been significant demographic and legal changes affecting the academic profession. Notably, the percentage of women faculty has increased: in 1975 women made up 22.5 percent of full-time faculty, while in 2000–01, women constituted 36 percent of full-time faculty, according to the AAUP’s Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, known as the "salary survey," which is published in the March–April issue of the Association’s journal, Academe. Many of the policies promoted in the AAUP’s 1974 statement are now federal law, such as the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, which prohibits discrimination based on pregnancy, and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, which provides for up to twelve weeks of unpaid leave a year for employees (women and men) to care for a newborn or a newly adopted child; to care for a parent, spouse, or child with a serious health condition; or to deal with the employee’s own serious health condition. Accordingly, the Committee on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession revisited the 1974 statement to address some of the current issues facing faculty members as they seek to integrate their family obligations and their work responsibilities in today’s academic community.

Although increasing numbers of women have entered academia, their academic status has been slow to improve. Women remain disproportionately represented within instructor, lecturer, and unranked positions: more than 57 percent of those holding such positions are women, according to the AAUP’s annual salary survey. In contrast, among full professors, only 26 percent are women, and 74 percent are men. Women remain significantly underrepresented at research institutions; this is in stark contrast to their significant representation at community colleges. The proportion of full-time women faculty at two-year institutions increased from 38 percent in 1987 to approximately 50 percent in 1998.¹ At the same time, among full professors at doctoral institutions, the proportion of faculty members who are women is only 19 percent. A salary advantage held by male faculty members over female faculty members exists at all ranks and institutional types. The salary gap is largest at the rank of full professor where, for all institutional types combined, women are paid, on average, only 88 percent of what their male colleagues are paid.² Most important, the percentage of women who hold tenured positions remains low. The 2000–01 AAUP salary survey reported that among full-time faculty women, only 48 percent are tenured, whereas 68 percent of full-time men are tenured.
The conflict between work and family obligations that many faculty members experience is more acute for women faculty than for men. Giving birth and raising children are distinctive events. Only women give birth, and it is an event that interrupts the career of a higher percentage of professors than any other "physical disability" or family obligation. Eighty-seven percent of women become parents during their working lives. Pregnancy, childbirth, and child rearing are also age-related, and most commonly occur during the same years that college faculty are seeking tenure in their jobs. In 1995 the average Ph.D. recipient was thirty-four years old. Although many men take substantial responsibility for the care of children, the reality is that women still assume more responsibility for child rearing than do men:

Raising a child takes 20 years, not one semester. American women, who still do the vast majority of child care, will not achieve equality in academia so long as the ideal academic is defined as someone who takes no time off for child-rearing. With teaching, research, committee assignments, and other responsibilities, pre-tenure academics commonly work many hours of overtime. Defining job requirements in this way tends to eliminate virtually all mothers, so it is not surprising the percentage of tenured women in U.S. colleges and universities has climbed so slowly.

Thus, the development and implementation of institutional policies that enable the healthy integration of work responsibilities with family life in academe require renewed attention.

The Association suggests that the following principles and guidelines be used to construct appropriate policies and practices regarding family leaves, modified teaching schedules, "stopping the tenure clock," and institutional assistance for family responsibilities. The policies fall into two categories: (1) general policies addressing family responsibilities, including family-care leaves and institutional support for child and elder care; and (2) more specific policies, such as stopping the tenure clock, that specifically relate to pretenure faculty members who are primary or coequal caregivers for newborn or newly adopted children, responding to the special and age-related difficulty of becoming a parent during the pretenure years.

Transforming the academic workplace into one that supports family life requires substantial changes in policy and, more significantly, changes in academic culture. These changes require a thorough commitment from the leaders of educational institutions as well as from the faculty. No template of policies fits every institution, but it is essential that the priorities, workloads, rewards structure, and values of the academy permit and support an integration of family and work. Without such support, the commitment to gender equity, for both women and men, will be seriously compromised.

Because of the unique characteristics of academic life, particularly the flexibility of schedules, tremendous potential exists for achieving a healthy work-family integration. At the same time, academic culture poses a special challenge. The lack of a clear boundary in academic lives between work and family has, at least historically, meant that work has been all pervasive, often to the detriment of family. As Lotte Bailyn of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology accurately observed:

The academic career . . . is paradoxical. Despite its advantages of independence and flexibility, it is psychologically difficult. The lack of ability to limit work, the tendency to compare oneself primarily to the exceptional giants in one’s field, and the high incidence of overload make it particularly difficult for academics to find a satisfactory integration of work with private life. . . . It is the unbounded nature of the academic career that is the heart of the problem. Time is critical for professors, because there is not enough of it to do all the things their job requires: teaching, research, and
institutional and professional service. It is therefore impossible for faculty to protect other aspects of their lives.²

As educational institutions seek to support faculty members in integrating work responsibilities and family life, they should recognize that families are varied and that they change in structure and needs over time. Therefore, institutions should adopt policies that contemplate, for example, the existence of blended families created by divorce and remarriage, and policies that include domestic partners, adopted and foster children, and other household members who live in a family group. Administrators and faculty members should be alert to the many forms that discrimination may take against those with a variety of family responsibilities throughout their careers.

Family-Care and Disability Leaves

Federal and state laws provide for a variety of paid and unpaid leaves for family responsibilities. These legal requirements establish minimum benefits only. The Association encourages institutions to offer significantly greater support for faculty members and other academic professionals with family responsibilities.

**Pregnancy disability leave**

Under the federal Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, which is part of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, universities as employers must provide the same disability benefits for pregnancy and childbirth as they provide for any other physical disability. If professors are entitled to paid disability leaves under institutional benefit programs, then women professors are entitled to paid pregnancy leaves. Physicians routinely certify six to eight weeks as the physical disability period for a normal pregnancy and birth. Some states, local governments, and, where applicable, collective bargaining agreements, go beyond federal law and require pregnancy disability leaves regardless of the availability of other disability leaves. The AAUP recommends that all educational institutions offer paid disability leaves for pregnancy.

**Family care leave**

The federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) requires employers with fifty or more employees to provide unpaid leave to both women and men for care of newborn or newly adopted infants, or for the care of children, spouses, or parents with serious health conditions. Employees can take up to twelve weeks of FMLA leave within a twelve-month period.

Although the FMLA is an important first step, it is inadequate, because it does not require that such family-care leave be paid, and it fails to provide for leave to care for same-sex or other domestic partners, and other ill family members who are not spouses or parents. In addition, the twelve-week annual time limit may, in certain circumstances, be inadequate. (Some states, local governments, and collective bargaining agreements provide more generous family leave.) The Association encourages both public and private educational institutions to go beyond the minimum coverage prescribed by the FMLA and provide also some form of paid family-care leave. (There are a number of ways institutions may finance the cost of family leave. For example, some institutions provide faculty members with the option of using their paid annual or sick leave concurrently with their unpaid leave.)

**Emergency care and other short-term leave**

Family emergencies can be disruptive professionally as well as personally. Nevertheless, they can be accommodated based on familiar models of sick leave. Options include extending sick leave to include
leave to care for an ill family member in cases of short-term illnesses not covered by the federal FMLA or other laws. Other alternatives include allowing use of short-term emergency leaves for contingencies connected to unusually adverse weather conditions or other emergency situations, such as the unavailability of usual child- or elder-care services.

**Longer-term leave for child rearing or other family responsibilities**

Institutions frequently grant extended unpaid leaves of absence to faculty members for a variety of purposes.⁸ Rearing children should be recognized as one appropriate ground for a leave of absence, and such leaves should be available to both men and women on the same terms and conditions as other unpaid leaves of absence. Other family responsibilities, such as caring for an ailing family member, should also be considered a legitimate reason for allowing unpaid leaves of absence.

The timing and duration of such leaves should be determined by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the administration. Faculty members on family leaves should receive consideration with respect to salary increments, insurance coverage, retirement annuities, and the like, comparable to the benefits available to faculty members on other types of unpaid leaves, such as those for public or private service outside the institution. Individual and administrative obligations connected with such leaves, including the timing of a tenure decision, should be those set forth in the applicable provisions of the AAUP’s *Statement of Principles on Leaves of Absence* (1972).

In accommodating the family needs of faculty members, whether through paid or unpaid leaves of absence of short or long duration, institutions should be careful in assigning the duties of the faculty member on leave. To avoid creating resentment among faculty members toward the professor on leave, disproportionate burdens should not be placed on other faculty members.

**Active Service with Modified Duties**

Many institutions of higher education have responded to the need for faculty to take care of newborn or newly adopted children by creating modified duty policies to allow faculty to obtain relief from some teaching or service obligations while remaining in active-service status. Active-service status allows faculty members to continue research or other obligations and receive full pay. For example, the University of California system’s "active service-modified duties" policy allows faculty partial or full relief from teaching for one quarter (or semester) if the faculty member has "substantial responsibility" for care of a newborn or newly adopted child under the age of five. This period of modified duties is not considered a leave, and the faculty member receives full pay.⁹ Other universities allow faculty to reduce semester- or year-long teaching loads for child-care purposes with proportional reductions in pay.¹⁰

In 1974 the AAUP recommended in *Leaves of Absence for Child-Bearing, Child-Rearing, and Family Emergencies* that "[t]he alternative of temporarily reduced workload should be available to faculty members with child-rearing responsibilities." Subsequently, in 1987 the AAUP recognized in *Senior Appointments with Reduced Loads* the importance of "policies and practices that open senior academic appointments to persons with reduced loads and salaries without loss of status." The statement acknowledged that such "[m]odified appointments would help meet the special needs of individual faculty members, especially those with child-rearing and other personal responsibilities." The AAUP now recommends that the possibility of appointments with reduced loads be extended to all full-time faculty members, irrespective of their tenure status. The AAUP encourages institutions to explore the possibility of adopting policies providing for short-term periods of modified duties at full pay for family responsibilities.
The Tenure Clock

The resolution of pretenure family-work conflicts is critical to ensuring that academic opportunities are truly equitable. Such conflicts often occur just when the research and publication demands of the tenure process are most onerous, and when many faculty members have responsibilities for infants and young children. Institutions should adopt policies that do not create conflicts between having children and establishing an optimal research record on the basis of which the tenure decision is to be made.

Tenure remains a fundamental requirement for protecting academic freedom. The administration and the faculty of an institution must determine the specific academic standards governing the tenure decision at their institution. Academic standards, however, can and, in this instance, should be distinguished from the amount of time in which an institution’s academic standards can be met. Specifically, institutions should allow flexibility in the time period for achieving tenure to enable faculty members to care for newborn or newly adopted children.

A probationary period of seven or fewer years allows faculty members to establish their record for tenure. Historically, this probationary period was based on the assumption that the scholar was male and that his work would not be interrupted by domestic responsibilities, such as raising children. When the tenure system was created, the male model was presumed to be universal. It was assumed that untenured faculty—whether men or women—were not the sole, primary, or even coequal caretakers of newborn or newly adopted children. An inflexible time factor should not be used to preclude women or men who choose to care for children from pursuing tenure within a reasonable period of years. One study found that 80 percent of "leadership campuses" enable faculty members to exclude a certain amount of probationary time for specific reasons, such as the birth or adoption of a child.

The 1974 AAUP statement Leaves of Absence for Child-Bearing, Child-Rearing, and Family Emergencies provided for "stopping the tenure clock" for purposes of child bearing or rearing when a professor takes a full or partial leave of absence, paid or unpaid. The AAUP now recommends that, upon request, a faculty member be entitled to stop the clock or extend the probationary period, with or without taking a full or partial leave of absence, if the faculty member (whether male or female) is a primary or coequal caregiver of newborn or newly adopted children. Thus, faculty members would be entitled to stop the tenure clock while continuing to perform faculty duties at full salary. The AAUP recommends that institutions allow the tenure clock to be stopped for up to one year for each child, and further recommends that faculty be allowed to stop the clock only twice, resulting in no more than two one-year extensions of the probationary period. These extensions would be available whether or not the faculty member was on leave.

In extending the probationary period in recognition of the time required for faculty members to care for newborn or newly adopted children, institutional policies should clearly provide that the tenure candidate be reviewed under the same academic standards as a candidate who has not extended the probationary period. Institutions should guard against imposing greater demands on a faculty tenure candidate as a consequence of his or her having extended the absolute time from the year of appointment to the year of tenure review. To ensure that any modification of the probationary time limits does not create or perpetuate historic gender discrimination, administrations should monitor tenure decisions to ensure that different standards are not imposed in practice through the application of policies that appear neutral. Institutions should also take care to see that faculty members are not penalized in any way for requesting and receiving extensions of the probationary period.

When a faculty member requests and receives an extension of the probationary period, the appropriate university official should clearly inform the faculty member, in writing, that existing academic
standards will govern the future tenure decision. Administrators and faculty members are encouraged to disseminate the stop-the-tenure-clock policy widely, and to monitor the policy’s use by both women and men.

The stopping of the tenure clock should be in the form of a clear entitlement under institutional policies, rather than in the form of an individually negotiated agreement or informal practice. Written employment policies designed to support the raising of children should not create a separate "track" that may stigmatize faculty members. Studies of junior tenure-track faculty indicate that the pressures result not only from time demands created by conflicting responsibilities, but also from uncertain or conflicting expectations on the part of senior faculty concerning the standards for tenure. On some campuses, an implicit model of total dedication still exists, requiring faculty members to demonstrate that work is one’s primary, even sole, commitment. Such expectations must be clarified and modified to recognize the realities of the lives of faculty members who wish to raise children while pursuing an academic career.19

Additional Institutional Support

Child care

Although many institutions recognize the need for child care, fewer offer or subsidize it.20 The AAUP recommends an institutional commitment to the provision of quality child care for the children of faculty and other academic professionals. As with other benefits, recommendations on the extent and form of such institutional support (whether through subsidized on-campus care or through a benefit plan) should be sought from an appropriate body of the faculty in consultation with other groups on campus, such as staff and students.

Child care is an issue for both men and women. The AAUP believes that for faculty members with child-rearing responsibilities to participate successfully in teaching, research, and service to their institution, they must have access to quality child-care facilities. Furthermore, the availability of child care is a crucial issue in recruiting and retaining faculty. Employers in and out of academe have found that the provision of on-site facilities has led to stronger and more contented families and increased productivity.21 Some of the benefits that accrue for faculty parents from child-care arrangements on campus include the ability to be reached easily in an emergency, the time and money saved in transportation, and the opportunity to share an occasional lunch or other daytime activity with their children. Faculty members derive peace of mind from knowing that their children are receiving quality care and that the facility has long-term stability. If the institution has an early childhood education program, the opportunity to use the facility for training students provides an additional benefit and contributes to high standards of child care.

Universities and colleges should assume a share of the responsibility for the provision of child-care services. Some institutions, because of their size or other considerations, may choose not to support on-site child care. Such institutions should explore alternatives, such as cooperative arrangements with other nearby employers, resource and referral services, and financial assistance.

Elder and other family care

Increasingly, faculty members are called upon to care for elderly parents and other family members. This tends to be more characteristic of mid-career or senior faculty than of junior faculty.22 Some faculty members may also be "sandwiched" between responsibilities for children and parents at the same time.
Just as the Association recommends an institutional commitment to providing quality child care, it also strongly recommends an institutional commitment to supporting faculty members in providing quality care to elderly parents or to other family members. Colleges and universities should consider affording financial support to faculty members to cover expenses necessary to allow family members to attend existing centers and programs that provide for elder care or the care of family members with special needs. Institutions should consider providing benefit plans that afford faculty members various options in meeting their family responsibilities.

**Flexible work policies and schedules**

In addition to formal leave policies, faculty members and academic professionals should have flexibility in scheduling to enable them to respond to family needs as they arise. Flexible work policies allow faculty members to participate in a child’s scheduled school activities or to handle the conflicts between school and academic calendars. Colleges and universities should, to the extent possible, coordinate academic-year calendars with other local educational institutions, or provide child-care support when conflicts occur.\(^{23}\)

Both child and other family-care needs of faculty members should be included among the many legitimate considerations in scheduling classes, meetings, and other faculty obligations.\(^{24}\) Likewise, institutional financial support for the expenses of providing substitute care should be considered when faculty members attend professional conferences.

**Conclusion**

Because institutional policies may be easier to change than institutional cultures, colleges and universities should monitor the actual use of their policies over time to guarantee that every faculty member—regardless of gender—has a genuine opportunity to benefit from policies encouraging the integration of work and family responsibilities. The goal of every institution should be to create an academic community in which all members are treated equitably, families are supported, and family-care concerns are regarded as legitimate and important.

A more responsive climate for integrating work and family responsibilities is essential for women professors to participate on an equal basis with their male colleagues in higher education. Recognizing the need for broader and more inclusive policies represents a historic moment of change. The Association encourages both women and men to take advantage of legal and institutional change so that all faculty members may participate more fully in the care of their children, and may provide the necessary care for parents and other family members.

**Endnotes:**


5. Ibid.

6. Cornell University provides an example of such an institutional commitment: "Cornell University is committed to policies, practices, and programs supportive of the members of its diverse community as they traverse the interlocking worlds of work and family. The University encourages, at all levels, an environment which is supportive of and sensitive to the needs and mutual dependence of the workplace and working families." See <www.ohr.cornell.edu/_ohr/life/life57d_workfampolicy.html>.


8. This section incorporates portions of the text of the AAUP’s 1974 *Leaves of Absence for Child-Bearing, Child-Rearing, and Family Emergencies*.

9. Similarly, the School of Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology provides that the school "will normally offer a one-semester release from teaching and administrative activities at full pay to faculty members who act as the primary caretaker at home for a new child." The University of Michigan also provides for "modified duties for childbearing," which enable a faculty member to recover fully from the effects of pregnancy and childbirth by allowing a pregnant faculty member, on request to her dean, [to] be granted a period of modified duties without a reduction in salary. At a minimum, modified duties means relief from direct teaching responsibilities for the academic term that includes the actual sick leave time the faculty member expects to take in connection with the birth. This policy is available to non-tenured as well as tenured faculty, but is available only in conjunction with pregnancy or childbirth. The tenure clock is not stopped during the period of modified duties unless the faculty member also has an appointment of less than 80 percent during the time she is on modified duties.

10. For example, the Wayne State University AAUP-AFT collective bargaining agreement (1999b–2002) provides for modified duty assignments at full or partial pay, depending on whether a full or reduced teaching load is arranged.

11. The AAUP statement *On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period* (1978) recognizes that "in specific cases the interests of all parties may best be served through agreement at the time of initial appointment to allow for more than four years of probationary service at the current institution (but not exceeding seven years), whatever the prior service elsewhere." Just as adjustments may be made to the probationary clock regarding prior service, so, too, should institutional policies allow for adjustment of the probationary period for the "specific cases" of faculty members who are primary or coequal caregivers to newborn or newly adopted children.

12. As Susan Kolker Finkel and Steven G. Olswang have noted, the traditional tenure system was based on a model designed for men who were professors with wives at home caring for children. See Finkel and Olswang, "Child Rearing as a Career Impediment to Women Assistant Professors," *Review of Higher Education* 19 (1996): 130. Accordingly, few of the early women professors married or had children. See Jessie Bernard, *Academic Women* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964). In 1973 the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education wrote:

Probably the most serious handicap facing married women desirous of a teaching career in higher education, especially in research-oriented universities, is that in the very age range in which men are
beginning to achieve a reputation through research and publication, 25 to 35, married women are likely to be bearing and rearing their children.


13. Nor did the traditional tenure system take into account the increased likelihood of medical problems associated with delayed childbirth or the age-related obstacles to adoption. See Amy Varner, "The Consequences and Costs of Delaying Attempted Childbirth for Women Faculty" (2000) and Joan Yang, "Adoption Issues for Faculty" (2000), <http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/faculty&families.htm>.

In 1995 the median age for the completion of a Ph.D. was thirty-four, which places the age of tenure at around forty and thus, "[a]sking women to delay having children until such a late age seems unfair and unkind, and involves health and infertility risks." Drago and Williams, "A Half-Time Tenure-Track Proposal."

A recent University of Michigan report found that the university’s "women assistant professors were more likely than men either to have children prior to beginning their academic careers or to delay child bearing and rearing until after they receive tenure or until they are well established in their careers." University of Michigan Faculty Work-Life Study Report (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Regents of the University of Michigan, 1999), 18.

In a survey of 124 women assistant professors in 1996, 43 percent viewed time required by children as a serious impediment to tenure; among those with children under age six, the figure rose to 82 percent. Finkel and Olswang, "Child Rearing as a Career Impediment to Women Assistant Professors," 133.

14. "Leadership campuses" are defined as the ninety-four campuses that were in the top 25 percent of respondents to a survey on "family-friendly" policies conducted by the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA). The report found that "these policies were put into effect in order to recognize that circumstances beyond the faculty member’s control may hinder the performance of responsibilities such as teaching, research, and service to the school or community." Dana E. Friedman et al., The College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs (Washington, D.C.: CUPA Foundation, 1996), 120.

