

CHAPTER 2: THE PROFESSORiate

2.1 Definition of the Professoriate 6

2.2 Definition of the Academic Council..... 6

2.3 MEDICAL CENTER LINE (MCL): Criteria and Guidelines for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions 7

2.3.A. Definition 7

2.3.B. Billet and Other Resource Allocations..... 7

1. Billet Authorization 7

2. Business Plan 8

3. Funding of Protected Time for Scholarship..... 8

2.3.C. Searches and Waivers of Search..... 9

2.3.D. Medical Staff Privileges..... 9

2.3.E. Ranks and Titles..... 10

2.3.F. Duration of Appointments 10

1. Term Appointments 11

2. Extension of Term Appointments..... 12

3. Continuing Term Appointments 12

4. Coterminous Nature of the Appointments 13

2.3.G. Progression through the Ranks 13

1. Career Trajectory 13

2. Timing of the Reappointment Review 13

3. Timing of the Promotion Review 14

2.3.H. Criteria..... 15

1. Proportionality of Contributions 15

2. Excellence in the Overall Mix 16

3. Regional and National Recognition 16

4. Criteria by Area of Primary Contribution..... 17

2.3.I. Application of the Criteria 18

1. Standards of Excellence, Acceptable or Unacceptable Performance 18

2. Factors in Applying the Criteria 19

2.3.J. Establishing, Monitoring and Applying Proportionality of Contributions. 25

1. Establishing, Monitoring or Changing the Proportionality of Contributions 25

2. Documenting Proportionality of Contributions for the Review Process 26

3. Clinical Care Proportionality 26

4. Scholarship Proportionality 26

2.3.K. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Assistant Professors..... 27

1. Appointment 27

2. Reappointment 27

2.3.L. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors 29

1. Appointment 29

2. Reappointment 29

3. Promotion..... 29

2.3.M. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors 30

1. Appointment 30

2.	Reappointment	31
3.	Promotion.....	31
2.4	UNIVERSITY TENURE LINE (UTL): Criteria and Guidelines for	33
	Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions	33
2.4.A.	Definition	33
2.4.B.	Billet Authorization	33
2.4.C.	Searches and Waivers of Search.....	34
2.4.D.	Medical Staff Privileges.....	35
2.4.E.	Ranks and Titles.....	35
2.4.F.	Duration of Appointments	36
1.	Term Appointments	36
2.	Tenure	37
3.	Tenure by Length of Service.....	37
4.	Tenure Clock Calculations.....	38
2.4.G.	Progression through the Ranks	39
1.	Career Trajectory	39
2.	Timing of the Reappointment Review	40
3.	Timing of the Promotion Review	40
2.4.H.	Criteria.....	41
1.	Scholarship.....	41
2.	Teaching.....	42
3.	Clinical Care	42
4.	Institutional Service	42
2.4.I.	Application of the Criteria.....	43
1.	Scholarship.....	43
2.	Teaching.....	44
3.	Clinical Care	44
4.	Respectful Workplace.....	46
2.4.J.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Assistant Professors.....	47
1.	Appointment as Assistant Professor (for a term of years)	47
2.	Reappointment as Assistant Professor (for a term of years).....	47
2.4.K.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors	48
1.	Appointment as Associate Professor (conferring tenure)	48
2.	Promotion to Associate Professor (conferring tenure).....	48
3.	Appointment as Associate Professor (without tenure).....	48
4.	Reappointment as Associate Professor (without tenure)	49
5.	Promotion (without tenure).....	49
2.4.L.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors	49
1.	Appointment as Professor (conferring tenure).....	49
2.	Promotion to Professor (with tenure).....	50
3.	Promotion to Professor (without tenure).....	50
2.5	NON-TENURE LINE (RESEARCH) [RESEARCH LINE]: Criteria for	51
	Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions	51
2.5A.	Definition	51
2.5B.	Billet Authorization	51
2.5C.	Funding.....	52