15. A growing number of institutions of higher learning already provide policies that extend the pretenure clock without requiring the faculty member to be on leave. For example, the University of Michigan faculty handbook provides for automatically stopping the tenure clock upon faculty request for up to one year for child rearing: "The one-year exclusion for pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions is automatic on request, but requests must be made prior to the initiation of the tenure review." Similarly, the University of California policy provides that "the Chancellor may grant to a faculty member who has substantial responsibility for the care of a newborn child or newly adopted child under the age of five up to one year off the tenure clock for each birth or adoption, provided that all time off the tenure clock totals no more than two years. . . . [T]he campus will accept no requests to stop the tenure clock after the tenure review has begun."

16. One survey found that of those higher education institutions that offer "stop-the-tenure-clock" policies, "nine out of ten allow the exclusion of up to two semesters." See Friedman et al., The College and University Reference Guide to Work-Family Programs. The University System of Georgia recently amended its board of regents policies on tenure to "enhance the family-friendly work environment." In so doing, it adopted a stop-the-tenure-clock policy that provides that "the total time granted for suspension of the tenure clock . . . shall not ordinarily exceed two years."
17. Institutions should inform external reviews that the candidate's probationary period has been extended under institutional policy and that the candidate's record should be reviewed as if he or she had only the normal probationary period.

18. The 1997–2000 Master Agreement between Northern Michigan University and the university’s AAUP chapter provides that "the taking of [family] leave shall not otherwise prejudice future tenure or promotion consideration." Similarly, Pennsylvania State University’s policy provides that a "staying of the provisional tenure period should not penalize or adversely affect the faculty member in the tenure review." In addition, the University of Wisconsin policy provides that if "the faculty member has been in probationary status for more than seven years, the faculty member shall be evaluated as if he or she had been in probationary status for seven years, not longer."

19. Similar requests should be considered during the pre-tenure period. So, for example, requests by tenure-track candidates to extend the time period for a third-year review, because of the birth or adoption of a newborn child for whom he or she is the primary or coequal caregiver, should be considered and, if granted, clearly documented so that the candidate is reviewed under the proper standard.

20. This section incorporates the substance and most of the text of AAUP’s 1989 statement Faculty Child Care.

21. In 2001 there were approximately 2,500 campus-based child care centers in the United States, according to the National Coalition for Campus Children’s Centers.

22. Elder-care responsibilities appear to fall most heavily on tenured professors, especially tenured women faculty. Thirty-seven percent of employees who assume elder-care responsibilities are fifty or older. See James T. Bond, Ellen Galinksy, and Jennifer E. Swanberg, 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce (New York: Families and Work Institute, 1997).

According to the National Academy on Aging, 72.5 percent of all informal caregivers are women. See Amy Varner and Robert Drago, "The Changing Face of Care: The Elderly" (2000), <http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/faculty&families.htm>. Accordingly, career advancement may be jeopardized by such caregiving responsibilities, including the continued advancement of women faculty. See M. M. Robinson, B. L. Yegidis, and J. Fun, Faculty in the Middle: The Effects of Family Caregiving in Universities, Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Working Paper 296 (Wellesley, Mass., 1999).

23. The University Park campus of Pennsylvania State University and the town of State College, for example, coordinate their spring breaks to enable faculty parents to care for their children during the break. See Final Report to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Pennsylvania State University, Work-Family Working Paper 01-01 9 (State College, Pa., 2001).

24. A 1996 study found that two-thirds of women and close to one-third of men experienced family difficulties when faculty meetings were scheduled after 5 P.M. on weekdays or during the weekend. See Linda P. Fried et al., "Career Development for Women in Academic Medicine," Journal of the American Medical Association 898 (1996).
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Guidelines for Good Practice
Part-Time and Non- Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-tenure-track faculty account for more than half of all faculty appointments in American higher education. The non-tenure-track consists of two major groups, those who teach part-time and those who teach full-time but are not on tenure-track lines. Part-time faculty have increased from 38 percent of faculty appointments in 1988 to more than 40 percent. Non-tenure-track, full-time faculty hold more than 20 percent of all faculty positions.

The AAUP believes that both the exploitation and the excessive use of part-time and non-tenure-track faculty undermine academic freedom, academic quality and professional standards.

- Institutions exploit faculty members when they appoint numerous part-time faculty in a single department or renew temporary faculty year after year without offering them raises in pay, access to benefits, opportunities for promotion, or eligibility for tenure and the procedural protections essential to academic freedom.

- Institutions that rely heavily on non-tenure-track faculty members to teach undergraduate students diminish academic freedom, respect for teaching, and public confidence in higher education.

There are legitimate uses of part-time appointments, e.g., to meet unexpected increases in enrollment or faculty vacancies, to provide service in a specialized field, or to develop a new academic program. However, the extensive use of part-time positions or extended temporary appointments has become habitual in too many institutions.

Basic instructional responsibilities should never depend on faculty who are denied professional consideration or who are exempted from the evaluations that are essential for maintaining academic standards.

Guidelines for Improvement

Improving the professional status of the growing number of non-tenure-track faculty members is difficult in financially hard times and unpopular with most administrations and many faculty members. Still, the AAUP believes that the long-range health of higher education requires that:

- institutions greatly reduce their reliance upon non-tenure-track faculty members, and

- faculty members who are appointed to part-time positions should be extended the benefits and privileges of the academic profession.

In order to address the growing use of non-tenure-track faculty, the AAUP calls on institutions to work toward achieving the following goals:

1. Institutions should limit reliance on non-tenure-track faculty. We recommend as guidelines that institutions limit the use of special appointments and part-time non-tenure-track faculty to no more than 15 percent of the total instruction within the institution, and no more than 25 percent of the total instruction within any given department.
2. In circumstances in which an institution has legitimate needs for a specialized class of faculty in part-time or fractional-time positions, the institution should have policies that provide for their long-term contract stability and for tenure.

The consolidation of non-tenure-track faculty, full- and part-time, into full-time tenure-track positions requires a long-term commitment of institutional dollars, but failure to make such a commitment will perpetuate the steady erosion of the quality of education in our colleges and universities.

Professional Standards

The AAUP seeks to ensure academic freedom and professional protection for all faculty, whether full- or part-time, tenured or nontenured. To that end we recommend that:

1. All appointments, including part-time appointments, should have a description of the specific professional duties required. Complex institutions may require multiple models of faculty appointments consistent with the diverse contributions appropriate to the institution’s needs.

2. The performance of faculty members on renewable term appointments, full- time and part-time, should be regularly evaluated with established criteria appropriate to their positions.

Failure to evaluate professional appointments diminishes the institution and the professional standing of the faculty.

- Evaluation of performance provides essential information for sound and fair institutional decisions regarding compensation, promotion, and tenure. Each institution should define the credentials and the quality of scholarship it requires of faculty members in different academic positions and then should make appointments and decisions regarding compensation and advancement based on the criteria specific to the position.

- Institutions faced with emergency appointments sometimes employ faculty members whose qualifications fall short of those normally required for tenure-track appointments. In general, institutions should avoid appointing, and should certainly not reappoint, faculty members whose qualifications or performance are so far below the prevailing institutional standard as to make tenure eligibility an impossibility.

Any lesser standard shortchanges the students and erodes support for academic standards in the institution and the wider community.

3. Decisions on compensation, promotion, and tenure should be based on the specified duties of the position.

Faculty members appointed to teach entry-level courses

- should have the opportunity to enhance their professional status and rewards based on performance of their defined responsibilities, and

- should not be held to expectations which may prevail for other positions.
4. Compensation for part-time employment should be the corresponding fraction for a full-time position having qualitatively similar responsibilities and qualifications. Compensation should include such essential fringe benefits as health insurance, life insurance, and retirement contributions.

5. Timely notice of nonreappointment should be extended to all faculty regardless of length of service. 1

_The AAUP’s 1980 report on part-time faculty recommends that part-time faculty who have been employed for six or more terms, or consecutively for three or more terms, should receive at least a full term’s notice of nonreappointment._

- Although it may be impossible to give a full term of notice to faculty members employed for less than three terms, we recommend that every effort be made to notify faculty at the earliest possible opportunity, but in no case later than four weeks prior to the commencement of the next term.

- Similarly, all faculty members should have reasonable advance notice of course assignments to allow adequate preparation.

6. Institutions should provide the conditions necessary to perform the assigned duties in a professional manner, including such things as appropriate office space, necessary supplies, support services, and equipment.

7. Non-tenure-track faculty should be included in the departmental and institutional structures of faculty governance.

8. Part-time faculty should be given fair consideration when part-time positions are converted into full-time positions. The evidence suggests that part-time employment often works as a disadvantage on the job market when applicants are considered for full-time tenure-track positions. Departments should be as scrupulous to avoid this type of discrimination as they are required to be in avoiding other forms of discrimination.

As the number of non-tenure-track appointments grows, the base of the tenure system erodes.

- The treatment of non-tenure-track faculty appointments is the barometer whereby the general status of the profession may be measured. While the colleague whose performance is undervalued or whose potential is blighted by underemployment bears the brunt of the situation, the status of all faculty is undermined by the degree of exploitation the profession allows of its members.

- Institutions that rely heavily on part-time faculty marginalize the faculty as a whole. Failure to extend to all faculty reasonable professional commitments compromises quality and risks the stability of the profession and the integrity of our standing with the public.

Endnote
1. Under the [1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure](https://www.aaup.org/statements/1940StatementOfPrinciplesOnAcademicFreedomAndTenure) and derivative
Association-supported standards, the services of a full-time faculty member who has taught at the institution for more than seven years should not be terminated without the individual's having been afforded the safeguards of academic due process that accrue with tenure. In such a case, timely notice is one among many procedural safeguards that should be provided.
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Introduction

This report provides guidance on conducting tenure evaluations that are thoughtful and just. Flawed tenure processes can exact a heavy toll on the unsuccessful candidate, his or her colleagues, and the institution. Our hope is that the good practices offered here may lessen the frequency and impact of disputes over tenure. We seek not to debate the merits of tenure in American higher education, but rather we seek to examine the tenure process and offer some suggestions to those responsible for conducting it.

Each year, thousands of nontenured faculty members undergo evaluations of their work, and each year a smaller but still significant number are evaluated for tenure.1 A recent study quantified some faculty concerns about the process. Of 378 faculty members surveyed at 19 four-year institutions, 37 percent said that standards for tenure and promotion were unclear. This sentiment existed even among senior faculty members who had themselves received tenure.2 It is no startling revelation that problems occasionally arise in tenure reviews. Most academics can recount a first- or second-hand tale about a difficult case. Unsuccessful candidates may file appeals on their campuses challenging tenure denial, and, with increasing frequency, they resort to the courts for redress of perceived discrimination, breach of contract, or other legal wrongs. Judges then have the final responsibility to assess tenure standards and procedures.

This report originated at a meeting convened by the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and United Educators Insurance (UE).3 These collaborating organizations have complementary interests in American higher education:

The American Council on Education

ACE is a comprehensive association of the nation’s colleges and universities dedicated to analysis of higher education issues and advocacy on behalf of quality higher education and adult education programs. Counted among ACE’s members are more than 1,800 accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities and higher education-related associations, organizations, and corporations. For further information, visit www.acenet.edu.

The American Association of University Professors

AAUP is a nonprofit charitable and educational organization that supports and defends the principles of academic freedom and tenure and promotes policies to ensure academic due process. AAUP has more than 45,000 members at colleges and universities throughout the country. For further information, visit www.aaup.org.
United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc.

Founded in 1987, UE provides insurance to colleges, universities, and related organizations. It is owned and governed by over 1,000 member institutions. UE offers policies that cover legal disputes over the denial of tenure. For further information, visit www.ue.org.

Following the meeting, the organizations developed the specific recommendations offered here. We hope this report will promote self-reflection by those who evaluate tenure-track faculty, as well as general institutional dialogue and improvement.

Ann H. Franke, Esq.
Vice President for Education and Risk Management
United Educators Insurance
Practical suggestions for the tenure evaluation process fall into four major themes. These suggestions speak to various audiences—notably department chairs, senior faculty who participate in evaluating tenure-track faculty, and academic administrators.

Clarity in Standards and Procedures for Tenure Evaluation

Institutions should ensure that their stated criteria for tenure match the criteria that, in actual practice, the institutions apply. Department chairs and other responsible administrators should clearly communicate all criteria, including any special requirements applicable within a department or a college, to a tenure-track faculty member early in his or her career at the institution. When the tenure review occurs, complications can arise if positive developments (such as the acceptance of a book for publication) or negative allegations (such as harassment charges) come to light. Institutions should anticipate these possibilities and develop procedures in advance for handling them. Another potential source of difficulty lies in the personal opinions expressed to those responsible for conducting the review. An institution should adopt a consistent approach to handling private letters and conversations, outside the normal review process, concerning the merits of a tenure candidate.

Consistency in Tenure Decisions

Tenure decisions must be consistent over time among candidates with different personal characteristics—such as race, gender, disability, and national origin. Protections in law and institutional policy against discrimination apply with full force to the tenure process. Consistency also requires that the formal evaluations of a single individual over time reflect a coherent set of expectations and a consistent analysis of the individual’s performance. Department chairs and other colleagues should not convey excessive optimism about a candidate’s prospects for tenure. A negative tenure decision should not be the first criticism the individual receives. Everyone who participates in reviews must scrupulously follow tenure policies and procedures, and administrators should take special care when reviewing candidates from their own disciplines.

Candor in the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

The department chair or other responsible administrator should clearly explain to every tenure-track faculty member the standards for reappointment and tenure and the cycle for evaluations of his or her progress in meeting these requirements. Periodic evaluations should be candid and expressed in plain English. They should include specific examples illustrating the quality of performance, constructive criticism of any potential areas

Summary
for improvement, and practical guidance for future efforts.

*Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates*

Faculty and administrators must treat an unsuccessful tenure candidate with professionalism and decency. The person responsible for conveying the disappointing news should use compassion, and colleagues should take care not to isolate the person socially. Active efforts to assist the candidate in relocating to another position redound to the mutual benefit of the individual and the institution.
Chapter 1
Clarity in Standards and Procedures for Tenure Evaluation

Most colleges and universities have well-articulated tenure policies. Over time, their faculty and administrators have collaborated on crafting standards and procedures that fit their unique institutional circumstances. Experience suggests, however, that some aspects of a tenure policy may nonetheless be overlooked, creating the potential for uncertainty or conflict. Faculty and administrations that anticipate these issues and develop thoughtful and consistent approaches to them will be best positioned to defend their decisions.

The tenure policy should comprehensively list all the major criteria used for evaluation.

"Teaching, research, and service" is the standard trilogy for evaluating faculty. Some institutions have enlarged these criteria with additional factors, while others rely on the traditional three. Whatever the formulation, an institution should assess, through its appropriate decision-making bodies, whether its policies accurately reflect the actual operation of its tenure system. Do tenure evaluators sometimes use unstated factors? Examples might include student enrollment, success in attracting external funding, or long-term institutional needs.

If a tenure denial is based on a criterion that does not appear in the written policy, the unsuccessful candidate may challenge the decision as unfair and improper. Some courts are sympathetic to these claims. Other courts give campuses latitude in interpreting, for example, “research” as including the ability to attract external funding, or “teaching” as including social skills in relating to students. The safest course is to articulate written standards that reflect the major criteria that are actually used.

The evaluators at all stages in the tenure process should know—and apply—the criteria.

After the institution identifies the major criteria, the next logical steps are to distribute and follow them. Many people may be involved in a tenure evaluation: senior faculty in the candidate’s department; members of a campus-wide tenure committee; the dean; the provost; the president; and, on most campuses, the governing board. Each evaluator at each stage must know and apply the proper criteria.

Has the candidate’s department adopted special requirements relevant to its discipline? Fields such as studio and performing arts, for example, often require creative output in forms other than traditional scholarly publishing. Computer scientists might use software development to demonstrate professional achievements. Even departments such as history or mathematics may have tailored criteria specific to their particular goals. The institution should take special care in evaluating interdisciplinary scholars to ensure that all evaluators measure the can-
candidate against the same yardstick. Whatever the criteria, all evaluators should know and apply them.

**The tenure policy should address whether tenure evaluators will consider positive events occurring after the tenure application has been submitted.**

Most institutions require candidates to submit comprehensive applications detailing their achievements. The policy should specify whether the evaluation will take into account developments occurring after the candidate has completed his or her application. A faculty tenure committee may need to be alert to the possibility, for example, that a publisher may finally accept a candidate’s manuscript *after* the tenure review has begun. Will this positive development carry weight in the tenure process? If so, who is responsible for supplementing the application with the new information? Can the candidate add the new information at any stage of the process, or is it at some point too late? If the candidate adds new information, should he or she receive reconsideration at any earlier stages?

While subsequent developments are most often positive, such as a new publication or improved teaching evaluations, they need not be. After applying for tenure, the candidate might suffer a decline in teaching evaluations, receive a harsh review of a recent book, or, in rare instances, be found to have engaged in sexual harassment or plagiarism. Commentators sometimes use the terms “static” and “dynamic” to distinguish between those tenure systems that accept new information during the review process and those that do not. An institution is well-advised to adopt policies that make clear in advance which approach it will use and, of course, to adhere to its policies. Positive developments can extend the tenure process; negative developments, as discussed below, may interrupt it.

**The tenure policy should indicate what steps the institution will take if a faculty member under consideration for tenure is charged with misconduct or if other negative events emerge.**

The problem of unexpected negative information is infrequent but can prove very troublesome. An allegation of misconduct may be made against a faculty member who is undergoing tenure evaluation. For example, a senior professor may allege during the departmental tenure deliberations that the candidate has included on his resume a paper that was actually written entirely by a graduate student. Unsigned or signed letters alleging sexual harassment may arrive from students. Someone may offer a rumor that the candidate has been charged with domestic violence, whether recently or in the distant past.

We strongly encourage institutions to seek legal advice in these situations *before* completing the tenure review. Beyond this generic advice, institutions take varied approaches.

Some institutions will channel such allegations into a campus dispute resolution mechanism, such as the college or university sexual harassment procedure. The institution will suspend the tenure process until completing the other proceeding. Other institutions give the candidate notice of the allegations and an opportunity to respond directly to the tenure committee. Under a hybrid approach, the institution might offer the candidate the option of a separate proceeding or consideration directly by the tenure committee. Still other institutions may decline to receive or consider in the tenure process any unsubstantiated or unresolved allegations of misconduct. An AAUP investigating committee concluded in one case that a probationary faculty member charged with misconduct during the course of a tenure evaluation should have received written charges stated with particularity, time to for-
mulate a response, and an opportunity to appear before the decision makers to present the response. Advice of legal counsel may well be helpful in ensuring compliance with institutional policy and legal responsibilities in these complex situations.4

Evidence of serious misconduct might come to light after tenure has been awarded. Rather than revisiting the award of tenure, the better course is to invoke the regular disciplinary process applicable to tenured faculty.

The tenure policy should address the voting protocol when an evaluator serves at more than one level of review.

A member of the candidate’s department may serve on the campus-wide promotion and tenure committee. If someone “wears multiple hats,” the question arises whether that individual votes once or twice on the tenure candidacy. Consider, for example, a full professor in biology who serves on the college-wide review committee. If an assistant professor in biology has applied for tenure, would the senior colleague vote only within the department, only on the college-wide committee, or at both levels? Smaller institutions may face this question most often. There is no single correct answer. The best approach is to anticipate the situation, address it through clear written policies, and then follow the policies consistently.

Individual faculty members may wish to express their own opinions about a tenure candidate to members of the campus-wide promotion and tenure committee or to the administration. The tenure policy should address how the recipients should treat these individual opinions.

Consider this scenario. A senior faculty member strongly believes that a junior colleague should not receive tenure. She is, however, unable to convince the department, which votes to recommend the award of tenure. She writes a separate letter to an acquaintance on the promotion and tenure committee, or to the dean, forcefully explaining her opposition to the candidate. Is such a letter proper under the institution’s policies? How should the recipient handle it? Should the tenure candidate be informed about the letter?

Senior faculty members often hold strong opinions about tenure candidates. They may seek to express their opinions, whether positive or negative, privately to individuals with influence in the evaluation process. They may write letters or e-mails or engage in conversations. From a policy standpoint, the institution’s rules should clarify whether such individual opinions may be properly conveyed and considered. If so, how should the recipient use the information? Should it be shared with evaluators who were involved earlier in the process, or should it be shared with the candidate?

The press has reported on one illustrative situation at New York University. A candidate who directed an ethnic studies program received a departmental vote of 17 to 1 in favor of tenure. The lone dissenter, a former dean, wrote a private 10-page letter to the incumbent dean sharply criticizing the candidate’s scholarship. Unknown to the candidate or the department, the letter became part of the tenure file. According to the press account, the promotion and tenure committee voted 8 to 2 against tenure, relying in part on the critical letter. The letter writer and the department disagreed over the propriety of the separate letter. Was it an exercise of the dissenter’s right to express his opinion or a subversion of the department’s democratic process? The administration ultimately offered the scholar a tenured position.5

From a litigation standpoint, a senior professor needs to understand that her letter may become public through the discovery process. If the candidate about whom she
wrote the letter is denied tenure, that individual may file suit and would receive access to the letter. Suppose, however, that the private, critical letter is unpersuasive and the candidate receives tenure. The letter remains in the institution’s files. Now suppose another scholar is denied tenure. The letter will come to light in a lawsuit if the court compares the evaluations of the successful and unsuccessful candidates. The trial judge can also order disclosure of verbal comments.

This problem is not hypothetical. In one tenure battle that landed in court, a senior historian had written a “confidential” letter to the dean of the faculty questioning whether a male historian had been evaluated less rigorously than female historians during their tenure candidacies. The male historian received tenure. A female scientist who subsequently was denied tenure sued and compared her qualifications to those of the male historian. The “confidential” letter from the senior history professor was presented as evidence at the trial and was reported in the press.6

Given the realities of academic life, some individual faculty members may well wish to share their unsolicited opinions about candidates with decision makers in the tenure process. The best course is for institutional policy to address the possibility. Key issues are whether the candidate receives notice about the communication and what weight, if any, the recipient may place on that communication. Good institutional rules will offer guidance so that all participants in the tenure process share a common understanding.

---

**Checklist on Clarity**

- The tenure policy should clearly state the criteria for tenure and should encompass all the major factors actually relied upon in evaluating tenure applications.
- Evaluators at all stages of the tenure process should know and apply the criteria appropriate to the candidate.
- The tenure rules should clearly explain whether evaluators will consider positive events subsequent to the submission of the tenure application—such as acceptance of a manuscript for publication—in making their evaluations.
- The institution should formulate a plan for handling allegations of misconduct or other negative information that may arise during the tenure process.
- A senior faculty member who serves on a college-wide tenure committee should know, in advance, whether he or she should vote on a tenure candidate in the department, at the college-wide level, or both.
- The institution’s rules should address what weight, if any, decisionmakers should give to informal and unsolicited opinions they receive about tenure candidates and whether candidates should be informed about such unsolicited communication.
Institutions strive for the highest standards of fairness in individual tenure decisions. They evaluate each candidate with great care, conducting a time-consuming and elaborate review. The process places the candidate’s achievements under intense scrutiny as his or her application proceeds through the various levels of review. The goal is a correct judgment based on the merits of the individual’s qualifications. Sometimes, though, evaluators overlook the role of consistency. The fairness of the tenure process depends not just on the outcome of an individual decision, but also on the consistency of multiple decisions over time.

The faculty, administration, and governing board should strive for consistency in the operation of the institution’s tenure evaluation process.

The challenge of consistency of evaluation is well known to anyone who has graded a large stack of student essays. Does the professor judge the first paper by the same standards as the one at the bottom of the pile? Consistency in tenure decisions presents a larger challenge. Evaluators make tenure decisions primarily on an individual basis rather than a comparative one. Student essays are graded within a relatively short time frame, but tenure decisions are made on an ongoing, periodic basis and through a process of successive recommendations leading to a decision. Candidates come from different disciplines. Most significantly, tenure decisions require a highly nuanced assessment of professional achievement.

From a legal standpoint, consistency in tenure decisions is a central concern. In 1972, Congress decided that colleges and universities must abide by the federal laws prohibiting employment discrimination. Tenure decisions thus receive close scrutiny from judges and juries as to whether the institution has equitably treated tenure candidates of different races, genders, national origins, religions, ages, or disability status. Sexual orientation may be relevant under state or local law or campus policy. Institutional policies typically list the types of discrimination that the institution prohibits. Inconsistency in tenure decisions, legally termed “disparate treatment,” is the essence of legal challenges alleging that an institution’s tenure process is discriminatory.

The courts typically allow an unsuccessful tenure candidate who sues for discrimination to compare his or her situation to those of scholars who have received tenure. An African-American electrical engineer suing for racial discrimination, for example, will point to the qualifications of white electrical engineering faculty members who have received tenure. A court may allow the plaintiff to compare his candidacy to those of white professors in other departments such as civil engineering, physics, or even more remote fields such as languages or social sciences. Yet different disciplines may apply different standards for tenure. Clinical programs are a good
example. Departmental tenure standards that articulate the different criteria will facilitate the legal review of the consistency of decisions.

Given that judges and juries will compare the institution’s tenure decisions over time and across disciplines, faculty and administrators need to pay heed to the consistency of tenure decisions. Reviewers at each level, from the department to the ultimate decision maker, should ask, “How does this candidate compare to others we have evaluated for tenure in the recent past?” Each tenure candidate is unique, and the evaluation process is anything but mechanical.

Even in the face of these difficulties, however, the institution needs to be alert to inconsistencies, particularly gross or blatant ones. One institution gives its university-wide committee a special role in checking for consistency. The committee members’ terms are staggered so that at any given time at least one member of the committee has served for six years. With each new tenure decision, the committee compares the candidate to the candidates it has evaluated over the past six years. Whether using this type of mechanism or others, the committee best devotes its attention to the consistency of decisions before a lawsuit is filed rather than after.

The faculty and administration should strive for consistency over time in their review of the work of each nontenured faculty member.

It is important for the department chair and other reviewers to be consistent over time when evaluating an individual candidate. An assistant professor may, for example, receive five successive annual evaluations from her department chair that praise her for excellent teaching. In the sixth year, the department chair begins to criticize her teaching. The change may be due to an actual decline in the candidate’s performance, or it may be due to a change in the chair’s approach to the evaluation. The institution should strive for consistency in the successive evaluations of an individual candidate. If challenged in a lawsuit, an institution is placed at a distinct disadvantage if an unsuccessful candidate for tenure received only excellent evaluations up to the point of tenure rejection.

Consistency in successive evaluations, of course, does not require that evaluators photocopy the same written comments and reuse them annually. Successive evaluations should, rather, faithfully reflect the candidate’s performance, including both improvements and declines. A careful department chair will review the prior evaluation before writing the next one as a check on both the expectations that were conveyed and the candidate’s progress in meeting them. The evaluations may also be useful items to include in the tenure application file. Faculty and administrators who conduct tenure reviews may benefit from seeing the earlier annual evaluations. If a candidate received earlier excellent evaluations but is rejected for tenure, he or she will be understandably frustrated by what appear to be capricious and misleading actions.

A department’s counseling of nontenured faculty members should be consistent with its and the institution’s tenure requirements.

The department bears the major responsibility for ensuring that a tenure candidate receives appropriate ongoing counseling during the probationary period. In several recent tenure disputes, departments have been faulted for providing inconsistent counseling or guidance to a junior faculty member.

In one situation, the president of a research university addressed a grievance filed by an unsuccessful tenure candidate. In deciding the grievance, the president wrote to the candidate explaining that he was assessing “whether you were substantially misled about your progress in meeting University standards.” The president concluded, “In light of the exceptionally incautious feedback that you received from your department, you may not
have taken every opportunity available to you to make more progress on your second project before your tenure review . . . " Based on this flaw in the department’s treatment of the candidate, the president upheld the grievance, offering as a remedy additional time and another tenure review.

Departmental evaluations that are inconsistent with the institution’s requirements can also be problematic. At Trinity College in Connecticut, the chemistry department had supported the tenure candidacy of Dr. Leslie Craine. When the college’s Appointments and Promotions Committee voted against Craine, the department wrote to the committee asking for reconsideration. As quoted in the Chronicle of Higher Education, the department blamed itself for not doing a better job of counseling Craine. Two years before the tenure decision, the department had evaluated whether Craine was on target for tenure. The department explained to her the publication requirement and, two years later, in the department’s opinion she had satisfied the requirement. After the negative tenure decision, the department wrote to the committee, “To change the rules between the second and the final [review assessing her progress towards tenure] is fundamentally unfair.” According to the press account, the department faulted itself for causing the institution to treat Craine inconsistently over time.

These cases illustrate the serious problems that can arise if a department’s approach to a tenure candidate is inconsistent with the institution’s requirements as interpreted by other bodies.

Tenure files should contain the proper information and should be retained after the decision. The tenure process is laden with paper. The department chair and other responsible officials should take care in assembling the review materials. They need to attend to what is compiled and who is responsible for its safekeeping. The candidate may later complain that the department chair or dean improperly excluded certain items favorable to her from her tenure dossier. Alternatively, she might complain that the chair or dean improperly included unfavorable items. Consistency is key. In challenging the composition of the dossier, an unsuccessful candidate will use other tenure files to illustrate proper and improper items. Some institutions give the candidate the right to inspect the dossier during the tenure process or shortly thereafter.

Safekeeping the materials is critical if the institution must later explain its decision. Occasionally a situation may arise in which the tenure dossier disappears after the decision is made. Under federal regulations, institutions receiving federal funds are required to retain records concerning promotion or termination for at least two years after the date of the action (29 CFR § 1602.49, 41 CFR § 60-1.12). State laws or institutional protocols may specify a longer period. One recommended approach is the retention of all employment records through the duration of the individual’s employment and for seven years thereafter.8

If the candidate is in the same discipline as an administrator involved in the tenure process, the administrator should handle the tenure application consistently with other applications.

An administrator should take care in reviewing the tenure application of a candidate specializing in the same discipline as the administrator. The administrator should treat the application the same way as those of candidates in other fields. While the administrator can certainly draw on his or her detailed knowledge of the discipline, the safest course is not to deviate in other respects from the normal tenure review process. Consider, for example, a provost who is a political scientist. She might be tempted, when reviewing the tenure application of an assistant professor in political science, to call a few trusted colleagues at other institutions.
for their opinions. If she departs from normal practice, and if the candidate is rejected, the candidate may argue that the outsiders were unduly influential. The candidate might argue further that the provost specifically sought negative opinions in an effort to scuttle the tenure application.

Another example is the administrator who will soon return to the faculty. If the administrator recommends against tenure for a candidate from the same field, the individual may allege that the administrator acted out of biased self-interest. The candidate may assert that the administrator wished to save a “slot” for his or her return to the faculty or did not want to compete with the more successful junior scholar.

Fortunately, these situations are relatively uncommon. They underscore, however, that special circumstances enhance the need for consistency.

All reviewers should follow tenure procedures to the letter.

An unsuccessful tenure candidate may seek to overturn the decision by pointing to irregularities in the handling of his or her tenure review. It is easy to state the abstract proposition that a college or university should faithfully and consistently follow its own procedures. Turning this abstraction into a reality requires ongoing vigilance and attention to detail.

The use of outside letters of reference offers a ready illustration. In one case at Kansas State University, a federal judge noted a departure from institutional rules on external letters:

The tenured faculty voted without having reviewed letters from faculty outside of the school (outside reviewers), which was the school’s practice, although the school’s written procedures provide for such information to be available or review prior to voting.9

In another case, the University of Minnesota solicited more than 40 external review letters about a female mathematician, while the normal number would have been six to 10.10

The best written rules are not always easily applied to actual situations, but all evaluators should strive to adhere as scrupulously as possible to the institution’s tenure review procedures. Letters of reference are one potential point of contention. A fuller list of the key steps in the tenure process that require close attention includes:

- Compilation of the tenure application file.
- Procedures for identifying external referees.
- Voting eligibility of departmental members (including faculty on leave).
- Availability of written materials to committees and individual administrators who vote on the candidacy.
- Informal communications made outside the official review process about the candidate.

One institution has built a procedural check into its tenure process. Before notifying a candidate of tenure denial, those evaluators who have had major responsibility for the review meet and work through a checklist to confirm that they have handled each procedural element of the tenure process correctly. Such a review can flag missing materials, missed deadlines, or other irregularities.

Departures from the tenure procedures may be reviewed in the unpleasant context of litigation. The institution will probably argue that the irregularity was not legally defective. Even if the institution prevails, the distraction and expense of litigation might have been avoided had the procedural error never arisen.
Checklist on Consistency

✓ Ensure that tenure decisions are consistent over time among candidates who have different personal characteristics that are legally protected such as race, gender, disability, ethnic origin, and religion.

✓ Ensure that the formal evaluations of non-tenured faculty and what they are told informally about the quality of their work are based on a consistent set of expectations. A negative tenure decision should not be the first criticism of the individual’s performance.

✓ The department should provide advice to faculty during the probationary period that is consistent with its and the institution’s expectations for tenure. Departments should be cautious about conveying excessive optimism about prospects for tenure.

✓ The tenure application dossier should include all required materials and exclude items that the institution has not used for other candidates.

✓ Administrators should take special care, when reviewing candidates in their own disciplines, that they not depart from standard tenure processes.

✓ All reviewers should scrupulously follow tenure procedures. Deviations can be used as evidence that the institution breached its obligation to conduct a fair review.
The concepts of clarity, consistency, and candor are useful in analyzing tenure evaluation procedures. Admittedly, though, the categories overlap somewhat. If, for example, tenure criteria are not clear, then it will be difficult if not impossible to counsel a tenure-track faculty member candidly about his or her progress in meeting them. Examining institutional processes from the perspective of tenure-track faculty can be instructive. Here are some observations from tenure-track faculty that illustrate the stresses they face. Their concerns also illustrate the overlapping nature of clarity, consistency, and candor:

“What does it take to get tenure? That’s the million dollar question. Standards change, and you never know how many articles you need.”

“I had a book contract, and in my second year review, they said I should concentrate on articles, not the book. So I did. In my fourth year review, they said, ‘Where’s the book?’”

“I’m in business, but my field is in psychology, so about half my work is published in psychological journals. My department chair told me that was fine.” The dean of this individual, however, told the interviewers, “What advice would I give to a young faculty member? I’d tell them to publish in business journals. We are a professional field and we should service the profession. To publish elsewhere would be a risk.”

“Almost 50 percent of my time is spent on committees. The problem is that we don’t have enough senior faculty to go around, and those who are senior don’t want to serve. The department chair feels he doesn’t have a choice, and the dean seems oblivious. There are always good reasons to put me on a committee; it’s just that I don’t think it will help me get tenure.”

A faculty member at a small college described her third-year review: “That year the review was just a mess so it wasn’t particularly helpful . . . They wanted names of three potential reviewers and so I did my research about people who were in appropriate institutions and so on and submitted the names. Then some time passed and finally I got word that all the reviewers had to be local and none of the reviewers I had given them were local. That meant that in a matter of two or three days I had to come up with new names. It was incredibly stressful.”

Responsibility for candor falls most squarely on the department chair or other individual charged with the direct, ongoing review of a tenure-track faculty member.
Mathematician John B. Conway has described for fellow department chairs the overriding importance of candor in evaluations:\textsuperscript{12}

“On humanitarian and professional grounds, junior faculty should get a clear understanding of their status long before tenure is considered.

“It is the head’s solemn duty to report to the candidate any bad news that comes out of the retention review. In a serious situation, the candidate should be asked to respond in writing. No one likes to communicate bad news. (Well, almost no one.) But it is absolutely essential that you do this, especially now. A head who puts on kid gloves at such a time is doing no one a favor. If the report is so bad that it seems irredeemable, terminate the candidate now before tenure is considered.

“There is the legal question, but there is also your obligation as a human being and the unofficial mentor of this young colleague. Do you really want them to spend the next few years thinking there is nothing to correct? That what they have been doing is leading toward tenure? And meantime the faculty is anticipating change and will conclude, when it fails to appear, that this person did not heed a warning and, hence, is unworthy of tenure. I have known of cases where a department head did not pass on the faculty’s concerns. When tenure was eventually denied, the candidate was shocked, the faculty discovered their warnings were not transmitted, and the head’s prestige and reputation suffered.

“A word of caution here is advisable. With five or six years of contact, people can become very friendly. Sufficiently friendly that hard decisions are almost impossible. Remember you are running a department, not a club. Chumminess is not an area where excellence suffices for tenure. Nice young mathematicians do not invite harsh judgments, but your job, and that of your colleagues, is to promote the well-being of the university. It is not to promote the sociability of the department.”

The temptation to put social concerns ahead of academic needs is real. In an article about a multimillion dollar jury verdict in a tenure denial case involving a chemistry professor, the press reported:

“David Henderson, then chairman of the chemistry department, said recently that he and his colleagues incorrectly perceived their roles as Ms. Craine’s advocates. ‘She was a friend,’ he explained. ‘We’d worked with her for six years . . . Today, Mr. Henderson describes some of the things that he wrote in the department’s letter of appeal as ‘hyperbole,’ part of a ‘calculated strategy’ to meet the requirements for appealing a negative tenure decision.”\textsuperscript{13}

Against this backdrop, we offer three general principles to guide the candor of faculty evaluations.

An institution owes every tenure-track faculty member a clear explanation of the requirements for tenure.

The institution should give every new faculty member an explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure. Members of the search committee might convey some information about standards during the interview process. Whatever the nature of discussions during the search process, after appointment the department or administration should fur-
nish a thorough explanation. Subsequent evaluations then provide an opportunity to review the requirements with the candidate. AAUP recommends that:

Probationary faculty members should be advised, early in their appointment, of the substantive and procedural standards generally accepted in decisions affecting renewal and tenure. Any special standards adopted by their particular departments or schools should also be brought to their attention.14

It is vital that the institution promptly inform the candidate of any changes in the standards. Interdisciplinary scholars may require special attention. Faculty members who are affiliated with more than one department face a particular risk that the institution will not clearly define the overall standards for evaluation of their performance, or will change these standards frequently over time.

An institution owes every tenure-track faculty member clear advice about his or her progress in meeting tenure requirements.

The institution’s primary goal in the evaluation is to give the candidate a full understanding of his or her progress to date in meeting the requirements. Candor is critical to both the institution and the candidate. The evaluation should be specific and should cover the full review period. Evaluators should avoid broad generalizations such as “Don’s teaching has improved over the past year.” Add specific details, such as “In his introductory readings course, Don succeeded in motivating the students, stimulating class discussion, and preparing them for upper-level work. His new compilation of reading material will have lasting value for our curriculum.”

The evaluation should cover the entire review period, not just the most recent few weeks or months. Normally the department chair shares the written evaluation with the candidate. In a meeting to discuss the evaluation, the department chair should take the opportunity to engage the faculty member in a substantive discussion about work to date and realistic prospects for the future. Use the meeting as an occasion for two-way communication, not just a one-way critique.

Most flawed academic evaluations tend to be excessively positive. A sugar-coated review is easiest for the chair to dispense and for the candidate to swallow. But over the long run, it can prove harmful to everyone.

William Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon have explained the importance of constructive criticism of tenure-track faculty:

[C]andidates should not be betrayed by the system. If evaluations throughout the first five years have been positive, yet the candidate is denied tenure, then a mistake needs to be rectified. Formal evaluation can be helpful to an individual if it deals with areas for improvement as well as strengths. An organization that does not take evaluation seriously is apt to disable a candidate for tenure because he or she has never received adequate feedback. In effect, the greater blame goes to the organization, but the unsuccessful candidate must pay the penalty.15

In today’s legal climate, the institution can pay its penalty in the lawsuit that the unsuccessful candidate brings against it.

Evaluators should state their constructive criticism in plain English rather than couching it in the argot of diplomacy. Consider this example. A chair tells a candidate that her most recent published article was “good.” The chair means that, while the article was basically acceptable, it did not meet the department’s high standards of excellence. The candidate, for her part, perceives the comment as praise. A jury later deciding a lawsuit would likely interpret “good” in the same way as the candi-
Annual Faculty Evaluation
Professor Pam Poe

Teaching
The student evaluations place Pam right at the median within the department. She continues to teach the sophomore introductory lecture course every fall. In addition, her development of the new critical methods seminar for department majors has been a big project. She rolled up her sleeves last summer and produced the new course, offered this spring, that has contributed substantially to the quality of our program.

Research
Pam’s research has been showing good progress. We look forward to the publication later this year of the book version of her dissertation by State University Press. In the past year, she has submitted two papers that are under consideration by *The International Bulletin of Methodology*, one of the leading journals in her field.

Service
Pam’s service record is outstanding. She chaired the committee that conducted the campus-wide study of life and learning issues for female students. She was the primary author of the committee’s report, which made major recommendations for reform in the areas of curriculum, housing, and student activities. On campus, both female and male students eagerly seek her assistance with academic counseling. In the local community, her effective work on the board of the local United Way has brought credit to the college.

Pam is in her fourth year in a tenure-track position. In addition to the across-the-board salary increase, I am pleased to recommend her for an additional 1.5 percent for merit.

Dr. Paul Murky, Department Chair

Sample Evaluations
These are two evaluations of a tenure-track faculty member. Consider their relative candor and usefulness to Professor Poe.