2.5.D.	Searches and Waivers of Search	54
2.5.E.	Ranks and Titles	55
2.5.F.	Duration of Appointments	55
1.	Term Appointments	55
2.	Extension of Term Appointments.....	56
3.	Continuing Term Appointments	57
2.5.G.	Progression through the Ranks	58
1.	Career Trajectory	58
2.	Timing of the Reappointment Review	58
3.	Timing of the Promotion Review	59
2.5.H.	Criteria	60
2.5.I.	Application of the Criteria	61
1.	Scholarship.....	61
2.	Other Considerations	61
2.5.J.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Assistant Professors	63
1.	Appointment as Assistant Professor (Research).....	63
2.	Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Research).....	64
2.5.K.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors	64
1.	Appointment as Associate Professor (Research)	64
2.	Reappointment as Associate Professor (Research).....	65
3.	Promotion to Associate Professor (Research).....	65
2.5.L.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors	66
1.	Appointment as Professor (Research).....	66
2.	Reappointment as Professor (Research)	66
3.	Promotion to Professor (Research)	67
2.6	NON-TENURE LINE (TEACHING) [TEACHING LINE]: Criteria and Guidelines for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions	68
2.6.A.	Definition	68
2.6.B.	Billet Authorization	68
2.6.C.	Searches and Waivers of Search	69
2.6.D.	Ranks and Titles	70
2.6.E.	Duration of Appointments	70
1.	Term Appointments	70
2.	Extension of Term Appointments.....	71
3.	Continuing Term Appointments	71
2.6.F.	Progression through the Ranks	72
1.	Career Trajectory	72
2.	Timing of the Reappointment Review	73
3.	Timing of the Promotion Review	73
2.6.G.	Criteria	74
2.6.H.	Application of the Criteria	74
1.	Teaching.....	74
2.	Other Considerations	75
2.6.I.	Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors	77
1.	Appointment as Associate Professor (Teaching).....	77
2.	Reappointment as Associate Professor (Teaching).....	78

2.6.J. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors (Teaching)	78
1. Appointment as Professor (Teaching)	78
2. Reappointment as Professor (Teaching)	78
3. Promotion to Professor (Teaching).....	79
2.7 EVALUATION PROCESSES AT THE DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS	80
A. Overview.....	80
B. Confidentiality	80
C. Role of the Department Chair	81
D. Timing of Evaluations.....	81
E. Assessment by the Department Chair	82
F. Departmental Evaluation Committee.....	83
G. Options of the Department Chair	84
1. When the Recommendation of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is Positive	84
2. When the Recommendation of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is Negative	85
3. When the Recommendation of Departmental Faculty is Positive	85
4. When the Recommendation of Departmental Faculty is Negative.....	86
H. Draft Long Form Review by the Senior Associate Dean	87
I. Assistant Professors Review Committee (APRC)	87
1. Purpose.....	87
2. Composition	88
3. Terms of Service	88
4. Function	88
5. Meetings and Quorum.....	89
6. Voting and Recusal	90
J. Options of the Senior Associate Dean on Receiving Recommendations by the Assistant Professors Review Committee	90
K. Decision by the Dean on Assistant Professor Appointments and Reappointments....	90
L. Appointments and Promotions Committee	91
1. Purpose.....	91
2. Composition	91
3. Terms of Service	92
4. Function	92
5. Meetings and Quorum.....	93
6. Voting and Recusal	93
L. Options of the Senior Associate Dean on Receiving Recommendations by the Appointments and Promotions Committee	94
M. The Role of the Executive Committee in Associate Professor and Professor Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions.....	94
N. Decision by the Dean on Associate Professor and Professor Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions	95
P. Review by the Provost	95
Q. Review by the Advisory Board.....	96
R. Review by the President.....	96

S.	Announcement of Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Approvals.....	97
2.8	COTERMINOUS APPOINTMENTS	98
2.9	PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS	99
2.10	JOINT APPOINTMENTS (UNDER REVISION)	100
2.11	COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (UNDER REVISION)	101

Note: University policies and procedures for faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion, as published in the Stanford University Faculty Handbook are applicable to the School of Medicine and take precedence.

2.1 Definition of the Professoriate

Conforming to 1989 and 1990 actions of the Senate of the Academic Council, the Professoriate consists of the following categories of professorial appointments:

- Tenure Line faculty at all ranks
- Non-Tenure Line faculty at all ranks
- Medical Center Line faculty at all ranks
- Other Faculty Designations (including Assistant Professor [Subject to Ph.D.], Senior Fellows and Center Fellows at designated policy centers and institutes)

For additional information, see Chapter 1.2.E. of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook.

2.2 Definition of the Academic Council

The Academic Council Professoriate consists of:

- Tenure Line faculty at all ranks
- Non-Tenure Line (Research) and Non-Tenure Line (Teaching) faculty at all ranks
- Senior Fellows at designated policy centers and institutes

The powers of the Academic Council are exercised through the actions of the Academic Council itself, the Senate of the Academic Council, the Academic Council Committees, the Advisory Board, and the Academic Council Professoriate. Agendas, minutes, committee rosters, committee reports and other materials related to the Academic Council Senate are available from the Academic Secretary or on-line at <http://facultysenate.stanford.edu/>.

For further information, see Chapter 1.2.F. of the Stanford University Faculty Handbook.

2.3 MEDICAL CENTER LINE (MCL): Criteria and Guidelines for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

[Adopted February 1989 and subsequently amended]

2.3.A. Definition

The role of a Medical Center Line (MCL) faculty member is defined by engagement in clinical care, teaching, and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine. Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor may also perform in an administrative role (broadly defined as institutional service).

All appointments, reappointments and promotions in the MCL are dependent upon excellence in the overall mix of contributions that is consistent with the high standards of Stanford University (**see Section 2.3.I.**). Such actions are also dependent upon programmatic need (including budgetary considerations), which may be evaluated in the context of the clinical program as a whole and/or of the individual's specific contributions.

The proportion of time and effort dedicated to the areas of clinical care, teaching and scholarship will depend upon the strategic goals and programmatic needs of the department and School, and will also take into consideration the interests and strengths of the faculty member. Candidates for appointment, reappointment and promotion will be evaluated according to the apportionment of their efforts in each area as described in **Sections 2.3.H. and 2.3.I.**

MCL faculty are members of the Professoriate of Stanford University and of the School of Medicine's Faculty Council.

2.3.B. Billet and Other Resource Allocations

1. Billet Authorization

Appointments to the Medical Center Line are initiated by departmental or joint departmental action. Although appointments may also be initiated by one of the School's five institutes, the appointment must be made in a department. A department chair must present the case for a new faculty position to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and obtain formal authorization from the Dean before a search can be launched. A billet number (representing a previously approved commitment) must accompany each search request.

By default, every billet that becomes vacant for any reason normally returns to the Dean's Reserve; to retain the position, the department chair must submit a request to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. In some circumstances, the position will be returned to the department for a replacement or for a search in another field. In other cases, the Dean may reallocate the position to another department or hold it in the Dean's Reserve.

Departmental leadership and the School administration must regard every search authorization as a potential long-term commitment. The Dean's search authorization is based upon the availability of resources (including a billet commitment and, in many cases, funding to cover protected time for scholarship), an assessment of the department's present and predicted future needs in clinical, research and teaching activities, and the specific programmatic need for the requested search; it reflects priority judgments both within the department and between departments. Contributions to interdisciplinary institutes may also play a role in assigning search authorizations to departments.

2. Business Plan

As a first step in initiating a search, a department, in consultation with the School's Office of Budget and/or Office of Faculty Compensation, should develop a detailed financial feasibility plan and compensation program to cover the initial term of appointment for faculty in the Medical Center Line. The level of detailed financial analysis required will be determined by whether the appointment represents a new line of practice, an urgent clinical need, a replacement or planned program growth. A copy of the [business plan](#) must accompany every MCL search initiation request.

3. Funding of Protected Time for Scholarship

Because scholarly activity is a requirement for appointment, reappointment and promotion of MCL faculty, departments must allocate and protect time for scholarly pursuits. There must be an explicit written plan for such academic time; this is typically formalized initially at the time of the job offer and should in general be reconfirmed at the faculty member's annual meeting with the department chair (or designate). The minimum protected time set aside for scholarship should be approximately 20% FTE. For further information on Scholarship Proportionality, see **Sections 2.3.I. and 2.3.J.**

For faculty who do not devote the highest proportion of their time and effort to scholarship, departments are expected to provide funding for

the minimum protected time (that is, approximately 20% FTE) for the duration of each appointment, regardless of rank. While there is no requirement to do so, for a variety of reasons (including receipt of NIH Career Development Awards [K Awards] or as a means to establish regional or national recognition), some faculty members may choose to pursue external funding for this protected scholarship time. Departments may encourage (but not require) them to pursue such opportunities.

2.3.C. Searches and Waivers of Search

As is the case for other faculty lines, it is expected that a rigorous and comprehensive search normally will be conducted for new appointments in the Medical Center Line. (The Office of Academic Affairs' [Guide to Faculty Searches](#) provides information on policies and procedures related to searches; see also [University Faculty Handbook 2.7.C.\(5\)](#).) On occasion, however, a search waiver may be approved when an exceptionally talented person (usually an eminent scholar who is clearly a leader in his or her field) is unexpectedly available.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consider waivers of search for appointments on a case-by-case basis. Under certain circumstances, a waiver of search may be pursued when convincing evidence is presented that a candidate, either internal or external to Stanford, not only meets the criteria for the position but that he or she would have emerged as a leading candidate had a national search been conducted. Search waivers for junior faculty appointments are granted only in extraordinary circumstances. There may be rare programmatic reasons that warrant a search waiver; inquiries should be addressed to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Under other circumstances, a determination may be made that a national search is the most appropriate way to proceed in filling the position. When the search is launched, the advertisement should not be tailored to fit a special candidate or candidates. Furthermore, the search committee should be instructed that although the credentials of internal candidates may be more easily assessed than those of others, its members are still obliged to consider by all appropriate means the credentials of candidates having no prior association with the University. This obligation should be made clear to any internal candidate who holds or has held a non-faculty Stanford appointment.

2.3.D. Medical Staff Privileges

Before a member of the MCL faculty is permitted to assume responsibilities for the care of patients at Stanford Hospital and Clinics and/or Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, he or she must apply for Medical Staff membership and be approved through a formal credentialing process that results in clinic

privileges. Similarly, an MCL faculty member who serves in a non-Stanford facility must obtain and maintain in good standing the privileges at that facility applicable to his or her duties.