The evaluation should include guidance for the future.
A good evaluation will include some guidance for the candidate’s future efforts. A department chair may encourage a candidate whose teaching is acceptable to devote attention to publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. The chair might encourage a candidate who has only co-authored publications to write as a
Annual Faculty Evaluation  
Professor Pam Poe

Teaching
The student evaluations place Pam right at the median within the department. She continues to teach the sophomore introductory lecture course every fall. In addition, her development of the new critical methods seminar for department majors has been a big project. She rolled up her sleeves last summer and produced the new course, offered this spring, that has contributed substantially to the quality of our program.

Over the next two years, I hope to see Pam devote attention to honing her teaching skills. One area she could usefully address is finding ways to encourage broader student participation in discussions. She is not undertaking any new course preparations in the coming year, which will give her an opportunity to consider new creative approaches to student involvement. I would be glad to consult with her on strategies and, if she wishes, to visit her classes occasionally.

Research
Pam’s research has been showing good progress. We look forward to the publication later this year of the book version of her dissertation by State University Press. In the past year, she has submitted two papers that are under consideration by The International Bulletin of Methodology, one of the leading journals in her field.

Pam understands that the college does not place substantial weight on the publication of dissertations (or other research projects undertaken elsewhere before a scholar joins our faculty). For a successful tenure candidacy, she will need to show a strong record of publication in peer-reviewed journals. At a minimum, the publication of three substantial articles will be required.

Service
Pam’s service record is outstanding. She chaired the committee that conducted the campus-wide study of life and learning issues for female students. She was the primary author of the committee’s report, which made major recommendations for reform in the areas of curriculum, housing, and student activities. On campus both female and male students eagerly seek her assistance with academic counseling. In the local community, her effective work on the board of the local United Way has brought credit to the college.

Pam and I have discussed the weight that the college gives to service in evaluating faculty. While important, it stands behind teaching and research in our priorities.

Pam is in her fourth year in a tenure-track position. In addition to the across-the-board salary increase, I am pleased to recommend her for an additional 1.5 percent for merit for her role in the development of the new seminar.

Dr. Charles Candid, Department Chair
An institution is vulnerable to challenge if it gives short shrift to any of the elements of candor. Particularly dangerous is the situation in which the institution has offered a candidate glowing evaluations for five years but then denies tenure on the basis of some inadequacy that no one ever communicated during the entire probationary period.

**Every tenure-track faculty member deserves:**

- A clear explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure, including any criteria specific to the department or school.
- Periodic evaluations of his or her progress in meeting the requirements.
- Candor in all evaluations.
- Specific examples that illustrate the quality of his or her performance.
- Constructive criticism outlining any potential areas for improvement.
- A review covering the entire evaluation period, not just the recent past.
- An evaluation in plain English.
- Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements, without promises or guarantees that the institution may not be able to honor.
- An understanding of how a review (or reviews) during the probationary period differs from a later tenure review.
Chapter 4
Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates

“Almost no one in the history department has talked to me this entire semester. I’m like someone who has been airbrushed out of a Kremlin photograph.”
– Historian denied tenure at Yale University

“It’s like you have leprosy.”
– English professor denied tenure at the University of Michigan

At most institutions, a denial of tenure means that the unsuccessful candidate will remain one final year and then depart. Faculty and administrators should continue to treat a candidate who has been rejected for tenure as a professional colleague. The institution can take many steps to help the individual with what may be a difficult transition. If the institution provides assistance and expressions of concern, it may reduce the anger and desire for revenge that some unsuccessful candidates feel. Caring for unsuccessful candidates is a humane and decent thing to do. It is also a good way to prevent some lawsuits.

Deliver the bad news with compassion.
Consider how your institution notifies candidates that they have been denied tenure. The most impersonal way is a short letter. How would you feel if you received this letter?

Dear Professor Jones,

It is my responsibility to advise you that the governing board voted last week to deny your application for tenure and promotion. You will receive a terminal one-year contract running through next June. Let me offer thanks for your years of service to our college and wish you well in your future professional endeavors.

Sincerely,
President Smith

One immediate question would be why the president did not send the letter more promptly after the board voted. But beyond that relatively minor detail, the letter is highly impersonal. It essentially abandons Professor Jones to face the future alone.

Written notice of the tenure denial is important from a legal standpoint. A better letter would provide an opportunity to meet with the provost or other high-level academic administrator to discuss the decision and any relocation assistance that the institution could provide.

Experience suggests that the provost, or similar official, should meet with each candidate denied tenure as soon as possible after the decision. The meeting can begin the process of repairing damage to the individual’s self-esteem. The provost uses the meeting to say, in effect, “You’re still a good person. You have many fine skills and talents.
At the present time, unfortunately, you and the institution were not a good long-term match.” The provost should allow the candidate to express feelings about the situation, which can provide the individual with some catharsis. The provost can also begin to outline ways in which the institution may be able to assist with the candidate’s transition.

Encourage colleagues to interact professionally with the unsuccessful candidate after the denial of tenure.

Social isolation can exacerbate the unsuccessful tenure candidate’s sense of failure. Colleagues should take care to interact sensitively and professionally with the individual after a negative decision. Take time for conversation and social interactions. Common courtesies can reduce some of the sting of the outcome.

One unsuccessful candidate described the awkwardness of hosting at her home a gathering for prospective students. She was obliged to “sell” them on the value of an institution that had recently rejected her. Should the gathering have been held elsewhere? The best approach probably would have been for the chair to ask whether she preferred to host what was an annual event one final time or to let the task fall to someone else. Unilaterally shifting the function without consultation probably would have been unwise. Open lines of communication can help the candidate through a difficult period and reduce the prospect of disputes over small or large issues.
Checklist on Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates

The institution can take many steps to help the unsuccessful tenure candidate get back on his or her feet elsewhere. Here are some possibilities.

✔ Networking about available positions at other institutions. Senior faculty in the department can be an enormous help in identifying possibilities at other institutions. They can contact colleagues nearby or in other parts of the country and urge them to consider the candidate for open positions. If the department, however, was strongly opposed to the award of tenure, the networking function might be better performed by a senior academic administrator. If the tenure denial was based on malfeasance, it would be irresponsible for the institution to help the individual relocate to another campus without adequate disclosure of the problem.

✔ Funds for travel and attending conferences. The unsuccessful candidate may find it helpful to have access to funds for attending conferences that have a recruiting component, other travel related to the job search, or maintaining professional contacts. The institution can specifically earmark a reasonable amount for the candidate’s use.

✔ Subscriptions to periodicals that have vacancy announcements. A personal subscription may relieve the candidate from the burden of hunting down the department’s shared copy of any publications that include position listings.

✔ Photocopying assistance. The search for an academic position requires large amounts of photocopying. The institution can designate someone to assist with this function. If the institution closely monitors copying charges, the candidate might be given a special allotment.

✔ Advice about academic job searches. Some candidates may be out of touch with the logistics of finding an academic position. Colleagues or the placement office may be able to offer “how to” advice on current techniques. The candidate might, for example, welcome advice about online information and networking resources and how to prepare a resume for electronic distribution.

✔ Release time, if the candidate desires it. The institution and the candidate may mutually decide that their interests would be best served if the candidate were relieved of certain duties during the terminal contract year. The candidate might, for example, be offered a reduced teaching load. Take care, though, that the decision is mutual. Involuntarily imposing a substantial change in responsibilities on someone denied tenure may create risks. Such action may anger the individual and increase his or her readiness to sue. The faculty handbook may limit the institution’s ability to change faculty responsibilities at particular times or in particular ways. If the institution relieves the individual of teaching, the action may violate AAUP’s recommended standards on suspension. Mutually agreed-upon release time is, however, acceptable.

✔ Portable research support. Occasionally, institutions have provided financial support to continue the faculty member’s research at another institution. Such “portable” support can signal the perceived value of the research and enhance the candidate’s attractiveness for another position.

✔ Other support that fits the individual’s unique circumstances. Take the time to learn about the candidate’s needs and desires for future professional employment. Then consider whether the institution can help satisfy them. Retraining, tuition waivers, the payment of professional society dues, and library access are but a few resources that the institution may be able to deploy. Every situation is different, so examine each with care.

Take care that any oral or written recommendations are consistent with the grounds for the tenure decision. If the candidate files a lawsuit, those recommendations may crop up as evidence.
Conclusion

Moving Forward

How can an institution move forward in refining and improving its evaluation process? Collaboration among faculty and academic administrators is a key ingredient. Advice from legal counsel may also be appropriate. We offer institutions the following approaches:

• Conduct workshops for department chairs on the appointment and evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Cover topics such as the importance of following institutional procedures, communicating well with tenure-track faculty, and preparing and retaining appropriate documentation. Possible presenters include experienced chairs and administrators, legal counsel, and outside experts. This report could serve as a basis for discussion.

• For smaller colleges, collaborate with neighboring institutions to develop joint annual or semiannual retreats or workshops for chairs and senior faculty.

• Encourage faculty and chairs to attend external programs on evaluation and tenure practices. Some ongoing workshops are listed in the bibliography. Disciplinary association meetings also sponsor occasional sessions. To compound the benefit of external programs, ask the attendees to share the insights they learn with others back on campus. Institutions often overlook the steps of sharing information and promoting campus dialogue with people who return from external programs.

• Have a small working group analyze situations of tenure denial that have occurred in the recent past and formulate recommendations for improvement. Don’t limit the recommendations just to revising the wording of campus policy. Also address the behavioral issues of how candidly and consistently the evaluators apply tenure standards.

• If lawsuits or other disputes have occurred, learn from those experiences and make appropriate changes. Calculate the intangible and tangible costs of dispute and devote comparable resources to preventing the next problem that might otherwise occur.

• Engage in a dialogue with tenure-track faculty about their perceptions of the tenure process. Ask about their understanding of the tenure standards and procedures, as well as the quality of the ongoing evaluations they are receiving. The information could be solicited informally through conversations or more formally through surveys. Use your findings to identify areas for possible improvement.

Consideration for tenure is a pivotal moment in the life of the candidate and the institution. The good practices detailed here
are designed to avert problems that can
detract from the hard work of evaluating
academic achievement. They are also designed
to enhance the fairness of the tenure process.
A few of the suggestions address institutional
policy. Most speak to the words and deeds of
the people who implement that policy. We
commend these practices to the serious atten-
tion of department chairs, other faculty
involved in tenure evaluations, and academic
administrators.
Introduction

1 The tenure process has evolved over time. Today, for example, senior faculty colleagues typically vote at the department level on a tenure candidate. In 1959, however, only 26 of 80 institutions surveyed involved faculty in tenure recommendations. The survey authors proposed that tenure procedures “should provide for official action by the faculty, at one or more levels, on all decisions about acquisition of tenure.” Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, Faculty Tenure (Jossey-Bass, 1973), 218. Yesterday’s recommendation has become today’s reality.


3 Those involved in the session, held in October 1998, were: Dr. Michael Baer, Senior Vice President for Programs and Analysis, ACE; Peter Byrne, Professor, Georgetown University Law Center; Donald Hood, Professor, Columbia University; Dr. Jonathan Knight, Associate Secretary, AAUP; Sheldon Steinbach, General Counsel, ACE; Patricia Sullivan, Chancellor, University of North Carolina–Greensboro; Donald Wagner, Professor, State University of West Georgia; David Lascell, Esq., Harter, Seecrest & Emery, LLP; and, from United Educators, Janice Abraham, President; Robb Jones, General Counsel; Laura Kumin, Vice President; and Ann Franke, then-Director.

Chapter 1

4 Relatively little has been written about the intersection of misconduct and tenure evaluation. A few accounts, however, discuss specific situations:

- Koerselman v. Rhynard, 875 S.W.2d 347 (Tex. App. 1994). When Professor Rhynard was evaluated for tenure, his senior colleagues inquired about rumors of sexual harassment allegations against him. The case details the actions of the department chair and dean in handling the allegations and their documentation.


Chapter 2
10 Ganguli v. University of Minnesota, 512 N.W. 2d 918 (Minn. App. 1994).

Chapter 3

Chapter 4
16 Robin Wilson, “‘It’s Like You Have Leprosy’: The Year After Losing a Tenure Bid,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 44 (March 6, 1998): A12.
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Programs, Workshops, and Conferences

Chairing the Academic Department
The American Council on Education annually sponsors workshops at several locations around the country. Each workshop features five or six expert presenters who lead in-depth sessions. The two-and-a-half-day interactive program attracts chairs and deans from all types of institutions. For more information call ACE at (202) 939-9415, or visit them on the web at www.acenet.edu.

Annual Conference for Academic Chairpersons
Kansas State University sponsors an annual conference every February in Florida for academic chairs. The overall goal is to help chairs better fulfill their responsibilities. The program format consists of general sessions, paper presentations, panels, and workshops. The proceedings are published annually. For more information, call Kansas State University at (785) 532-5575, or visit them on the web at www.dce.ksu.edu/dce.

Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences (CCAS)
CCAS sponsors annual seminars for deans and department chairs in eastern and western locations. For more information, call CCAS at (480) 727-6064, or visit them on the web at www.ccas.net.

Others
The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Conference of Academic Deans (ACAD), and many disciplinary associations such as the Modern Language Association are among other groups that sponsor occasional programs and sessions on tenure evaluation practices.
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UCSF Department of Anesthesia Online Promotion Posting
Faculty Merits and Promotions

Introduction to Academic Advancements

The following is an introduction to the process for academic advancement, which includes merits, promotions, appraisals of achievement and promise, and changes in series.

There are 5 types of series academic appointments:

- Ladder; also referred to as a FTE (Full Time Employee with tenure)
- In Residence
- Clinical X (Anesthesia)
- Clinical
- Adjunct

There are 3 academic ranks for appointments:

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor

Each rank has prescribed years of service length for advancement actions as follows:

- Assistant Professor, Steps 1, 2, and 3 years (two years at each step)

  A promotion from Assistant to Associate is considered "normal" after 6 years of service. Step 4 is available if required to complete six years of service at the Assistant rank.

- Associate Professor, Steps 1, 2, and 3 years (two years at each step)

  A promotion from Associate to full Professor is also considered "normal" after 6 years of service. Step 4 is also available for Associate rank.

- Professor, Steps 1 through 9 (three years at each step)
- Professor, Step Above Scale
Schedule for Academic Advancement

The schedule for academic advancement begins each July, and continues throughout the next 12 month period. The Academic Personnel Unit undertakes the following list of activities annually.

**June - July** — A departmental Review Committee is established by the Chair of the Department. Members of the committee generally represent all ranks and series of faculty, as well as all medical sites (Moffitt/Long, Mount Zion, San Francisco General Hospital, and the Veterans Administration Medical Center).

**July** — Faculty who are eligible for advancement (i.e., a merit, promotion, or appraisal of achievement and promise) are asked to submit individual merit or promotion packages for review. Checklists are provided for faculty to submit required materials, which include curriculum vitae, and in specific cases, letters of recommendation and evidence of publications.

**July/August** — Merit and promotion packages are collected by the Academic Personnel Unit and prepared for the departmental Review Committee.

**August - November** — The Review Committee evaluates individual faculty packages and submits the results of its balloting and recommendations to the Chair.

**December** — Promotion packages are submitted to the Dean’s office.

**February** — Merit packages are submitted to the Dean’s office.

**May - June** — Approval notices are generated by the Chancellor and Dean’s office and faculty are notified by the Department Chair. In some instances, a proposed merit or promotion action may be modified. This requires the Chair to meet with individual faculty to discuss issues concerning revision to an initially proposed merit or promotion, and future evaluation of faculty’s performance.

**July** — The first of July is the effective date for approved merits and promotions. Payroll Action Forms are submitted to the Dean’s office to initiate title changes, step and pay increases.

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS**

**Merits**

The Dean’s office (Academic Affairs) approves merits for Assistant Professors advancing from Step 1 to Step 2 for all series.

**Promotions**

Packages are initially reviewed by the Dean’s office (Academic Affairs). The Dean’s office then forwards the package to the Office of Academic Affairs and its Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The CAP makes its report to the Vice Chancellor’s office for Academic Affairs. If the recommendations are supportive, the Chancellor notifies the faculty of their promotion.

Please proceed to the [series selection page](http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/).

For more information about the academic advancement process, refer to the Academic Personnel Manual at the following website: [http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/](http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/)
Faculty Merits and Promotions 2003

Please select the series for your appointment and click on the appropriate link in the column heading below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Ladder Rank</th>
<th>In Residence</th>
<th>Clinical X</th>
<th>Clinical</th>
<th>Adjunct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>See Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Creative Work</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>See Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Competence and Activity</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>See Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and Public Service</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>See Note</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Criteria for promotion of faculty in the adjunct series can vary depending on the role expected of each individual. Every faculty member in this series should seek specific clarification from the department chair as to how the criteria will be weighted in his/her evaluation.
Academic Actions

In-Residence, Clinical X (Anesthesia) and Ladder Rank Series

Please refer to the following list of terms, then click on the link which indicates the action you are eligible for.

- "Promotion" as used throughout this process denotes an increase in rank (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor);
- "Merit" denotes an increase from one step to another step
  - "normal merit" is an increase to the next highest step (Step 1 to Step 2)
  - "accelerated" means either a step increase which will be awarded earlier than normal, or a step increase which will skip an intermediate step (Step 1 to Step 3)

- Promotion
- Appointment
- Merit
  - Normal
  - Accelerated to the Next step
  - Accelerated Beyond one step
  - Professors, step 5 to 6
  - Professors step 9 to above scale
- Change in Series
- Appraisal of Achievement and Promise
PROMOTIONS

Effective: July 1, 2003

In-Residence, Clinical X (Anesthesia) and Ladder Rank Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A

- Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
- In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
- Print out the form.
- Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae

- Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
- Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
- Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
- Print your CV.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 5 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).

- Enter your information in the file.

- Print the file.

- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
Merits and Promotions

NORMAL MERITS & ACCELERATED MERIT TO NEXT STEP

Effective: July 1, 2003

In-Residence, Clinical X (Anesthesia) and Ladder Rank Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A

   • Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   
   • In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   
   • Print out the form.
   
   • Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae

   • Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   
   • Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   
   • Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   
   • Print your CV.
   
   • Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   
   4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.

6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees: Not required for normal merits and accelerated merits to the next step

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested

5. Recap
   - Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
   - Enter your information in the file.
   - Print the file.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at [http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso](http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso). Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees **full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address**.

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).

- Enter your information in the file.

- Print the file.

- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
MERITS: PROFESSOR, STEP 5 & 6
AND PROFESSOR 9 TO ABOVE SCALE

Effective: July 1, 2003

In-Residence, Clinical X (Anesthesia) and Ladder Rank Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work).
See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.

6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees **full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.**

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
- Enter your information in the file.
- Print the file.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
CHANGE IN SERIES

Effective: July 1, 2003

In-Residence, Clinical X (Anesthesia) and Ladder Rank Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A

   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae

   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
   6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Biography

A biography form is required for this change of series. It is not included in the files you download. It will be sent to you by the Academic Personnel Office as an email attachment. Please complete it as thoroughly as possible and send it by return email. Note that the address lines on the first page are very small, so please use appropriate abbreviations to keep your entries short and avoid generating extra pages in the form.

4. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

- Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.
  
  a) 3 intramural referees
  
  b) 3 extramural referees

5. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

6. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).

- Enter your information in the file.

- Print the file.

- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

7. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). (Not required for advancement from Step1 to Step2). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.

Now that you have completed the above steps, please assemble your printouts from the above steps in the same order as listed above and send the packet of printed materials to the Academic Personnel Office -- Box 0648.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:
   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom, left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
   6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees
Enter referee's information online at [http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso](http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso). Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

Please include referees **full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address**.

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. **Formal summary course evaluations** will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. **Recap**

   - Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
   
   - Enter your information in the file.
   
   - Print the file.

6. **Evidence of Creative Activity** - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.

Now that you have completed the above steps, Please assemble your printouts from the above steps in the same order as listed above and send the packet of printed materials to the Academic Personnel Office -- Box 0648.
Academic Actions

Clinical Series

Please refer to the following list of terms, then click on the link which indicates the action you are eligible for.

- "Promotion" as used throughout this process denotes an increase in rank (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor);
- "Merit" denotes an increase from one step to another step
  - "normal merit" is an increase to the next highest step (Step 1 to Step 2)
  - "accelerated" means either a step increase which will be awarded earlier than normal, or a step increase which will skip an intermediate step (Step 1 to Step 3)

- **Promotion**
- **Appointment**
- **Merit**
  - **Normal**
  - **Accelerated to the Next step**
  - **Accelerated Beyond one step**
  - **Professors, step 5 to 6**
  - **Professors step 9 to above scale**
- **Change in Series**
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:
   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees

Enter referee’s information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

a) 3 intramural referees
b) 5 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
- Enter your information in the file.
- Print the file.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
NORMAL MERITS & ACCELERATED MERITS TO NEXT STEP

Effective: July 1, 2003

Clinical Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees -- *Not required for normal merits and accelerated merits to the next step*

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
- Enter your information in the file.
- Print the file.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees

Enter referee’s information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefreques t.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees **full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.**

   a) 3 intramural referees

   b) 3 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

   - Open the file called **Recap** (found in the **Merits and Promotions Materials** folder on your desktop).