Medical Center Line appointments are contingent upon and coterminous with the MCL faculty member obtaining and maintaining in good standing the privileges necessary for the performance of the faculty member's intended clinical role. Failure to obtain and maintain in good standing such privileges will generally result in the immediate termination of the faculty member's faculty appointment.

2.3.E. Ranks and Titles

Appointment to the MCL is contingent upon (and coterminous with) affiliation with a specified medical center or centers.

The Medical Center Line ranks are:

Assistant Professor of [department] at [specified medical center]
Associate Professor of [department] at [specified medical center]
Professor of [department] at [specified medical center]

A typical title is "Professor of Surgery at the Stanford University Medical Center." In everyday usage, the designation of the medical center may be removed from titles of MCL faculty, but it is to remain in their titles in curriculum vitae, Stanford University publications, personnel files, appointment and promotion papers, administrative records, and other similar contexts. In journals and other external publications, as well as on stationery, business cards and websites, the designation is not required.

MCL appointments are coterminous with the affiliation at the medical center(s) specified in the formal title. Circumstances that sever that relationship (such as the termination of Stanford's affiliation with, or a faculty member's termination from or refusal or inability to provide services at, a specified medical center) will generally result in the immediate termination of an MCL appointment.

2.3.F. Duration of Appointments

Most new MCL faculty appointments are for a term of years. Promotion to or reappointment at the rank of Professor may be for a continuing term or, in special circumstances, for a term of years. MCL faculty appointments are not in the University's tenure line, and do not accrue tenure by length of service. The usual duration of an appointment (subject to relatively rare exceptions

granted by the Provost for good cause and on a case-by-case basis) for each rank is:

Rank	Initial Appointment	Reappointment or Promotion
Assistant Professor (MCL)	Generally 4 years	Renewable generally for 6 years for a maximum of 10 years in rank
Associate Professor (MCL)	Generally 5 years	Renewable for an unlimited number of up to 5 year terms
Professor (MCL)	Generally 5 years	Continuing term unless otherwise expressly specified (for special circumstances for which an appointment for a term of years is appropriate)

1. Term Appointments

Although term appointments are frequently made with the clear possibility of reappointment or promotion, there is no entitlement to such action at the end of the term, and it is not automatic. Instead, decisions on reappointment and promotion, like decisions on initial appointment, are subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by the School's departmental faculty and the School's academic leadership.

Reappointment and promotion reviews are generally (but not always) initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. (For further information on the timing of reviews, see **Section 2.3.G.**) At such time, the faculty member will receive a communication from the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs that confirms the initiation of the review and includes information regarding criteria for the reappointment or promotion action, along with a general description of the process. Departments are then responsible for following up with more specific information, and it is the faculty member's obligation to provide materials that are requested, such as an up-to-date curriculum vitae and candidate's statement. The Office of Academic Affairs will work with departments to create a schedule so that the reappointment or promotion review is conducted in a timely manner.

Deans and department chairs are reminded that consideration of reappointment and promotion cases should include an account of the future of the department/division, which may include consideration of programmatic need (including budgetary considerations).

2. Extension of Term Appointments

Circumstances that *may* extend a term appointment in the MCL include part-time appointments, leave without salary, New Parent Extension, childcare leave, some personal circumstances that significantly disrupt teaching and scholarly activities for an extended period, and other extenuating circumstances, such as excessive, unanticipated clinical duties or other compromising exigencies.

Circumstances that do *not* extend a term appointment in the MCL include pregnancy disability leave, short-term disability leave, sabbatical leave, leave for periods of pure research, and administrative appointments.

MCL Assistant Professors are ineligible for any extensions to their appointment that would take the total appointment time beyond ten years in rank.

Further information on extensions of term appointments and the request and approval process for such extensions is available in [Chapter 2.5.C. and 2.5.D.](#) of the University Faculty Handbook.

3. Continuing Term Appointments

Because they are not in the University Tenure Line, MCL faculty are not eligible for tenure and do not accrue time toward tenure by length of service. However, reappointments at or promotions to the rank of Professor may be made for a continuing term, which provides security of appointment without requiring further formal reappointment.

Continuing term appointments may be terminated for just cause, or (upon proper notice) when satisfactory performance ceases or for programmatic reasons (including budgetary considerations). Although a department or school may expect a continuing programmatic need at the time of reappointment or promotion to a continuing term appointment, that need may change and, in rare cases, could lead to termination of the appointment. For example, a department or school may decide to phase out a particular area altogether, or an area may simply be scaled down, decreasing the required number of faculty. Alternatively, a department or school may decide to develop or treat an existing program in ways that may require either the reassignment of duties to another faculty line, or an appointment in a faculty line other than the Medical Center Line. Other reasons may involve funding considerations.

Termination of any continuing term appointment must be discussed in advance with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and subsequently approved by him or her, as well as by the Dean.

4. Coterminous Nature of the Appointments

See **Sections 2.3.D. and 2.3.E.** concerning the coterminous nature of all MCL appointments in regard to medical staff privileges and medical center affiliation.

2.3.G. Progression through the Ranks

1. Career Trajectory

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an Assistant Professor will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in clinical care, scholarship and teaching. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

Reflecting an upward trajectory, candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor should have compiled a record of excellent clinical, scholarly or teaching accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment or last reappointment.

2. Timing of the Reappointment Review

Under normal circumstances, reappointment reviews for Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. However, the timing of the initiation of the evaluation process at the departmental level is at the discretion of the department chair, taking into account factors including the end date of a current appointment, the possible start date for the reappointment if the outcome of the School and University process is favorable, and considerations relating to notice of non-renewal and possible terminal year requirements if the outcome is negative. University policies regarding negative reappointment and promotion decisions and notice of non-renewal are found in the University Faculty Handbook at [Chapter 2.8.C.](#) and [4.4.E.](#)

In cases where reappointment reviews are initiated more or less than one year in advance of the appointment end date, the department chair should inform the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who will then need to endorse the timing of the review.

3. Timing of the Promotion Review

MCL Assistant Professors may spend a total of ten years in rank before being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor. Typically, promotion reviews for Assistant Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date, that is, at the beginning of the tenth year in rank. It is important to note, however, that promotions may be initiated at any time when there is unequivocal evidence that the quality of the faculty member's contributions meets the criteria for promotion to the higher rank; in most cases, this will typically occur in one of the years following reappointment. However, in rare cases promotion may be considered in lieu of reappointment (for example, in cases where a faculty member has had prior years of faculty experience at his or her current rank). For many MCL Assistant Professors, promotion should be considered at the time of the mandatory annual counseling meeting during the sixth or seventh year in rank.

Associate Professors are normally considered for promotion one year in advance of the appointment end date, that is, at the beginning of the fifth year of the appointment or reappointment. However, promotions may be initiated at any time when there is unequivocal evidence that the quality of the faculty member's contributions meets the criteria for promotion to the higher rank.

Consultation between the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is essential in determining the timing of a promotion review that commences before the tenth year in rank for Assistant Professors or the fifth year of appointment or reappointment for Associate Professors. Such actions at either rank can only be initiated with the consent of the candidate and approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

In cases where an "early" promotion is initiated (that is, prior to the beginning of the tenth year in rank for Assistant Professors or prior to the fifth year of the appointment or reappointment for Associate Professors) and subsequently fails, an unsuccessful candidate may be proposed again at a later time if that remains desirable to the candidate and the department. However, in order to avoid potential awkwardness following a negative promotion decision, it is prudent to initiate a promotion review only when a positive outcome can be anticipated with reasonable confidence.

2.3.H. Criteria

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure initial appointment, reappointment and promotion, according to field and discipline. Candidates come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. In addition, there may be great variation in emphasis among the components of activity (i.e., clinical care, teaching, scholarship and, in some cases, institutional service) considered under these criteria and guidelines. Given the many different activities in which MCL faculty are engaged, such variations are expected and are appropriate. Nevertheless, all faculty appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

The criteria detailed below should be considered in concert with **Sections 2.3.K, 2.3.L. and 2.3.M.**, which address specific criteria for the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, respectively.

1. Proportionality of Contributions

The allocation of an MCL faculty member's time is determined by the department chair in light of the strategic and programmatic needs of the department and School. While each faculty member will be expected to make contributions in clinical care, teaching, and scholarship, he or she will normally have a primary focus in one of these areas (that is, the area in which the highest proportion of his or her time and effort is dedicated) and will be evaluated for appointment, reappointment or promotion accordingly. For example, a faculty member with a primary clinical commitment will be evaluated mainly on that basis, with proportionate consideration given to contributions in teaching, scholarship, and, where applicable, institutional service.

Typically, MCL faculty members will spend the majority of their time on clinical care and teaching. In such instances, a minimum of approximately 20% FTE should be protected for scholarly research from required clinical care, teaching and, if relevant, administrative duties.

Under certain limited circumstances, however, the highest proportion of time and effort may be dedicated to scholarship in order to meet a specific departmental programmatic need. Occasionally, a proportion of up to 80% may be allowed for a limited period of time, usually in conjunction with grant requirements.

2. Excellence in the Overall Mix

In the MCL, appointments (and subsequent reappointments and promotions) are based upon a requirement of excellence in the overall mix of contributions in clinical care, teaching, and scholarship that advances clinical medicine. In determining whether this standard has been met, reviewing bodies should be guided by the expectation that faculty members will nearly always be required to establish and maintain excellence in the area in which the highest proportion of their time and effort is dedicated; given the nature of the line, however, excellence in clinical care is required regardless of the proportion of commitment.