   - Enter your information in the file.

   - Print the file.

   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates

2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only

3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.

4. Description of clinical activities.

5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
- Enter your information in the file.
- Print the file.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Biography
A biography form is required for this change of series. It is not included in the files you download. It will be sent to you by the Academic Personnel Office as an email attachment. Please complete it as thoroughly as possible and send it by return email. Note that the address lines on the first page are very small, so please use appropriate abbreviations to keep your entries short and avoid generating extra pages in the form.

4. Referees
Enter referee’s information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

a) 3 intramural referees
b) 3 extramural referees

5. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

6. Recap
- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
- Enter your information in the file.
- Print the file.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
Academic Actions

Adjunct Series

Please refer to the following list of terms, then click on the link which indicates the action you are eligible for.

- "Promotion" as used throughout this process denotes an increase in rank (Assistant, Associate, Full Professor);
- "Merit" denotes an increase from one step to another step
  - "normal merit" is an increase to the next highest step (Step 1 to Step 2)
  - "accelerated" means either a step increase which will be awarded earlier than normal, or a step increase which will skip an intermediate step (Step 1 to Step 3)

- **Promotion**
- **Appointment**
- **Merit**
  - **Normal**
  - **Accelerated to the Next step**
  - **Accelerated Beyond one step**
  - **Professors, step 5 to 6**
  - **Professors step 9 to above scale**
- **Change in Series**
PROMOTIONS
Effective: July 1, 2003
Adjunct Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

*The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:*

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 5 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).

- Enter your information in the file.

- Print the file.

- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
NORMAL MERITS & ACCELERATED MERIT TO NEXT STEP

Effective: July 1, 2003

Adjunct Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Referees: *Not required for normal merits and accelerated merits to the next step*

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap
   - Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
   - Enter your information in the file.
   - Print the file.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.
ACCELERATED MERITS BEYOND 1 STEP

Effective: July 1, 2003

Adjunct Series

First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A

   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae

   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
   6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).

- Enter your information in the file.

- Print the file.

- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
   6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Referees

Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefquest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees **full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.**

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. **Formal summary course evaluations** will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
- Enter your information in the file.
- Print the file.
- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. **Evidence of Creative Activity** - 5 representative reprints (**one set only**). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

   The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

   1. Employment history, with dates
   2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
   3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
   4. Description of clinical activities.
   5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work).
See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.

6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.

3. Referees

Enter referee’s information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees **full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.**

a) 3 intramural referees

b) 3 extramural referees

4. **Formal summary course evaluations** will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

5. Recap

- Open the file called Recap (found in the **Merits and Promotions Materials** folder on your desktop).

- Enter your information in the file.

- Print the file.

- Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. **Evidence of Creative Activity** - 5 representative reprints (**one set only**). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.
First download a set of Microsoft Word files to your desktop. These will appear in a new folder on your desktop called "Merits and Promotions Materials." You will use these files to complete the application process. Also, print a copy of this checklist for easy reference. If you have trouble downloading these files from this site, please contact Anesthesia Information Technology.

1. Addendum: Attachment A
   - Open the Document "Attachment A" (found in the "Merits and Promotions Materials" folder on your desktop).
   - In Microsoft Word, complete the document with your personal information.
   - Print out the form.
   - Sign and date form.

2. Curriculum Vitae
   - Reference the sample CV found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop; your own CV should follow the same format and order of categories as the sample.
   - Read the document called CV Tips (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop). This can be printed for easy reference.
   - Open the file CV Template (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop), and complete the template with your own information.
   - Print your CV.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

The following items must be included in the curriculum vitae:

1. Employment history, with dates
2. Date at bottom left corner of 1st page only
3. A one-page description of your current teaching responsibilities and summarizing past, current and anticipated teaching hours. Reference this list of courses taught in the Department of Anesthesia.
4. Description of clinical activities.
5. A one-page description of current research program. List five most significant recent publications (where co-authored, please indicate nature of your contribution to work). See sample CV on how to cross-reference Most Significant Publications to Bibliography.
6. Research funding: name of source, dollar amount, year(s) of funding if applicable.
3. Biography
A biography form is required for this change of series. It is not included in the files you download. It will be sent to you by the Academic Personnel Office as an email attachment. Please complete it as thoroughly as possible and send it by return email. Note that the address lines on the first page are very small, so please use appropriate abbreviations to keep your entries short and avoid generating extra pages in the form.

4. Referees
Enter referee's information online at http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/internal/fac/merits/mp/mprefrequest.lasso. Obtain your employee ID number before you begin as it will be required to associate your referees with your merit or promotion action. **DO NOT send your referee information by email or printed list - Academic Affairs accepts referees only by online submission.**

Please include referees full name, title(s), address, phone/fax numbers, and email address.

   a) 3 intramural referees

   b) 3 extramural referees

5. Formal summary course evaluations will be obtained by the Academic Personnel Unit from E-Value. Additional letters of evaluation may be requested.

6. Recap
   - Open the file called Recap (found in the Merits and Promotions Materials folder on your desktop).
   - Enter your information in the file.
   - Print the file.
   - Send one copy with your packet and one copy by email attachment to the appropriate party, see the bottom of this page for email links.

6. Evidence of Creative Activity - 5 representative reprints (one set only). Include a self-addressed envelope (required) to return reprints.

Now that you have completed the above steps, please assemble your printouts

Suggestions/Comments to: AIT Group
Anesthesia Information Technology
521 Parnassus Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94143-0648
http://anesthesia.ucsf.edu/fac/merits/
Appendix Seven

AAMC Recommendations
Increasing Women’s Leadership in Academic Medicine: 
Report of the AAMC Project Implementation Committee

Janet Bickel, Diane Wara, M.D., Barbara F. Atkinson, M.D., Lawrence S. Cohen, M.D., Michael Dunn, M.D., Sharon Hostler, M.D., Timothy R. B. Johnson, M.D., Page Morahan, Ph.D., Arthur H. Rubenstein, M.D., George F. Sheldon, M.D, and Emma Stokes, Ph.D.

The authors are the members, staff and resource persons of the AAMC’s Increasing Women’s Leadership in Academic Medicine Project Implementation Committee.

Correspondence should be addressed to Janet Bickel, Associate Vice President for Medical School Affairs, AAMC, 2450 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, jbickel@aamc.org.

[NOTE: AAMC’s Executive Council approved this Report on 2/28/02; it will be published in Academic Medicine in October 2002].

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AAMC’s Increasing Women Leadership Project Implementation Committee examined four years of data collected from schools on the representation of women faculty and leaders, results of interviews with department chairs, and new research from other sectors on the advancement of women. With women comprising only 14% of tenured faculty and 12% of full professors, the Committee concludes that the progress achieved within academic medicine over the last 25 years is incomplete and inadequate. Few schools, hospitals, or professional societies have what might be considered a “critical mass” of women leaders, and the pool of women from which to recruit academic leaders remains small. Scientific and medical careers involve considerable personal and public investment, but the potential of most women is being wasted.

Because academic medicine needs all the leadership talent it can develop to address accelerating institutional and societal needs, this wastage is of growing not receding importance. Only those institutions able to recruit and retain women will likely maintain the best house staff and faculty. The long-term success of academic health centers is thus inextricably linked to the development of women leaders.

The Committee therefore recommends that medical schools, teaching hospitals, and academic societies focus on the following opportunities: 1) Emphasize faculty diversity in departmental reviews, evaluating department chairs on their development of women faculty; 2) Target the professional development needs of women within the context of helping all faculty make the most of their faculty appointment, including guidance for men to become more effective mentors of women; 3) Assess which institutional practices tend to favor men over women’s professional development, such as defining “academic success” as largely an independent act and rewarding unrestricted availability to work (i.e., neglect of personal life); 4) Enhance the effectiveness of search committees to attract women candidates, including assessment of group process and of how candidates’ qualifications are defined and evaluated; and 5) Financially support institutional Women in Medicine programs and the AAMC Women Liaison Officer and regularly monitor the representation of women at senior ranks.

BACKGROUND

In 1996, AAMC approved the report of its Increasing Women’s Leadership in Academic Medicine Project Committee. President Jordan J. Cohen charged an Implementation Committee with prioritizing the 15 recommendations (Appendix 1) and working to advance them.

At the outset this Committee recognized that: 1) The number of women entering medical school has led to the premature conclusion that gender equity has been achieved; 2) Drawing a circle around difficulties specific to women’s advancement is impossible because men and women’s professional development goals and needs are more alike than different; 3) Few medical schools treat faculty as human resources to be retained and developed, thus a framework is often
lacking for improving faculty professional development in general; and 4) The paucity of research on leadership development and executive selection in academic medicine means that a framework is also lacking for understanding how best to improve women’s leadership development.

But these complexities need not deter medical schools, teaching hospitals, and academic societies from further work to increase the number of women leaders. The 1996 Report presented the rationale as: 1) principles (the right thing to do); 2) pragmatic (the smart thing to do) and 3) prevention (of litigation and the loss of women’s talents). The Project Implementation Committee finds the second of these to be the most persuasive: an effective business strategy includes the development of women leaders as central to the long-term financial success of the medical center.

METHODS

While the Implementation Committee found value in virtually all of the original recommendations (Appendix 1), its data-gathering efforts centered primarily around two.

First, for the last 4 years the Implementation Committee collected from dean’s offices (via an AAMC President’s Memo) data on the representation of women; on average 95% of schools responded. Annual publication of results from this ‘benchmarking survey’ has encouraged schools to monitor these data themselves and to compare their statistics with national averages.

Second, since the goal of increasing women’s leadership is hindered by a lack of understanding of the role of department chair, the Committee recommended a qualitative study of chairs’ leadership challenges. Funding was obtained from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to support an experienced investigator’s inductive analysis of open-ended, in-depth interviews with a sample of 34 chairs and two division chiefs. While the stated focus of the study was chairs’ leadership challenges, the sample was drawn to also facilitate study of chairs’ views of how to increase women’s leadership and of differences between women and men chairs’ leadership challenges. Accordingly, three specialties were chosen to include an adequate number of women chairs (i.e., family medicine, pathology, ob-gyn) as well as two specialties with a high-profile role in academic medicine (i.e., medicine and surgery) (in order to increase the number of female surgeons in the sample, two division chiefs were interviewed along with the chairs). Within each specialty, individuals were also chosen to achieve balance with regard to geographic locale, longevity in the position, and public/private sponsorship of the institution.

Other information-gathering methods utilized by the Committee included: examination of medical schools’ Women in Medicine (WIM) initiatives and faculty mentoring programs; review of new research on women’s advancement in academic medicine and other sectors and professions; and consultations with experts on gender vis-a-vis organizational change, leadership development programs, and the executive search process.

RESULTS

The results of this information-gathering are organized as follows: 1) Data from AAMC Sources and Benchmarking Surveys; 2) Results from Department Chair Interviews; 3) Results of Recent Research on Women’s Careers; and 4) Medical School Women in Medicine (WIM) Programs and Initiatives.

Data from AAMC Sources and Benchmarking Surveys

Table 1 compares women faculty data from 2001 with the 1995 data from the previous AAMC report. The proportion of full-time medical school women faculty increased from 25% to 28%. The proportion of full professors who are women grew from 10% to 12%. However, although women now comprise close to half of medical students (45%) and instructors (46%), on average there are still only 21 women full professors per medical school (i.e., about 1 per
department including both non-tenured and basic sciences faculty) compared to 161 men at this rank.

Dramatic differences among departments also remain, with internal medicine, surgery and the surgical subspecialties particularly lagging at the professor rank. In emergency medicine, otolaryngology and orthopedic surgery, the proportion of professors who are women actually declined—from 11% to 6%, 8% to 7%, and 2% to 1% respectively.

Not shown in the Table, the percent of tenured faculty (all ranks) who are women is 14%--a decline from 15% in 1995. Between 1995 and 2001, the percent of women who are tenured dropped from 14% to 12%, about the same proportional decline as the percent of men tenured (32% to 28%). Faculty Roster System data also reveal that, while the faculty attrition rate has been declining slightly since 1980, the average annual rate of women faculty attrition (9.1%) still exceeds that of men (7.7%).

With regard to the distribution of men and women across faculty ranks, these proportions have remained quite stable at all ranks over at least the last 20 years. In 2001, 10.9% of women and 30.9% of men are full professors; 19% and 24%, associate professors; 50% and 36%, assistant professors; 19% and 8% instructors (remainder missing). In 1985, 9.9% of women and 31.5% of men were full professors; thus it has taken over 15 years for the proportion of women faculty who are professors to increase a whole percent.

Such snapshots are not as telling as cohort analyses. A study of all women and a sample of men physician faculty appointed in 1980 at US medical schools found that eleven years later, 83% of men compared to 59% of women had achieved associate or full professor rank; 23% of men and only 5% of women had achieved full professor rank. These men and women reported the same degree of preparation for an academic career in terms of board certification, advanced degrees and research during fellowship training. But women were less likely to have office or laboratory space, protected time for research, or to have begun their faculty careers with grant support. These women worked about 10% fewer hours per week and had fewer publications than their male counterparts; however, even after adjustment for these factors, they remained substantially less likely to be promoted.

A more recent analysis limited to Faculty Roster System data on all U.S. medical school faculty from 1979 and 1993 found that 36% of "eligible" men on tenure-track (that is assistant professors for at least two years) were promoted to associate professor compared to 24% of women. On non-tenure tracks, 18% of eligible men and 10% of women were promoted to associate professor. Disparities from associate to full professor were not as great, suggesting that promotion from assistant to associate professor is the critical career event for women. Another important finding was that women medical school graduates are no longer more likely than men to become full-time faculty.

With regard to academic administrative roles, in 2001 women chair approximately 214 departments (91 basic science and 123 clinical departments) (including interim/acting chairs), which is about 8% of all medical school chairs. Departments with the largest number of women chairs include microbiology, pathology, anesthesiology, family medicine, obstetrics/gynecology, and pediatrics (Table 1). In 1995 only 115 women chaired a department. However, 214 makes an average of just 1.7 per medical school, and at least 20 of 125 medical schools have no women chairs (most of these have never had one).

The number of women assistant, associate, and senior associate deans now total approximately 422 (an average of three per school); three schools had no woman in a decanal position. As of July 2002, women hold deanships at eight of the 125 U.S. medical schools (2 are interim).
Results from Department Chair Interviews

Chairs universally acknowledged the existence of barriers to the advancement of women and proposed a spectrum of approaches to address them, requiring individual as well as institutional action. The chairs’ explanations for the continuing scarcity of women leaders centered around constraints of traditional gender roles, manifestations of sexism in the medical environment, and lack of effective mentors. Their suggested strategies ranged from one-on-one interventions (e.g., confronting instances of bias, advising women on selecting mentors) to institutional changes such as extending probationary periods, instituting mechanisms for responding to unprofessional behavior, and establishing mentoring networks across the university.

The other gender-related findings from the interviews is that, once on the job, women chairs face challenges that men do not, particularly: lack of recognition, inappropriate attention paid to them, resistance reporting to them, and constraints on their leadership and decision-making styles. The following quotes (all from women chairs) illustrate these challenges: 1) “A woman has a harder time getting the floor. And when she starts talking, the degree to which people are listening versus preparing their rebuttal or signing their charts, goes way out of whack. There’s still condescension.” 2) “Women are never taken as seriously. . .[I] present ideas, and nobody says anything. But six months later a male colleague presents the exact same thing and wow, it’s the greatest idea.” 3) “For a man having a female boss is threatening. . . or just a feeling of failure….If my boss is a woman, what does this say about me?” 4) “When you become dictatorial then you really are on the outs. If you raise your voice as a woman you’re a bitch. You do that as a man and it’s kind of like he’s having a bad day.” 5) “Women are often perceived as not being tough enough for these jobs. And so I think you have to show that you can be tough. But I also am very conscious that I have much more of a kind of interactive and negotiated approach to solving problems and some of that is, I think, more characteristic of women in leadership positions”. This last observation was echoed in a positive vein by many men chairs describing women’s leadership for instance as: “a more collaborative decision-making process,” “managing the interpersonal dimension of a problem in a meaningful way,” and “better at bringing a group to consensus.”

Recent Research on Women’s Careers

Since the last comprehensive status report on women in academic medicine was published, numerous new studies have elucidated gender differences in advancement (Appendix 2 summarizes many of these). Key points include:

*Women face many more challenges than men in obtaining career-advancing mentoring, such that they frequently lack “social capital” and hence essential information; this isolation further reduces their capacity for risk-taking, often translating into a reluctance to pursue professional goals or a protective response such as niche work or perfectionism (the obverse strategy of identifying a hot topic).*

*Many men have difficulty effectively mentoring women (as whites do ethnic minorities); a contemporary approach to mentoring builds on the recognition that styles and advice that worked for the mentor may not work for their proteges.*

*Without being conscious of their “mental models” of gender, both men and women still tend to devalue women’s work and to allow women a narrower band of assertive behavior. These cumulative disadvantages combine with women’s “surplus visibility” such that women who make mistakes are less likely than men in similar circumstances to be given a second chance.*

*Women physicians face more difficulties than men in garnering help from nurses and in controlling their work lives (e.g. patient load, office scheduling) and are more likely to burnout. They continue to earn significantly less for the same work.*
It is also now clear that strategies aimed primarily at “fixing women” can only achieve partial results. Strategies to promote women must also target features of the work culture that may be “simply the norm” but that disadvantage women. The National Science Foundation, convinced that only institutional transformations will remove barriers to women scientists’ advancement, has initiated a new grant program to encourage such institutional-level policy change, e.g. reconfiguring the tenure track. The most prestigious law schools have studied why only 16% of partners are women and concluded that firms need to: measure the cost of turnover; track the numbers of men and women promoted; conduct confidential postdeparture interviews with each lawyer the firm regrets losing; survey clients on their priorities and definition of quality; and support the choice to work reduced hours and create career path flexibility. The corporate world has been faster than academia and the professions to move along these lines. For instance, Bestfoods, a major multinational, is engaged in an organizational change process led by the CEO to develop women leadership. The urgency of the problem of high turnover of women led Deloitte & Touche’s CEO in 1991 to create an Initiative for the Retention and Advancement of Women, which has tripled the percentage of women partners. The CEO states that “the changes are by no means complete...but we have opened our eyes to differences in style that go beyond gender to include culture... Although this Initiative has made managing more complicated, the benefits are substantial: greater creativity, and greater performance for our clients.

Medical Schools’ WIM Programs & Initiatives

How are medical schools facilitating the development of women faculty? Only 13% of medical schools have a formal women faculty organization; an additional 31% have an informal one (both types vary greatly in scope and characteristics). Thus, at over half of U.S. medical schools, no locus exists for activities supporting women’s professional development.

For the last 25 years, almost all medical schools have appointed one or two AAMC Women Liaison Officers (WLO). However, support for this position and related activity is often lacking. At only 36% of schools does someone’s job description include staffing or overseeing the WIM function. Since most schools have been experiencing secretarial and other staff cuts and and since measures to increase clinical productivity amount to disincentives for volunteering time, this lack of designated responsibility almost ensures lack of coordination and of continuity of WIM programs. At 69% of schools, the dean’s office allocates some annual funding for WIM (for example, to fund an event to bring women students and faculty together or to support selected women to attend an AAMC women faculty professional development seminar). Thus at about a third of schools, there is no financial support from the dean’s office.

AAMC’s benchmarking survey also found that at least 40% of schools have conducted a salary equity study in the past 5 years. A number of schools reported that their studies revealed no disparities, but a greater number found unexplainable gender-related differences. Schools correcting the inequities found that a relatively small amount of money could “buy” disproportionate increases in the morale of the women faculty.

The most comprehensive analysis to date of initiatives to develop women faculty examined the seven medical schools identified by the DHHS as Centers of Excellence (COE) in Women’s Health. Commonalties among these schools included conducting an assessment to identify issues of greatest concern to women faculty and targeting programs at those needs and ensuring the representation of women on institutional committees. These schools also focused on improvements not specific to women: heightening department chairs’ focus on faculty development needs, preparing educational materials on promotion and tenure procedures, improving parental leave policies, allowing temporary stops on the tenure probationary clock and a less than full-time interval without permanent penalty, and conducting exit interviews with

1 About 241 of the 377 COTH members and 28 of the 95 CAS members have appointed a WLO.
departing faculty. Beyond faculty utilization of these programs and options, these schools regularly evaluate their initiatives by comparing recruitment, retention and promotion of women and men faculty and by conducting faculty satisfaction and salary equity studies. Surveying faculty about their career development experiences and their perceptions of the environment, comparing the responses of men and women, and presenting the results to faculty and administrators have proved particularly useful. As other schools have found as well, this process establishes a baseline, builds institutional support and guides initiatives. In all this work the support of the top leadership has been instrumental.

Only the Department of Medicine at Johns Hopkins has comprehensively evaluated its interventions to increase the number of women succeeding in the department. A follow-up three years after the interventions began revealed that a 66% increase in the proportion of women expecting to remain in academic medicine and a unexpected 57% increase in the proportion of men expecting to. Moreover, the number of women at the associate professor level increased from 4 to 26, with no change in promotion criteria. But as Dr. Emma Stokes (the department's organizational development specialist) explains: “Improvements do not last unless you address the culture.” Under the aegis of the departmental mission to “foster a collegial work environment that promotes the success and well-being of faculty, staff, students and patients,” efforts at Hopkins continue, guided by “insights about the links between gender bias and expensive turnover and poor productivity.”

KEY FINDINGS

On the one hand the numbers of women faculty, department chairs and deans have never been higher. However, this growth has not substantially reduced gender differences in advancement or sufficiently strengthened the pool of women candidates for administrative positions. Thus, the progress achieved over the last 25 years is incomplete and inadequate. Few schools, hospitals, or professional societies have a “critical mass” of women leaders. And the pool from which to recruit women academic leaders remains shallow. Moreover, for the first time in recent history, young women physicians are not more likely than men to become full-time faculty; women’s interest in an academic career is diminishing more than men’s during residency training and the attrition rate of women faculty exceeds that of men. DeAngelis has speculated that the reasons for women’s diminishment of interest in an academic appointment include disheartenment at the paucity of women in positions of power. Many women physicians and scientists in their 40’s and older, especially those in academics, are losing faith that equity beyond graduate education will ever be achieved. Even when they achieve leadership roles, women still experience more resistance to reporting to them and more constraints on their decision-making and leadership styles.

Ironically, at the same time, most male physicians and medical students are concluding that equal opportunity is now or soon will be a reality. And many young women, surrounded by women peers and unaware of their predecessors’ struggles, are assuming that women may be freely choosing to reap fewer rewards than men for their work but that they themselves won’t have to settle for less. Thus, impetus for change is lacking, as the women who are leaving academic medicine—or simply not gaining promotion—tend to be invisible.

Medicine and science have not realized and are not currently realizing the full value of their investment in women. Scientific and medical careers involve considerable personal and public resources, but the leadership potential of most women continues to be wasted. This is a collective loss—all the more unaffordable given the leadership challenges facing medicine.

There are both short- and long-term payoffs for academic health centers that capitalize on women's intellectual capital. For instance, women leaders are essential to the effective marketing of a women's health initiative. And beyond women's health per se, patients are seeking women surgeons and subspecialists, as students are seeking women role models in these fields. As women
constitute an increasing proportion of students, only those institutions able to recruit and retain women in all departments will have the best house staff, faculty and administrators. And strong women will attract other strong women; the absence of women in key positions is a negative signal to women candidates.

In natural systems, as diversity increases, so does stability and resilience. The corporate world has been quicker than academia to recognize such benefits. Moreover, evidence is accumulating that diverse teams outperform homogenous ones. Exposure to diverse colleagues helps managers make better decisions and cultivate new ideas by drawing on a larger pool of information and experiences; diversified staff also help increase market share by facilitating marketing to an increasingly diversified customer base. Companies with reputations for good management of diversity are more successful in attracting and retaining top-quality employees (some of these link managers’ compensation to their success in recruiting and advancing women and minorities). Thus, diversity is good business. Companies with high ratings on equal employment opportunities outperform those with poor ratings on hiring and advancing women and minorities. Fortune 500 companies with the highest percent of women executives deliver earnings far in excess of the median compared to large firms with the fewest women. Even among IPOs (Initial Public Offerings) compared to those without women, companies with women in senior management received higher valuations (measured in terms of market price to book value per share) and performed better over the long haul.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are the Committee’s recommendations about the most salient opportunities in the work that remains:

1) Emphasize faculty diversity in departmental reviews, evaluating department chairs on their development of women faculty.

With regard to access to academic rewards, disadvantage is created and reinforced largely at the department level. Thus the department is the seat of change, with the department head the key. Chairs play many pivotal roles in faculty development, including integrating women and minorities into the department. But, as MIT’s investigation of senior faculty revealed, non-democratic practices and cronyism in many departments translate into women’s having fewer academic resources than men.

Suggested actions include questioning candidates for the position of chair on how they have handled and plan to handle gender equity and faculty development responsibilities (Appendix 3 includes examples of such questions). Dean’s executive meetings with chairs can regularly focus on women faculty development, perhaps built around a case study and facilitated by the faculty affairs administrator or by an organizational development expert. Finally, departmental reviews afford a critical opportunity to emphasize diversity issues: how effectively is the chair recruiting and developing women and minority faculty, serving as a role models for the role models, planning for his or her succession? Two reinforcements would optimize this strategy: 1) award chairs who achieve diversity goals a bonus or some important form of recognition; 2) offer chairs having difficulties developing a diverse workforce a safe place to acknowledge their developmental needs and to build skills. An organizational development expert (a change facilitator) and an ombudsperson (a neutral complaint handler) can both be very useful in this work.

2) Target the professional development needs of women within the context of helping all faculty make the most of their faculty appointment, including guidance for men to become more effective mentors of women.
Compared to men, women face more challenges obtaining career advising, mentoring, and time for scholarly activities, and are at greater risk of burnout. Of all faculty subgroups, junior women clinicians appear most at risk for not realizing their professional potentials; and within this subgroup, minority women face additional challenges.

These needs are best addressed within the context of general faculty development. A human resource and “talent management” approach would facilitate faculty members’ achieving both their own and their institution’s goals. But at too many schools this context is lacking; no medical school currently has what might be considered a comprehensive faculty development system. Since the costs of turnover and recruitment in most cases greatly exceed the costs of faculty development (see Appendix 4), institutional resources are being wasted.

A healthy empowered faculty is necessary for sustained productivity—unlikely unless the medical school invests in its workforce. The development of human capital translates into financial capital; an American Management Association study found a remarkably strong correlation between training budgets and profits. A number of schools now do offer advising and mentoring programs, including handbooks and agreements, designed to assist chairs and senior faculty in meeting career advising responsibilities (Appendix 5). One way to reinforce the importance of mentoring junior faculty is to evaluate senior faculty on this dimension. Handbooks and discussion sessions can assist men lacking experience or success in mentoring women to improve their skills.

3) Assess which institutional practices tend to favor men over women's professional development, such as defining “academic success” as largely an independent act and rewarding unrestricted availability to work (i.e., neglect of personal life).

Reality is socially constructed in every culture such that the group with the most control over the resources finds its own view most accurately reflected in the institutions it creates. Thus, while many organizational practices may appear to be “simply the norm,” they do not reflect the experiences of most women, so most women will not “measure up” as easily as men do. For instance, medicine tends to over-value heroic individualism compared to the largely invisible work of preventing crises and maintaining relationships. Since women faculty tend to be doing the less visible, collaborative, relational work, their contributions remain under-recognized. Also, medical organizations tend to construct power hierarchically, as if it were a limited quantity at the top rather than an energy which expands when shared, as women are more likely to construct it.

The need to develop women faculty is not the only indicator that academic medicine should take a fresh look at certain practices. For example, though research is now team-based and multidisciplinary and an increasing percentage of clinical work depends on physicians’ partnerships with other health professionals, faculty promotion criteria still define “success” as largely an independent act that must attain national recognition via publication. These criteria actually divert emphasis from contributions to local missions and to collaborations. New models of mutuality are needed to recognize and reward contributions of all team members. Such methods would encourage collaborations among basic, population and clinical researchers and others by defining the contributions of the team and then dissecting the individual contribution of each member.

Another practice inviting re-examination is the devaluation of the scholarship of application, teaching and integration compared to “discovery” scholarship—even though excellent examples of expanding the traditional definition are now available. Many societal needs cannot be met by “discovery” scholarship alone. For instance with regard to the current diabetes epidemic, while discovery research on the molecular biology of diabetes is important, so is research on prevention, epidemiology, psychosocial dimensions, and family systems—research areas to which women are more often drawn than men. However, many investigations in these latter areas require qualitative or outcomes research (“soft science”) rather than randomized controlled trials (“hard science”). Unfortunately, researchers using qualitative and outcomes methods find fewer grant sources and
fewer places to publish.

Another norm deserving of reconsideration is unrestricted availability to work taken as evidence of commitment to the profession, in essence rewarding neglect of family and personal life.\footnote{\textsuperscript{65,66,67,68}} Many schools' tenure and promotion systems force unnecessary "either work or family" choices during the most critical childrearing years. Moreover, evidence is accumulating that work-home interference strongly contributes to the burnout of both women and men physicians (i.e., "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment.")\footnote{\textsuperscript{69}} As the upcoming generation is less willing than previous ones to sacrifice quality of life, academic medicine will lose both women and men if greater work-life balance is not achievable.\footnote{\textsuperscript{70}} Idiosyncratic "under the table" arrangements provide temporary fixes but leave each family to find its own solutions; creating widely available options is more efficient and innovative.\footnote{\textsuperscript{71}} Unfortunately little progress has been occurring in expanding on-site child care. Some medical schools have, however, been adding temporal flexibility to faculty tracks and creating promotion tracks for less-than-full-time faculty.

Practices for academic societies and teaching hospitals, as well as medical schools, to assess for gender-related effects also include: how committee assignments are distributed (women tend to be under-appointed to the most powerful committees), how candidates for leadership positions get nominated and how visiting professors are selected. Even apparently small changes can have important long-term effects.\footnote{\textsuperscript{72}} For instance, increasing the number of women visiting professors can improve their visibility and recruitability. But such efforts cannot be one-time events. No organization would say "we did accounting last year, we don't need to do it again." Yet this is often how investment in learning new ways of working together are viewed, as one-time events rather than as ongoing processes.

4) Enhance the effectiveness of search committees to attract women candidates, including assessment of group process and of how candidates’ qualifications are defined and evaluated.

The comparatively low number of women faculty being “groomed” for leadership by a powerful mentor is a major contributor to the present difficulties institutions face in recruiting women leaders. But the frequently anachronistic nature of the search process itself also contributes--e.g., inappropriate preoccupation with candidates’ research credentials and lack of attention to group process issues. Improvement of the search process in general\footnote{\textsuperscript{73}} and educating search committees on pitfalls and opportunities in targeting women candidates can improve an institution’s recruitment of women. Suggested approaches include:

- Search committees should assess their processes and interview techniques for unintended gender bias. Committees tend to judge women candidates by different standards than they judge men. For instance, while sometimes veiling their intent, search committees may ask women candidates’ questions such as “Are you really sure this is right for your life?” and “Does your husband support your goals?” Interviewers are less likely to ask men such questions even though many have responsibilities and interests that might conflict with the position. Also, groups tend toward “homosocial reproduction”—that is, people tend to promote individuals who resemble them and with whom they feel comfortable. This “comfort factor” in selecting candidates for senior positions works against women; when a culture’s leadership is dominantly male, even highly qualified women may be viewed as “risky” simply because they do not look or sound like the traditional executive.\footnote{\textsuperscript{74}} Since members of search committees may not be aware that their “mental models” influence their decision-making, they need processes to facilitate self-examination with regard to their treatment of women and other minorities. An organizational development specialist or other skilled facilitator can assist committees in gaining objectivity, as well as in recognizing gaps between what committee members say they seek in candidates and how they actually behave.

- Committees need more than one respected woman because “token” members tend not to be taken seriously. In “skewed” groups (20% or less of persons from another social type),
tokens tend to lack clout and face loyalty tests, and any discrepant characteristics receive undue attention. Because of the paucity of women professors and because most already have so many institutional responsibilities, it may be necessary to expand eligibility requirements to include women associate professors.

- Search consultants can help increase the diversity of the candidate pool.

- The earlier partner/spouse relocation issues can be addressed, the better.

- Some institutions and departments are not ready for women leaders, i.e., there may be too much resistance or bias on the part of key players for the woman to succeed no matter what her qualifications. Savvy women look for environments where someone has already set a tone for women to become leaders. But recruiting a woman into an environment where she is almost bound to fail would harm both her career and the institution. Because so few women hold highly visible positions, their failures stand out more than men's failures, with negative memories lingering for years. Rather than "blaming" the women, institutions where such failures have recently occurred and schools with low success at recruiting and retaining women in senior positions might better investigate what institutional characteristics may be contributing factors.

- A strategy to increase the likelihood of a new woman leader's success (especially if the position has not been previously held by a woman) is to build into her recruitment package the services of a professional coach. Leadership development programs such as ELAM should also be explored.

Finally, AAMC's Faculty Roster System (FRS) Recruitment Assistance Service offers medical school search committees the option of requesting basic data (including mailing address) for specified categories of faculty (e.g., all women professors of surgery). FRS can also generate mailing labels for women chairs in any specialty, many of whom may know of possible women candidates in their fields. AAMC's WIM office maintains a listing of WIM specialty organizations which may serve as useful points of contact with potential women candidates in that field.

5) Financially support institutional Women in Medicine programs and the AAMC Women Liaison Officer and regularly monitor the representation of women at senior ranks.

Active WLOs and WIM programs add value to their institution. Long-standing WIM programs (whether the locus is a faculty organization, dean's committee, office, or an outgrowth of one department) contribute initiatives and energy far beyond the scope of "women's issues"—an inaccurate label in any case. For instance, at many schools, WIM programs have focused on improving professionalism, mentoring, promotion and tenure policies, and leadership skill development. But too many WIM programs depend solely upon volunteered time, meaning they are always in jeopardy. Financial support is a necessary but not sufficient ingredient of effective initiatives. Other ingredients are a respected leader's commitment, a strong women faculty organization with multiple sources of energy, and the assistance of an organizational development expert or other change-facilitator.

Schools lacking a WIM focus now have numerous examples of how to create and sustain one. Schools with established programs should be evaluating them and considering how to extend improvements.

What organizations measure they tend to improve. The Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) now requires schools undergoing a full accreditation survey to document the number of women faculty across academic ranks. Since 1997, AAMC's collection and publication of school-identified data on the representation of women have been stimulating schools to monitor where they stand in relation to the national mean. AAMC will continue this practice, as well as
offering tailored Institutional Profile System institutional ranking reports on the representation of women.

Other tools include:

- Building a salary and promotion database that can be reviewed annually; such a database would greatly facilitate gender equity studies.
- Surveying faculty on their career development experiences and needs and on morale issues, comparing responses of men and women and comparing departments (AAMC has a number of examples of such instruments).
- In departments with enduring problems with recruitment, retention or advancement of women faculty, conduct focus groups to probe difficulties and identify change strategies.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of all these recommendations depends on the leadership of the dean and other senior administrators of the institution. In Table 2 the Committee offers a variety of tools for assessing and monitoring interventions under each of the above recommendations.

The long-term success of academic health centers is inextricable from the development of women leaders. As Jordan Cohen recently stated: “Cultivating diversity in our faculty and in our leadership is an indispensable strategic instrument for meeting the challenges that academic medicine faces in the 21st century. Grooming women for leadership positions and eradicating the barriers currently impeding their success are essential components of this strategy. Those institutions that fail to seize the advantages offered by elevating talented women to positions of power are destined to be eclipsed by those that do.”
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Appendix 1: Recommendations of Original Increasing Women’s Leadership in Academic Medicine Project Committee
Note: Italicized recommendations are those selected by the Implementation Committee for greatest emphasis. Numbers in parenthesis refers to the objective under which the recommended task appears in Project Committee Report:

(1) developing and mentoring women faculty, administrators, residents and students;
(2) improving pathways to leadership and leadership development;
(3) fostering readiness to change.

I) Tasks for Academic Medical Leaders/Institutions:

A) create mentoring and professional development programs, open to all with special focus on needs/concerns of women faculty (1)

B) add temporal flexibility to resident and fellow training opportunities and faculty promotion policies (1)

C) improve resources which support family roles, e.g., child care centers (1)

D) offer assistance to job candidate partners (1)

E) support the work of AAMC Women Liaison Officers and women faculty organizations/committees (1)

F) monitor representation of women at senior ranks and on major committees (to include summary report to governance, showing the hiring/promotion of men and women faculty by track) (1)

G) model highest standards of professionalism and assure that meeting these standards is explicit part of evaluation process of all members of academic community (perhaps with values articulated in mission statement) (1)

H) evaluate faculty and administrators on abuse of power (1)

I) encourage search committees to make extra efforts to identify women candidates (2)

J) provide guidance to search committees regarding evaluation of women and minority candidates (2)

K) encourage important committees to undertake training in conflict management, to engage in discussion of leadership styles, and to examine gender stereotypes, in particular, how the same words may be viewed differently depending on the sex of the actor (2)

L) when recruiting department heads, place more emphasis on management/nurturance of faculty/residents and on team-building skills (2)

M) provide training in management/nurturance of faculty/residents and in team-building skills for current department heads/administrators (2)

N) hold chairs accountable for accomplishment of goals (such as career guidance to junior faculty/residents and in proportion of women faculty promoted) (2)

O) incorporate these issues/recommendations into strategic planning efforts (with the goals of assuring professionalism and excellence and of meeting social contracts) and in self assessments (with a focus on achieving stated missions and evaluating staff/students perceptions of the learning and organizational climate) (3)
II) **Tasks for AAMC:**

A) continue professional development seminars (1) [15th Early Career and 8th Senior/Mid-Career Women Faculty Professional Development Seminars held in 2001]

B) publish resource guide (1) [Enhancing the Environment for Women in Academic Medicine: Resources and Pathways [http://www.aamc.org/about/progemph/wommed/wimguide/start.htm]

C) develop speaker's bureau (1) [ongoing]

D) offer assistance and consultation to institutions in developing strategies/seminars (1) [ongoing]

E) *interview women department chairs regarding factors critical to their success and advice they would give younger colleagues aspiring to major administrative posts (2) [see Methods section]*

F) interview major search firm heads to garner perspectives on finding/placing women candidates (2) [discovered to be unfeasible except for meeting with one managing partner]

G) create a leadership development seminar, targeted at senior faculty and administrators, for building an institutional focus on faculty development (focus on overcoming gender-related communication barriers, managing change and building teams) (2) [session included in Executive Development Seminar]

H) provide assistance to institutions in developing local and regional leadership development workshops targeted at administrators and department heads (2) [as requested]

I) create National Leadership Honor Society (NLHS) to encourage/award students who distinguish themselves as values-based, service-oriented leaders (2) [the Committee was not attracted to the idea of creating a special society]

J) continue efforts to increase the number of women at AAMC's executive and management staff levels, on its committees and within its governance (3) [increases have been accomplished]

K) integrate Project Committee's recommendations into ongoing programs and strategic planning (3) [insufficient progress]

L) consider and create opportunities for interdisciplinary discussion among AAMC Administrative Boards and among other AAMC constituent groups (3) [insufficient progress]

M) via LCME, examine gender breakdowns of faculty data by promotion and hiring rates and by rank and tenure and of membership on major committees and encourage institutions to conduct salary equity studies and self-assessments of gender climate and faculty development needs (3) [as of 2001 LCME asks site-visited schools for faculty gender data by academic rank]

N) make available to institutions tools for these types of assessments (3) [ongoing].
Appendix 2: Results of Recent Research on Women’s Careers

A) Academic Advancement

- Cross-sectional studies have largely corroborated findings of cohort analyses showing that women reap fewer rewards than men in terms of academic rank and compensation, even after adjustments for specialty, hours worked and other variables. Studies of plastic surgeons and cardiothoracic surgeons found no gender differences in background, hours worked or professional activities, but women made lower salaries and women in academics held lower rank and were less likely to be tenured. A survey of academic pediatricians found that compared to men, women spent more time in teaching and patient care and less in research, had less institutional support for research and less adequate mentorship, and were less academically productive; adjustment for all independent variables did not eliminate gender differences in salary. A study of surgeons in one large department found that women faculty were far less likely than the men to believe that clerical support, technical support and non-research start-up funds were adequate; even though these women were more likely than the men to have extramural funding, they published less.

- MIT investigated differences in resources allotted to men and women professors. Findings included: “Marginalization increases as women progress, accompanied by differences in salary, space, awards, and offers from outside...Even though each new generation began by believing that gender discrimination was solved in the previous generation, the pattern repeats itself...Problems especially flourish in departments with non-democratic practices, i.e., administrative procedures whose basis is known only to a few lead inevitably to croyism and unequal access to resources...While the reasons are complex, a critical part of the explanation [for the few women at the professor rank] is our collective ignorance of what discrimination looks like. It turns out to take many forms, including a pattern of difference in how male and female colleagues are treated and of powerful but unrecognized assumptions that work systematically against women even in the light of obvious good will.” Subsequently, the leaders of M.I.T., Yale, Stanford, Princeton, Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, University of Michigan, University of California and California Institute of Technology, have begun to work together toward equity and the full participation of their women faculty members. They are sharing annual gender analyses of salaries and resources and hiring and working to implement more family-friendly policies.