Performance that falls below this standard of excellence in either the primary area or in clinical care, or that falls below the standard of acceptable performance in a secondary (non-clinical care) area, will normally result in a negative appointment, reappointment or promotion decision. For further information, see **Section 2.3.I.**

Standards of Excellence, Acceptable or Unacceptable Performance.

3. Regional and National Recognition

Depending on their rank, MCL faculty members are expected to have shown promise to attain or to have attained regional or national recognition in their field. In addition to recognition garnered from clinical care, teaching and scholarship, regional or national recognition may be gained through and evidenced by such activities as membership on editorial boards; service on national committees or study sections; leadership, membership or participation in leading scientific or clinical societies having an impact in the faculty member's field; and invited lectureships and visiting professorships.

For appointment or reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, there should be evidence that candidates have the promise to attain *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions in clinical care, teaching, and scholarship that advances clinical medicine.

For appointment, reappointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, there should be evidence that candidates have attained *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions in clinical care, teaching, and scholarship that advances clinical medicine. Such recognition should normally be confirmed in letters from independent external referees who do not have mentoring,

collaborative or other relationships with the candidate that might raise a question about objectivity.

For appointment, reappointment or promotion to the rank of Professor, there should be evidence that candidates have attained *national* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions in clinical care, teaching, and scholarship that advances clinical medicine. Such recognition should normally be confirmed in letters from independent external referees who do not have mentoring, collaborative or other relationships with the candidate that might raise a question about objectivity.

4. Criteria by Area of Primary Contribution

a. Clinical Care

For faculty members who make their primary contributions through clinical care, excellence in this area is required. A standard of excellence or of acceptable performance in teaching and in scholarship will normally be needed in order to achieve excellence in the overall mix of contributions. For further information regarding the application of criteria for clinical care, see **Section 2.3.I.**

b. Teaching

For faculty members who make their primary contributions through teaching, excellence in this area is nearly always required, along with excellence in clinical care (the latter being the standard for all MCL faculty). A standard of excellence or of acceptable performance in scholarship will normally be needed in order to achieve excellence in the overall mix of contributions. For further information regarding the application of criteria for teaching, see **Section 2.3.I.**

c. Scholarship

For faculty members who make their primary contributions through scholarship, excellence in this area is nearly always required, along with excellence in clinical care (the latter being a standard for all MCL faculty). A standard of excellence or of acceptable performance in teaching will normally be needed in order to achieve excellence in the overall mix of contributions. For further information regarding the application of criteria for scholarship, see **Section 2.3.I.**

d. Institutional Service

Associate Professors or Professors who make their primary contributions through institutional service are understood to have less time for clinical care, teaching and scholarship compared with colleagues without such duties (though administrative efforts per se may lead to scholarly activity or unusual opportunities for advancement of clinical medicine). In those cases, the performance should nearly always be required to meet a standard of excellence, and may be considered in the reappointment and promotion process. Excellence in clinical care is also required (as it is for all MCL faculty). A standard of excellence or of acceptable performance in scholarship and teaching will normally be needed in order to achieve excellence in the overall mix of contributions. For further information regarding the application of criteria for institutional service, see **Section 2.3.I.**

(Note: Since a major commitment to administrative activities detracts from the time available for the primary areas of clinical care, teaching and scholarship, Assistant Professors are discouraged from significant administrative commitment and departments are discouraged from requiring such.)

2.3.I. Application of the Criteria

1. Standards of Excellence, Acceptable or Unacceptable Performance

In determining excellence in the overall mix of contributions, the following definitions should be used as a general guide:

Excellence is defined as achieving a level of distinction that is consistent with the high standards of Stanford University and the mission of the School of Medicine, that is, to be a premier research-intensive medical school that improves health through leadership and collaborative discoveries and innovation in patient care, education and research.

School of Medicine expectations for *acceptable performance* will typically be understood to be less than excellence (as described above), but to exceed the basic professional competence standards of the general clinical and scholarly communities. Areas where performance is found to be acceptable, but with room for improvement, should receive appropriate attention during annual

counseling meetings or through the counseling memorandum that is part of the reappointment or promotion review process.

Unacceptable performance denotes a quality of activity that is below the standard for acceptable performance expected of a Stanford faculty member. In rare instances, such a situation may be mitigated if, in the opinion of reviewing bodies (informed by compelling evidence) the unacceptable performance is predicted to improve significantly through the counseling process.

2. Factors in Applying the Criteria

Determination of satisfaction of applicable criteria is based on material accumulated during the appointment, reappointment or promotion review process; documentation that explicitly and tangibly supports both the quality of performance and the quantity of contributions is required.

The professional judgment of those assessing these data is the critical factor in determining whether the faculty member's accomplishments meet or surpass the standard of excellence in the overall mix of contributions.

Evaluation should be of total performance. Taking into consideration the proportionality of contributions in each year of the current appointment, appropriate weight should be given to the quality and quantity of work in the following categories:

a. Clinical Care

Excellence in clinical practice or clinical care is a requirement for those faculty members whose duties include such practice. Factors considered in assessing clinical performance may include (but are not limited to) the following:

General Clinical Proficiency: maintains up-to-date knowledge base appropriate to scope of practice; maintains current technical/procedural proficiency; applies sound diagnostic reasoning and judgment; applies sound therapeutic reasoning and judgment; applies evidence from relevant scientific studies; seeks consultation from other care providers when appropriate; maintains appropriate clinical productivity; and demonstrates reliability in meeting clinical commitments.

Communication: communicates effectively with patients and their families, physician peers, trainees, and other members of

the health care team (for example, nurses, nurse practitioners, respiratory therapists, pharmacists); and maintains appropriate medical documentation.

Professionalism: treats patients with compassion and respect; serves as patient advocate (puts the patient first); shows sensitivity to cultural issues; treats physician peers, trainees, and other members of the health care team (for example, nurses, nurse practitioners, respiratory therapists, pharmacists) with respect; is available to colleagues; responds in a timely manner; and respects patient confidentiality.

Systems-Based Practice: effectively coordinates patient care within the health care system; appropriately considers cost of care in medical decision-making; participates in quality improvement activities; and demonstrates leadership in clinical program development and administration.

The MCL may include faculty members who contribute indirectly to patient care in clinical environments that heavily emphasize technology and/or a multidisciplinary approach. For example, a radiation physicist may play an integral role in treatment planning for individual oncology patients or a biomedical engineer may work closely with a surgeon or interventional cardiologist to develop and implement new treatment strategies. In such cases, factors considered in assessing clinical performance may include (but are not limited to) applicable factors described above.

b. Teaching

Depending on the proportion of time and effort, a standard of excellence or of acceptable performance in teaching is essential for appointment, reappointment and promotion in the MCL. If the highest proportion of a faculty member's time and effort is dedicated to teaching, a standard of excellence should nearly always be met. Factors considered in assessing teaching performance may include (but are not limited to) the following: knowledge of the material; clarity of exposition; positive style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism; institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; ability to stimulate further education; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

It is recognized that most clinicians teach in small group sessions or with individual trainees. With the approval of their departments and if time allows, MCL faculty members may also develop or participate in formal didactic courses.

Teaching may, for example, be of undergraduates, medical students, residents, clinical and postdoctoral fellows, ancillary staff (e.g., nurses) and in postgraduate and continuing medical education.

c. Scholarship

Depending on the proportion of time and effort, faculty appointed, reappointed or promoted in the MCL should meet a standard of excellence or of acceptable performance in scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will almost always be required.

The nature of the scholarly activities, the effort required and the time available to pursue them should be aligned with the strategic goals and programmatic needs of the department and School, as well as with the interests and strengths of the faculty member. Scholarship within the MCL is viewed as an important result of outstanding performance in clinical care and teaching duties as well as a valuable yardstick for documenting performance. In most cases, scholarly activities will flow naturally from the MCL faculty member's clinical responsibilities, and these scholarly activities are expected to complement the clinical activities. In turn, a successful program of scholarly work may lead to innovative approaches in the care of patients and/or the education of students. In most cases, the record should show how the clinical care, teaching and scholarly activities are intertwined and explicitly what scholarship resulted from the work that can be objectively judged by faculty peers.

MCL faculty members may pursue research in any appropriate arena, such as basic science research, clinical trials, clinical or translational research, or health policy research. Factors considered in assessing scholarship may include (but are not limited to) the following: scholarly activity and productivity; impact, innovation and creativity; recognition in the field; ability to work effectively as part of a research team; effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics.

Scholarship conducted by MCL faculty members may result in achievement in a more narrowly defined field than expected of a faculty member in the University Tenure Line.

i. When the Proportionality of Contribution is Secondary

For those Assistant and Associate Professors whose time and effort in scholarship is secondary, written contributions may take a wide variety of forms, including peer reviewed articles, chapters, commentaries, case reports and reports of the results of clinical investigations. Any of these types (as long as the quality is excellent or acceptable and the quantity is appropriate) may be considered sufficient evidence of scholarly work.

With the increasing prevalence of collaborative “team science,” it is understood that there are many ways for a faculty member to be recognized for individual substantive contributions to multi-author works. These may include conception and design; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting of the manuscript; critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; statistical analysis; obtaining funding; administrative, technical or material support; or supervision. Evidence accumulated during the appointment or review process should provide information regarding the nature of the faculty member’s substantive contributions to multi-author works, as well as the impact that the publications have had in advancing medicine.