- Based on over 450 in-depth interviews and on a quantitative survey, a new longitudinal analysis of women in science allows numerous conclusions:

  a) Increasing the number of women doesn’t automatically produce positive effects. As the numbers of women in a department increase, they divide into distinct subgroups sometimes at odds with each other, e.g. age and race/nationality.

  b) Women still experience isolation within an activity that for men, is highly social and socializing. When a woman seeks affiliation through women’s groups, this is labeled as a ‘special need’. This paradox is compounded when similarly isolated women are appointed as tokens to committees and pointed to as ‘role models’ (i.e. expected to be ‘solutions’ to a ‘problem’).

  c) Gender differences in advancement are rooted in the ways work is organized. For instance, the tenure system is a forced march in the early years, allowing a slower pace later on. Most women would prefer the opposite timing.

  d) The majority of departments studied were severely competitive and individualistic. The departments that showed the most improvement in recruitment of women had a more collegial, cooperative atmosphere. Since much of the process by which disadvantage is created and reinforced occurs at the department level (e.g. recruitment, access to benefits), this is the seat of change, with the department head the key. Thus departmental reviews should include emphasis on diversity issues.
B) **Mentoring**

- Many studies have found that women gain less benefit from the mentor relationship. One internal medicine department found that mentors more actively encouraged men than women proteges to participate in professional activities outside the institution and that women were three times more likely than men to report their mentor taking credit for their work. Among cardiologists, women found their mentors to be less helpful with career planning than men did and more commonly noted that their mentor was actually a negative role model (19% of women vs. 8% of men). They were also less likely than men to negotiate for salary, benefits, travel, space, support staff, and administrative duties—reflecting a combination of naivete and under-use of their professional network. The American Orthopaedic Society asked women academics to rate obstacles to academic advancement; the 3 most frequently identified were: lack of protected time for research, inadequate mentoring and need to see more patients to support the department. Women’s informal networks are less extensive and less likely to include superordinates or colleagues from previous institutions. Women tend to be more modest than men about their achievements and less apt to see themselves as qualified for top positions even when their credentials are equivalent or superior. Consequently, women actually have a greater need for mentoring than men do.

- A study of the career progress of minorities at US corporations reveals similar results: that is, minorities face extra challenges obtaining mentoring. Insights from this research apply directly to women. Conclusions include: 1) Of the minority professionals who became executives (vs those who plateaued), even though they were not on an obvious fast track during stage 1 of their career, influential mentors were investing in them as if they were. These relationships opened the door to challenging assignments and protected the protégé from unfair criticism. 2) Managers who plateaued received mentoring that was basically instructional, whereas those who became executives enjoyed fuller developmental relationships with mentors, particularly early in the career when confidence-building is crucial. These mentors gave both coaching (i.e. technical advice) and counseling (i.e. experiential cues and emotional support). 3) Cross-race and cross-gender relationships may encounter numerous extra difficulties forming and maturing: a) A mentor who holds negative racial or gender stereotypes is unlikely to give proteges the benefit of the doubt (whereas fast-track whites are likely to be evaluated based on their perceived potential), with the consequence that the minority is less likely to take risks. b) When the mentor has trouble identifying with the protégé, seeing beyond the protégé’s weaknesses is harder; also a “protective hesitation” interferes with communication about race and other thorny issues. c) A protégé adopting the behavior of the mentor might produce different results (e.g., an aggressive style successful for white men may get women and minorities labeled “angry”). d) Because cross-race relationships are rare, people focus on them, adding to their fragility and discouraging people from participating in them. 4) A key task of the mentor is helping the protégé build a network which needs to be heterogeneous along three dimensions: functionally (from sponsors to peers); position and location; and demographically. 5) The work of mentoring minorities does not end with one-on-one relationships but requires broader initiatives such as executive development workshops addressing these issues, helping colleagues manage their discomfort with race, and offering a range of career paths so that people can move at their own speed.

C) **Mental Models of Gender**

Gender stereotypes are perceptual shorts acquired early in life but are far from innocuous because they interfere with evaluations of competence. Both men and women asked to rate works of art, articles and curriculum vitae give lower ratings when they believe they are rating the work of a woman. An analysis of peer-review scores for postdoctoral fellowship applications revealed that women applicants had to be 2.5 times more productive than the average man to receive the same competence score. Moreover students judge women faculty who are not nurturing much more harshly than they do men professors who are not nurturing.
Negative mental models of women persist in part because individuals, especially dominant personalities, tend to ignore information discrepant to their stereotypes. Features common to clinical medicine, ie time pressures, stress and cognitive complexity, also stimulate stereotyping and “application error” (ie, inappropriate application of epidemiological data to all group members). Even so, most scientists and physicians appear to believe that they work in a meritocracy and that they are not influenced by stereotypes. Some even conclude that women are advantaged compared to men. But as Michael Kimmel has observed: “while individual men do not feel powerful, power is so deeply woven into their lives that it is most invisible to those who are most empowered.” In fact, a pervasive barrier to achieving organizational diversity is that “people tend to be attracted to others who are like themselves. . .[thus] unless the people in charge recognize their own biases. . .[women and minorities] will have difficulty achieving the secret handshake.”

D) Other Disadvantages

- The first such study of physicians’ work lives found that compared with men, women physicians have more patients with complex psychosocial problems. Women physicians also reported substantially less work control than men, i.e., volume of patient load, selecting physicians for referrals, and office scheduling. Women were 1.6 times more likely to report burnout than men, with the odds of burnout by women increasing by at least 12% for each additional 5 hours worked per week over 40 hours. This study also found a $22,000 gap in income between men and women, after controlling for age, specialty, practice type, time in current practice, uninsured status of patients, region, hours worked, and other variables.

- A 1998 survey of Board-certified internists in Pennsylvania found that women earned 14% less per hour than their male counterparts, even after adjustment for demographic, training, practice and family characteristics, suggesting that institutional factors may contribute to salary inequities.

- Women physicians also face extra difficulties in the doctor-nurse relationship. A survey of over 3500 Norwegian physicians found that compared to men physicians, women are met with less respect and confidence and receive less help. By refusing to do things for women physicians, either by neglecting orders or by telling them to do things themselves, nurses ‘cut’ women physicians ‘down to size.’ Women must therefore “calculate and negotiate behavior to avoid conflicts. . .[whereas] men do not have to involve themselves in such negotiations in order to get respect and the service work done.”

Appendix 3: Questions to Assess the Faculty Development and Diversity Orientation of Candidates for Chair and Dean Positions

- What do you think motivates most faculty to work hard and achieve?

- In a large department, how would you assess the needs of the most significant subgroups of faculty?

- What would faculty that you have mentored say is your approach to career development? What motivated you to work with and mentor these faculty in the way you did? Describe some of your successes and your less successful experiences and outcomes? If you wanted to validate your assumptions about how your advisees experienced your approach, how would you do it?

- At your current institution, is there a women faculty organization or committee on women? What has been their approach to defining and addressing women faculty career development?
• How have you demonstrated your commitment to the development of women professionals in your various positions and roles?

• In your current position, have you ever seen a woman or ethnic minority faculty treated unfairly? How would/did you handle it?

• Have you observed differences in the mentoring needs of men and women mentees? Of young physicians and scientists today compared to 10 or 20 years ago?

[Developed by Emma Stokes, Ph.D., Senior Organizational Development Specialist, Johns Hopkins University, Department of Medicine]

Appendix 4: Two Approaches to Assessing Faculty Turnover Costs

A) Evaluate Return on Investment of Faculty Development by Comparing Costs of Recruitment to Cost of Mentoring & Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Cost of Recruitment</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average Cost of Mentoring/Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of productivity in previous faculty member’s last 3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff for faculty development/mentoring program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising the position</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-salary program costs (e.g. workshops, food, supplies, web site, publications)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search firm and/or administrative costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time of junior and senior faculty spent in development/mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview travel expenses (air fare, hotel, meals, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mentoring award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search committee and other faculty and staff time spent interviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time of boss in developmental planning and performance appraisal feedback sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work put on hold + lost opportunity costs in not being able to pursue other initiatives until replacement is on board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education of chairs, division chiefs and senior faculty in developmental planning, mentoring skills, and performance appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload on other faculty and staff (overtime, etc.) to get work done during selection and training of replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation and training time for replacement to become fully productive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost patients, referrals, and grants of faculty member, cancelled clinics, delays before out-of-state physicians become licensed &amp; can bill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowered morale and productivity, time spent talking about it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recruitment package requirements – e.g. signing bonus, release time for scholarship, reconfiguration of lab space, other perks

Moving allowance
Loss of other faculty and staff


B) Turnover Costing Exercise: ________________________________

(Job Title)

A. Typical annual pay for the job _________________________

B. Percentage of pay for benefits times annual pay _________________________

C. Total annual cost (add A & B) _________________________

D. How many employees voluntarily quit in this job in the past 12 months? _________________________

E. How long does it take for one employee to become fully productive (in months) _________________________

F. Multiply _______ E _____ X C X 50% _________________________
   12

G. Annual turnover cost for this job (multiply F X D) _________________________

DIRECT HIRING COSTS
1. Costs for recruiting/advertising _________________________
2. Staff time for identifying, preparing, placing ad _________________________
3. Agency and search fees _________________________
4. Internal referral bonuses _________________________
5. Relocation expenses _________________________
6. HR/recruiting staff expenses (salaries, benefits, budget costs) _________________________
7. Total annual hiring costs (add 1 thru 6) _________________________
8. Cost per hire (divide 7 by number hired) _________________________

INDIRECT HIRING COSTS
1. Management/supervisor time per hire in hours _________________________
2. Management orientation and training time per hire _________________________
3. Average annual manager/supervisor salary and benefits costs divided by 2,080 _________________________
4. Average annual management costs for hiring _________________________
   \{(1) + (2) \} X (3)

[Developed by Robert Mathis, PhD, College of Business Administration, University of Nebraska –
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Appendix 5: Examples of Medical School Faculty Career Advising and Mentoring Programs

To assist faculty in making optimal use of their academic appointment and to strengthen the institution, many schools have created programs and resources to improve faculty mentoring. These range from assigning all new assistant professors an advisor to offering an extensive guidebook of tools, scenarios and other supports, as at the Medical College of Wisconsin, which has even published an evaluation of its mentoring program. Other examples appear below. Among the goals of all such efforts is building a supportive ecology in which faculty career and skill development more naturally occur.

Contemporary mentoring presents challenges not faced by academic medicine’s current leaders, most of whom were “groomed” by someone who was also a white male. The homogeneity of senior faculty contrasts sharply with the heterogeneity of students and young faculty, many of whom present orientations unfamiliar to their potential mentors. Moreover, given the rapidly changing complexities of medicine and career-building, advice applicable even five years ago may no longer be helpful. Thus, many chairs and senior faculty could use assistance in becoming effective “contemporary” mentors. One such resource is Johns Hopkins Department of Medicine’s Career Development Guide, which offers advice on techniques of active listening, avoiding assumptions, and how to reflect back.

Evaluating chairs and faculty on how well they meet their mentoring responsibilities can help assure that these responsibilities are taken seriously. A start would be to add items on mentoring to annual faculty evaluations, and to ask senior faculty to name their proteges and junior faculty, to name their mentors.

Stanford University School of Medicine Faculty Mentoring Program Web site: <http://www-med.stanford.edu/school/facultymentoring>
- Initiated in 1994 out of Dean’s Council on Diversity to address sense of isolation of junior faculty and sense that patient care pressures put academic careers in jeopardy
- Co-directed by 2 emeritus professors
- Mentees (assistant professors) choose mentors (associate and full professors) from roster and contact them directly (also now most department chairs assign each incoming assistant professor a temporary mentor)
- Program also includes social occasions for discussion of common problems and group mentoring opportunities with lunch provided

University of Arkansas College of Medicine Women’s Faculty Development Caucus (WFDC) Mentoring Project (http://www.uams.edu/cmefd/mentoringpage.htm)
- Pilot project begun in 1997 through Office of Faculty Development
- WFDC Mentoring Committee paired mentor/mentees based on responses to a survey
- Mentors given CVs of assigned mentees, resource book, mentor guide

University of Wisconsin-Madison Medical School Faculty Mentoring Program (Molly Carnes, M.D., <mlcarnes@facstaff.wisc.edu>, (608) 233-0687)
- Faculty policies state that senior faculty responsible for mentoring junior faculty
- Opportunity to find mentors outside department
- Each fall the faculty steering committee contacts junior faculty to participate
- Interested mentors/mentees fill out questionnaire
- Training session for mentor/mentee pairs to facilitate process
- Women in internal medicine meet monthly and take turns critiquing each others’ CV
Mayo Medical School Mentoring Initiative
- New Staff Orientation stresses importance of intra-departmental and extramural mentors and how to select them and establish a workable relationship
- Faculty affairs dean presents process to department chairs: (1) some responsible leader in the department meets annually with staff to discuss scholarly goals, (2) the chairs assure that all new faculty have an appropriate academic appointment, and (3) the staff understand the criteria to gain them eventual promotion to the next higher rank and when that might be realistic. This program is part of an annual Operating Planning Process that holds chairs accountable.

Boston University Mentoring Program (Leslie Wright, lmwright@bu.edu)
- Recruited top senior faculty for a 1 hour commitment; junior faculty invited to submit CV and a work in progress to be worked on with the mentor
- 30 pairs matched
- High satisfaction levels; more than ½ of pairs have continued

University of Ottawa Academic Women’s Association Mentoring Program (Rose Goldstein, M.D., Assistant Dean, Faculty, <rgoldstein@ottawahospital.on.ca>; (613) 737-8175)
- Begun in 1992 to provide junior women faculty members with a support system when first entering the University.
- To extend networking, matches are made across departments.
- “Guide to Faculty Mentoring” and a resident mentoring handbook published.

MCP Hahnemann University School of Medicine (www.mcphu.edu/COL)
- Preceptoring for 1st year faculty (1 year, primarily informational).
- Mentoring for junior faculty (multi-year, preparing for promotion)

East Carolina University, The Brody School of Medicine
- Two year program for senior faculty to develop effective mentoring skills.
- Two year program pairing junior faculty with a senior faculty member.
- Year-long group mentoring program for junior faculty incorporating career planning and skill development for professional advancement.
# Table 1

Proportion of Women Faculty by Department and Number of Women Department Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Associate Professors</th>
<th>Full Professors</th>
<th>Number of Women Department Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy</td>
<td>23% 26%</td>
<td>22% 24%</td>
<td>16% 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>21% 23%</td>
<td>25% 26%</td>
<td>11% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>23% 26%</td>
<td>24% 25%</td>
<td>15% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology (basic and clinical)</td>
<td>26% 30%</td>
<td>25% 30%</td>
<td>13% 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>19% 21%</td>
<td>21% 22%</td>
<td>11% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>18% 21%</td>
<td>19% 24%</td>
<td>9% 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Basic Sciences</td>
<td>24% 27%</td>
<td>25% 31%</td>
<td>13% 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesiology</td>
<td>26% 28%</td>
<td>23% 22%</td>
<td>8% 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>30% 33%</td>
<td>26% 38%</td>
<td>12% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medicine</td>
<td>20% 26%</td>
<td>7% 21%</td>
<td>11% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine</td>
<td>32% 38%</td>
<td>20% 25%</td>
<td>14% 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
<td>22% 26%</td>
<td>18% 20%</td>
<td>7% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>22% 25%</td>
<td>17% 22%</td>
<td>8% 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics &amp; Gynecology</td>
<td>35% 39%</td>
<td>22% 28%</td>
<td>9% 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>20% 24%</td>
<td>17% 22%</td>
<td>6% 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgery</td>
<td>10% 10%</td>
<td>8% 8%</td>
<td>2% 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otolaryngology</td>
<td>19% 20%</td>
<td>14% 16%</td>
<td>8% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>39% 42%</td>
<td>32% 34%</td>
<td>17% 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>38% 40%</td>
<td>29% 38%</td>
<td>17% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine/Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>32% 36%</td>
<td>24% 29%</td>
<td>11% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health/Prev. Med.</td>
<td>36% 40%</td>
<td>33% 34%</td>
<td>19% 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>21% 23%</td>
<td>18% 21%</td>
<td>9% 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>11% 13%</td>
<td>8% 10%</td>
<td>3% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Clinical Sciences</td>
<td>28% 30%</td>
<td>22% 21%</td>
<td>14% 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25% 28%</td>
<td>21% 24%</td>
<td>10% 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: Faculty data from Faculty Roster system; Chair data from schools via surveys and AAMC Directory of Academic Medical Education, 2000-2001.

*Includes Interim/Acting Chairs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Measurement/Outcome</th>
<th>Accountability/Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Emphasize faculty diversity in departmental reviews | - Assess faculty development experience of candidates for chair jobs (Appendix 3)  
  - Reward chairs for developing women faculty  
  - Devote portions of executive committee meetings and retreats to improving women faculty development  
  - AAMC continue obtaining and publishing annual statistics on faculty diversity | - Number of women recruited, promoted and retained  
  - Number of women division chiefs  
  - Decline in EEO complaints | - Evaluate and reward department chairs on faculty diversity |
| 2) Target career development needs of women faculty | - Department chairs and dean’s offices work together to improve human resources orientation toward faculty, including more information about promotions process  
  - Institute mentoring programs & awards  
  - AAMC continue to provide examples of good practices | - Compare costs of faculty development with costs of faculty turnover  
  - Number of valued faculty leaving  
  - Number of mentoring-program-matched pairs continuing  
  - Improvement in faculty satisfaction/morale as assessed by climate survey | - Department chairs and CEOs regularly assess effectiveness of interventions and “return on investment” faculty development/mentoring programs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Measurement/Outcome</th>
<th>Accountability/Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3) Assess practices for gender-related effects | - WIM or other committee examine practices/policies for unintended effects on women’s advancement  
- CEOs seek & mentor women for key committees & positions  
- Expand definition of scholarship at schools and in scientific organizations  
- Assisted by AAMC, copy successful programs from other schools and industry | - % women visiting professors  
- % women on powerful committees  
- Availability of flexible benefits, PT track, family leave, tenure clock-stopping | - Leaders’ self-assessment, on such questions as “Do I…”:  
- Develop accountability within the institution for gender equity, including rewards for successful attainment of goals  
- Identify areas where gender equity is likely to be a problem  
- Explicitly identify women to mentor for leadership positions  
- Nominate women for highly visible Posts  
- Listen to women’s and men’s suggestions equally and ensure equal participation of women and men in public settings  
- Review proposed policies by women faculty to ensure that there will not be unintended gender-related consequences |
| 4) Improve search committees and nominating process | - Appoint diverse committees  
- Educate search committees on pitfalls & opportunities re: recruiting women  
- Academic societies create a database of qualified women to nominate for visiting professorships & other appointments  
- AAMC publish “good practices manual” for chairs | - Number of committees with greater than 25% women  
- Number of committees assisted by organizational development or other skilled facilitator  
- Number of searches identifying women among final candidates | - Dean/CEO mandate inclusion of women on “short-list”  
- Committees conduct self-evaluation of process |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Measurement/Outcome</th>
<th>Accountability/Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Strengthen WIM Program</td>
<td>- Financially support WIM/WLO</td>
<td>- Evaluate department chairs on faculty retention and diversity</td>
<td>- Dean monitors national standing on numerous gender-related indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Regularly benchmark representation of women against AAMC published means</td>
<td>- Conduct salary equity study and faculty morale survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AAMC continues to publish annual report on status of women faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix Eight

University of California Family Friendly Policies for Faculty and Other Academic Appointees
POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

The University of California has established policies and programs to assist faculty and other academic appointees in balancing the needs of work and family. This web site provides summaries of these family friendly policies and programs.

In particular, faculty and other academic appointees planning for the birth or placement of a child for adoption or foster care should be aware of the following systemwide policies: childbearing leave, Active Service-Modified Duties, parental leave without pay, and extension of the eight-year probationary period. These policies provide for certain guaranteed benefits for faculty and other academic appointees to assist them in childbearing and childrearing. Faculty and other academic appointees should especially be advised that:

- All pregnant academic appointees who require a leave are eligible for childbearing leave, regardless of length of service. In many cases, this will be a leave with pay.

- Leave for childbirth and recovery normally will be for at least 6 weeks; more time may be necessary for medical reasons.

- All academic appointees who have substantial responsibility for the care of a newborn child or a child under age five placed for adoption or foster care are eligible for one quarter (semester) of Active Service-Modified Duties. Eligibility shall normally extend from 3 months prior to 12 months following the birth or placement and shall be concluded within 12 months following the birth or placement. During this period normal duties shall be reduced. A statement describing the modified duties is subject to approval by the
Chancellor.

- Active Service-Modified Duties is not a leave of absence. Normally, for faculty, the modification of duties will be either partial or full relief from teaching. In the quarter or semester of childbearing leave, there must be full relief from scheduled teaching duties. In the case of health sciences faculty, however, clinical duties may be reduced, as appropriate.

- Any childbearing or parental leave, provided for in APM - 760-25 or 760-27 which is equal to or exceeds one semester or quarter and which is not greater than one year, shall automatically be excluded from service toward the eight-year probationary period.

- Requests for time off the tenure clock must be made within two years of a birth or adoption.

Note:

The policies and programs summarized in this web site apply specifically to faculty and other academic appointees of the University of California and information is current only as of the date of publication. Before taking any action, you should refer to updated academic personnel policies in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and collective bargaining agreements.

The policies of the Academic Personnel Manual do not apply to academic employees covered by collective bargaining agreements. For details about implementation of policies, programs, and collective bargaining agreements on your campus, consult your local campus Academic Personnel Office.

Impact of Leaves on Benefits

Academic employees need to be especially aware of the impact, if any, of a period of leave on benefits such as health insurance and disability insurance. In particular, academic appointees are encouraged to enroll in the Short-Term Disability and Supplemental Disability plans when they are first employed by the University. To clarify benefits status while on leave, academic appointees should consult well in advance of a leave with staff in their department, local Benefits Office, or local Academic Personnel Office.
LEAVES OF ABSENCE

FACULTY AND OTHER ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

- Childbearing Leave
- Active Service-Modified Duties
- Parental Leave Without Pay
- Extension of the Eight-Year Probationary Period
- Family and Medical Leave
- Sick Leave
- Vacation
- Holidays
- Other Leaves

ACADEMIC APPOINTEES COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

[**UNDER CONSTRUCTION**]

ALL ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

- Time Off to Participate in School or Day Care Activities
- Work-Incurred Illness and Injury
- Catastrophic Leave Sharing Programs

---

FACULTY AND OTHER ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

Childbearing Leave (APM - 760-25)

Leave for childbearing shall be granted on request, with or without pay, to an academic appointee who bears a child, for the period before, during, and after childbirth. Childbearing leave shall consist of time an appointee is temporarily disabled because of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions. Leave for childbirth and recovery normally will be for at least 6 weeks; more time may be necessary for medical reasons. Under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), an academic appointee who is disabled because of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions is eligible to take an unpaid childbearing leave ("pregnancy disability leave") for up to 4 months during the period of actual disability. During childbearing leave, no duties shall be required by the University.

An academic appointee may be eligible for Short-term Disability plan benefits and, if enrolled, Supplemental Disability plan benefits if she is unable to work because of her physical condition.

All pregnant academic appointees who require a leave are eligible for childbearing leave, regardless of length of service. However, based on the provisions of APM - 760-25-a(1), (2), and (3), they may or may not be eligible for childbearing leave with pay.

- An academic appointee who accrues sick leave or vacation leave credit may, at her option, use accrued leave for childbearing leave.
- An academic appointee in a title that does not accrue sick leave and who has served in her title or any faculty title for at least 12 consecutive months will receive her approved base salary for up to 6 weeks during the period of time she is unable to assume her normal University obligations. Any additional compensation paid under health sciences compensation plans shall be paid in accordance with campus policies.
An academic appointee in a title that does not accrue sick leave and who has served in her title less than one year will receive her approved base salary for approximately the period which would be accrued during the appointment in accordance with the accrual rates in APM - 710-18. Any additional compensation paid under health sciences compensation plans shall be paid in accordance with campus policies. If additional time is needed, leave without pay will be granted for the necessary period. However, a member of the Academic Senate who has served less than one year will receive at least her approved base salary for up to 6 weeks during the period of time she is unable to assume her normal University obligations, regardless of length of service.

If an academic appointee on an approved childbearing leave also is eligible for family and medical leave (see APM - 715), up to 12 workweeks of the childbearing leave shall run concurrently with family and medical leave under Federal law. Childbearing leave may be taken on an intermittent or reduced scheduled basis. Upon termination of a childbearing leave (up to 4 months if certified disabled by a health care provider), an eligible appointee is also entitled to up to 12 additional workweeks of unpaid leave under the California Family Rights Act (CFRA) for reason of the birth of her child, if the child has been born by the end of the childbearing leave, or for any other covered reason except pregnancy or related medical conditions, provided the appointee has time remaining in her leave entitlement.

The aggregate duration of all leaves plus periods of Active Service-Modified Duties granted for a given pregnancy may not exceed one year.

As an alternative to or in addition to childbearing leave, the University shall temporarily modify a pregnant appointee's position or transfer her to a less strenuous or hazardous position upon request if medically necessary and if the temporary modification or transfer can be reasonably accommodated. This temporary modification or transfer shall not be counted against an eligible academic appointee's entitlement to up to 4 months of childbearing leave ("pregnancy disability leave" under the FEHA) or family and medical leave unless the modification has taken the form of intermittent leave or a reduced work schedule. Childbearing leave does not need to be taken in one continuous period of time but may be taken on an as-needed basis.

For more information, see [http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-760.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-760.pdf)

**Active Service-Modified Duties (APM - 760-28)**

A period of Active Service-Modified Duties shall be granted on request to any appointee who has substantial responsibility for the care of his or her newborn child or child under age five placed for adoption or foster care. Eligibility for one quarter (semester) of Active Service-Modified Duties shall normally extend from 3 months prior to 12 months following the birth or placement and shall be concluded within 12 months following the birth or placement. During this period normal duties shall be reduced.

A request for a period of Active Service-Modified Duties shall include a written statement by the academic appointee certifying that he/she has substantial responsibility for the care of an infant or young child. A statement describing the modified duties is subject to approval by the Chancellor. During a period of Active Service-Modified Duties, the appointee is on active status. Active Service-Modified Duties is not a leave of absence. Normally, for faculty, the modification of duties will be either partial or full relief from teaching. In the quarter or semester of childbearing leave, there must be
full relief from scheduled teaching duties. In the case of health sciences faculty, however, clinical duties may be reduced, as appropriate.

In no event may the aggregate duration of all leaves plus periods of Active Service-Modified Duties granted for a given birth or placement exceed one year.

A period of Active Service-Modified Duties is included as service toward the eight-year probationary period or toward other service limits described in APM - 133.

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-760.pdf

**Parental Leave Without Pay (APM - 760-27)**

Parental leave without pay may be granted for up to one year to any academic appointee for the purpose of caring for his or her child. Accrued vacation may be substituted in lieu of unpaid parental leave. When parental leave is combined with childbearing leave, family and medical leave, and/or Active Service-Modified Duties, the period shall not exceed one year for each birth or placement of a child for adoption or foster care with an appointee or the spouse or domestic partner of an appointee. Parental leave which is not covered by State or Federal family and medical leave law is subject to the approval of the Chancellor. (See APM - 759 for leave without pay.) A leave cannot be approved beyond the end date of the appointment.

An appointee on parental leave without pay not covered by State or Federal family and medical leave law is responsible for the continuation of benefits during any unpaid portion of the leave.

An academic appointee who is eligible for family and medical leave (see APM - 715) shall be granted an unpaid leave to care for the appointee's newborn child or a child newly placed with the appointee for adoption or foster care. Up to 12 workweeks of the parental leave shall run concurrently with family and medical leave. Parental leave granted pursuant to the FMLA must be concluded within 12 months following the child's birth or placement.

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-760.pdf

**Extension of the Eight-Year Probationary Period (APM - 133-17)**

Any childbearing or parental leave, provided for in APM - 760-25 or 760-27 which is equal to or exceeds one semester or quarter and which is not greater than one year, whether with or without salary, shall automatically be excluded from service toward the eight-year probationary period unless the faculty member informs the department chair in writing before, during, or within one quarter or semester after the leave, that it should not be excluded from service toward the eight-year probationary period.

Upon request of a faculty member who has substantial responsibility for the care of a newborn child or a newly-adopted child under age five, time off the tenure clock for up to one year may be granted by the Chancellor for each event of birth or adoption during the probationary period provided that all time off the tenure clock totals no more than two years in the probationary period. The tenure clock may be stopped more than one time during the probationary period. Each request for time off the tenure clock must include a written statement by the faculty member certifying that he/she has substantial responsibility for the care of the child or children. Requests for time off the tenure clock must be made within two years of a birth or adoption. The provision to stop the tenure clock may be invoked even if a faculty member with substantial childcare responsibility does not take a formal leave or have a modification of duties. For determining years toward the eight-year limitation of service, the combined
total of periods of leave unrelated to academic duties and time off the tenure clock may not exceed two years.

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-133.pdf

**Family and Medical Leave (APM - 715)**

In accordance with applicable State and Federal law, family and medical leave provides eligible employees with entitlements to leave for up to a total of 12 workweeks in the leave year, continuance of health plan coverage as if on pay status, and reinstatement rights. Eligible academic appointees are entitled to take unpaid leave or to substitute accrued sick leave or accrued vacation leave for the following reasons: his or her own serious health condition; to care for his or her child, parent, or spouse with a serious health condition; to care for his or her newborn child or a child newly placed with him or her for adoption or foster care.

An academic appointee is entitled to up to 12 workweeks of family and medical leave during the leave year provided that he or she has at least 12 cumulative months of University service and has worked at least 1,250 hours during the 12 months immediately preceding the commencement date of the leave. Family and medical leave is normally unpaid leave except that accrued sick leave and accrued vacation leave may be substituted. For academic appointees who do not accrue sick leave, Chancellors may approve leave with pay for up to 12 workweeks. Whenever possible an appointee shall provide at least 30 days advance notice of the need for a family and medical leave. Family and medical leaves run concurrently with other approved leaves taken for a purpose which meets criteria for a family and medical leave-qualifying event.

When medically necessary, as certified by the appointee's health care provider, an appointee may take family and medical leave on a reduced work schedule or on an intermittent basis, including absences of less than one day.

Leave granted to care for the appointee's newborn child or a child newly placed with the appointee for adoption or foster care shall be concluded within 12 months following the child's birth or placement.

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-715.pdf

**Sick Leave (APM - 710)**

With the exception of those fiscal-year academic appointees in titles listed in APM - 710-14, academic appointees do not accrue sick leave. In the case of illness of appointees who do not accrue sick leave, Chancellors may approve leave with pay. Such leave may be approved with pay in accord with campus policy.

Eligible fiscal-year academic appointees accrue sick leave credit provided the appointment is at 50 percent or more at the rate of one working day per month for full-time service. Eligible appointees at 50 percent or more accrue sick leave at a proportionate rate.

Accrued sick leave shall be used in keeping with normally approved purposes including personal illness; medical appointments; childbearing (see APM - 715 and 760); disability; and medical appointments of, illness of, or bereavement for an appointee's child, parent, spouse, domestic partner, sibling, grandparent, or grandchild. In-laws or step relatives in the relationships listed, including relatives of the domestic partner who would be covered if the domestic partner were the appointee's spouse, are also covered. Other persons residing in the appointee's household are also covered.
Vacation (APM - 730)

Academic personnel appointed on an academic-year basis are expected to be in residence from the day designated in the University Calendar as the opening of the Fall term through the end of the Spring term. Academic-year appointees do not accrue vacation leave.

Academic personnel appointed on a fiscal-year basis for 6 months or more at 50 percent time or more accrue vacation leave. Student academic personnel appointed on a fiscal-year basis for 12 consecutive months or more at 50 percent time or more accrue vacation leave. Vacation is accrued at the rate of two working days per month for full-time service. Eligible appointees at 50 percent or more time accrue vacation at a proportionate rate. Vacation credit may accumulate to a maximum of 48 working days. The maximum accumulation for appointees working half time or over is also 48 working days (i.e., the same maximum number of hours as that of full-time employees).

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-730.pdf

Holidays (APM - 720)

Official holidays for academic appointees are those administrative holidays annually in the University Calendar.

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-720.pdf

Other Leaves (APM Section V - Benefits and Privileges)

To obtain detailed information regarding other leaves and eligibility requirements, visit the following Web site, http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/sec5-pdf.html

ACADEMIC APPOINTEES COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

[** UNDER CONSTRUCTION **]

ALL ACADEMIC APPOINTEES

Time Off to Participate in School or Day Care Activities

The California Family School Partnership Act provides for time off for employees to participate in school activities such as PTA meetings, parent/teacher conferences, or field trips. The child must be in kindergarten through grade 12 or a licensed child day care facility and the employee is the child's parent, guardian, or custodial grandparent. Leave may be for up to eight hours per calendar month, not to exceed 40 hours per year. An employee wishing to take time off must give reasonable notice of the planned absence and may be requested to provide certification from the child's school or licensed child day care facility. An employee may use vacation and/or compensatory time off. If accrued leave is not available, an employee may use leave without pay.

Work-Incurred Illness and Injury
Each UC location has a Workers' Compensation Manager who can answer questions about employees' work-incurred injuries or illnesses and/or related claims and benefits. A list of UC Workers' Compensation Managers is available through the UC Office of Financial Management Risk Management Web site at http://www.ucop.edu/riskmgmt/wcmdir.html

Catastrophic Leave Sharing Programs

Campuses may establish local catastrophic leave sharing programs to give employees the opportunity to voluntarily donate accrued vacation in support of colleagues who have exhausted their paid leave due to their own serious illness or in caring for a seriously ill family member.

PART-TIME APPOINTMENT IN THE PROFESSOR SERIES
(APM - 220-16-c and 220-16-d)

An appointment to a title in the Professor series is normally for full-time service to the University, although there may subsequently be a permanent or temporary reduction in the percentage of time of the appointment by agreement between the appointee and the University.

An appointment for less than full-time service with a title in the Professor series may be authorized under appropriate circumstances, provided that the Chancellor specifically approves the arrangement as being in the best interests of the University and fully justified by the particular circumstances.

When an appointment for less than full-time service is approved, the University is not obligated to increase the percentage of time of the appointment, even if the appointee and the department should desire such an increase in the future.

For more information, see http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-220.pdf
Appendix Nine

Table of UCSF Faculty by School, Series and Sex
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>LADDER</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16 (36%)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN RESIDENCE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38 (34%)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUNCT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>56 (32%)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>LADDER</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>45 (18%)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>&lt;.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN RESIDENCE</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>89 (24%)</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL X</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33 (29%)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>209 (45%)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUNCT</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>96 (40%)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>472 (33%)</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>LADDER</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38 (93%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN RESIDENCE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46 (96%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUNCT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>105 (90%)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>LADDER</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10 (37%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN RESIDENCE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13 (62%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUNCT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28 (41%)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAMPUS</td>
<td>LADDER</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>109 (30%)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN RESIDENCE</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>93 (24%)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL X</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>38 (30%)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CLINICAL</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>306 (47%)</td>
<td>345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUNCT</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>115 (41%)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>661 (37%)</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>&lt;.0001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mantel Haenszel Chi square test
** Chi square test
## Work Life Policies For Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Sick Leave</th>
<th>Maternity/Childbearing</th>
<th>Modified Duties</th>
<th>Parental/Childrearing</th>
<th>Time Off Tenure Clock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC</td>
<td>With (or without) pay at discretion of administration for AY faculty. 12 days/year for FY faculty. May use for domestic partner</td>
<td>With (or without) pay at discretion of administration; normally 6 weeks, additional time may be approved.</td>
<td>Reduction of normal duties for 1 quarter/semester within 3 mos. prior to and 12 mos. after birth/placement. Relief from teaching in term of childbearing</td>
<td>FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. Additional leave without pay up to one year at discretion of administration. May be used for domestic partner</td>
<td>1 year for birth/adoption of child. Second extension allowed for subsequent birth or adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>No formal sick leave accrual; reasonable number of justifiable absences paid in full. For extended illness/accident requests treated on an individual basis with due respect for length of service and other relevant factors; may be paid up to but not normally exceeding 6 mos.</td>
<td>Personal/parental leave without pay up to 12 weeks (including FMLA) may be approved; extensions may be approved. Personal leave must be completed within 12 mos. Personal leave may be used for same sex “spousal equivalent.”</td>
<td>For unborn child or child newly placed for adoption or foster care, may request 1 semester of full paid teaching relief.</td>
<td>Leave without pay up to 12 weeks (including FMLA); extension approved for specific circumstances of request</td>
<td>Approved parental leaves do not count in determination of years of service for tenure decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Leaves of any kind, other than sabbatical, may not exceed 24 months in a 7-year period. Faculty do not accrue sick leave. However, short absences, including illness, normally are with full salary.</td>
<td>Paid leave for 4 months.</td>
<td>Reduction of teaching load only during the quarter of the birth and/or in the subsequent quarter.</td>
<td>FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. Additional leave without salary up to to one year.</td>
<td>1 year for birth of child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>Maternity/Childbearing</td>
<td>Modified Duties</td>
<td>Parental/Childrearing</td>
<td>Time Off Tenure Clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University of Illinois-Urbana</td>
<td>Not available. 25 days of sick leave (12 days cumulative and 13 days non cumulative). Additional sick leave up to 45 days may be requested from the Shared Benefits Pool. Chancellor may grant paid sick leave up to one-half of an appointment year for faculty with at least 3 full years of service.</td>
<td>Not available. Sick leave may be used for pregnancy. Sick leave may also be used for a period of time not to exceed 12 weeks under FMLA, to care for the child.</td>
<td>Not available. Not available.</td>
<td>Not available. FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. May use paid sick leave or vacation, as appropriate, during FMLA leave, or may use leave without salary if necessary. Paid parental leave up to two weeks following the birth/adoption of child. This leave is counted as part of 12-week entitlement FMLA.</td>
<td>Not available. 1 year for birth/adoption of child under 6 yrs., disability, or extended illness. No more than 2 tenure delays will be granted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Short-term paid leave at regular salary up to 3 weeks annually; may be used for domestic partner. Extended sick leave: Faculty with 2-10 years of service receive 1/2 year at regular salary, and 1/2 year at 1/2 regular salary; faculty with greater than 10 yrs. service receive 1 year at regular salary and 1 year at 1/2 regular salary.</td>
<td>Paid leave per extended sick leave policy.</td>
<td>Relief from direct teaching responsibilities for academic term of birth.</td>
<td>FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. Must use sick leave and vacation leave if available. Excused absence up to 21 days/year; unpaid leave of absence beyond 21 days up to a year. May be used for domestic partner.</td>
<td>1 year off total for childbearing, parental/dependent care, extended sick leave. Childbearing is automatic time off tenure clock; parental/dependent care/extended sick leave is not automatic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Buffalo</td>
<td>Sick leave accrual is based on years of full-time service: 0-1 year: 15 days 2 years: 16 days 3, 4, 5 years: 18 days 6 years: 20 days 7 years or more: 21 days Additional sick leave at full or partial salary, together with use of any sick leave provided above, shall not exceed 6 months. Additional sick leave without salary shall not exceed one calendar year.</td>
<td>See sick leave policy. The policy covers &quot;temporary disability,&quot; including pregnancy.</td>
<td>Not available.</td>
<td>Leaves of absence without salary may be granted for childcare.</td>
<td>Not available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Sick Leave</td>
<td>Maternity/Childbearing</td>
<td>Modified Duties</td>
<td>Parental/Childrearing Dependent Care</td>
<td>Time Off Tenure Clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Temporary disability (sick leave) is available for the period of temporary disability up to 6 months.</td>
<td>12 weeks for maternity leave. For the first 6 weeks, the University continue full salary and benefits; during the remainder of the leave, the University will pay no salary but will contribute employer's portion of benefits so long as faculty member continues to pay premium portion.</td>
<td>Reduction of normal duties up to 1 semester. Salary will be prorated to amount worked, with at least 50% commitment.</td>
<td>FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. Paternity or adoption/foster care leave, unpaid up to 12 weeks. Additional leave without pay up to 1 year.</td>
<td>Requires written request by the faculty member and written approval by dean and provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>9 days/year for AY faculty. 12 days/year for FY faculty. Additional sick leave may be approved.</td>
<td>Unpaid leave not to exceed 6 months.</td>
<td>Temporary alternative duties up to 16 weeks: alternative work schedule, substitution of duties; project-specific work; and/or transportable work.</td>
<td>FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. Additional leave without pay up to 1 year.</td>
<td>1 year for birth/adoptive child. Up to 2 delays will be granted during the individual's tenure-eligible period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>90 days of paid leave. Faculty sick leave is not accruable.</td>
<td>90 days of paid leave for maternity/childbearing. Paid sick leave is not available for adoption.</td>
<td>Not available.</td>
<td>FMLA is 12 weeks unpaid leave. Additional leave up to 6 months is available and may be full-time without salary or part-time with pay; leave is renewable after review. Family leave for infant care will not be extended beyond a 2-yr. period.</td>
<td>1 year, the year in which the leave is taken is not counted as a year towards the tenure review.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>