Scholarly contributions may also include activities as represented by the following, as long as these can be objectively evaluated by persons qualified to perform such evaluations: teaching activities that may include such achievements as developing and implementing novel teaching methodologies or a new and innovative course, shaping a core curriculum, or creating educational software or video programs; creation of novel diagnostic, therapeutic or administrative practices that may influence health care delivery; creation of major new patient services or new systems of health care; creation of mechanisms or tools to improve the efficiency of health services and/or systems of care or

creation of methods to evaluate outcomes of care; administrative efforts that lead to scholarly activity or unusual opportunities for advancement of clinical medicine.

While it can be a useful marker of substantial scholarly contribution, investigative independence is *not* an absolute requirement. Likewise, although it can be useful in assessing matters such as distinction, including regional or national recognition, external funding is *not* a requirement.

ii. When the Proportionality of Contribution is Primary

Under certain limited circumstances, the highest proportion of time and effort may be dedicated to scholarship in order to meet a specific departmental programmatic need. In such cases, a standard of excellence should nearly always be met, and the main emphasis of written contributions should be on peer-reviewed articles. To complement the record of peer-reviewed articles, other written work such as books, chapters, reviews and commentaries may be considered as long as their impact in advancing clinical medicine can be established. With respect to multi-author works, it is expected that contributions will be made through first or senior authorship or through other substantive contributions.

Investigative independence is expected since it can be a useful marker of substantive scholarly contributions.

In most cases, faculty members whose primary contribution is through scholarship will have a record of external funding, which is often viewed as an indicator of how the work is regarded in the field and may likewise be relevant to an assessment of the ability of a faculty member to carry out an excellent program of scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine.

iii. The Rank of Professor

For appointment or reappointment at or promotion to the rank of Professor, the main emphasis of written contributions should be on peer-reviewed articles, regardless of the proportion of time and effort.

Contributions may be made through first or senior authorship or through other substantive contributions to multi-author works. To complement the record of peer-reviewed articles, other written work such as books, chapters, reviews and commentaries may be considered as long as their impact in advancing clinical medicine can be established.

d. Institutional Service

Institutional service (including what may be called institutional citizenship) may at times be a factor in appointment, reappointment and promotion decisions. For example, many administrative duties critical to all aspects of the operation of the School of Medicine require input from, or direction by, faculty. Thus, Associate Professors and Professors are encouraged to participate in administration of the School's programs, and both the scope and the quality of administrative performance may be considered in the reappointment and promotion of senior faculty at the Associate Professor and Professor ranks. Those with significant ongoing administrative duties, such as department chairs, service line directors and others involved in the operation of Stanford Hospital and Clinics and Lucile Salter Packard Children's Hospital, are understood to have less time for clinical care, teaching and scholarship compared with colleagues without such duties (though administrative efforts per se may lead to scholarly activity or unusual opportunities for advancement of clinical medicine). In such cases, the quality of the performance may be considered in the reappointment and promotion process.

Since a major commitment to administrative activities detracts from the time available for the primary areas of clinical care, teaching and scholarship, Assistant Professors are discouraged from significant administrative commitment and departments are discouraged from requiring such.

e. Respectful Workplace

The School of Medicine is committed to providing a work environment that is conducive to teaching and learning, research, the practice of medicine and patient care. Stanford's special purposes in this regard depend on a shared commitment among all members of the community to respect each person's worth and dignity. Because of their roles within the School of Medicine, faculty members, in particular, are expected to treat

all members of the Stanford Community with civility, respect and courtesy and with an awareness of the potential impact of their behavior on staff, students and other faculty members.

As detailed earlier in this section, application of criteria for evaluating the quality of clinical care, teaching and scholarship include specific expectations regarding a faculty member's professional behavior in the workplace. They are reiterated here to emphasize their importance as factors in appointment, reappointment and promotion actions.

In clinical care activities, such factors relevant to evaluation of whether the standards for clinical performance have been met may include: professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; humanism; ability to work effectively as part of the health care team; and effective communication with colleagues, staff, students and patients.

In teaching activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for teaching have been met may include: a positive style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism; institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

In scholarly activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for scholarship have been met may include: the ability to work effectively as part of a research team; effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics.

Results from the distribution of clinical excellence and teaching evaluation forms, as well as from referee letters, will aid reviewing bodies in assessing a faculty member's performance in the workplace.

2.3.J. Establishing, Monitoring and Applying Proportionality of Contributions

1. Establishing, Monitoring or Changing the Proportionality of Contributions

The allocation of an MCL faculty member's time is determined by the strategic and programmatic needs of the department and School. The approximate proportionality of contributions is initially determined at the time of appointment and is generally confirmed in the faculty

member's offer letter. MCL Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors with a fixed term of appointment should discuss the proportionality of their contributions at annual counseling meetings with their department chair (or designate); this proportionality should be recorded on the annual counseling meeting form. In consultation with and with approval by the department chair (or designate), a faculty member's proportionality of contributions may change; such changes should be included in written documentation summarizing the counseling meeting.

2. Documenting Proportionality of Contributions for the Review Process

Evaluation for reappointment and promotion should take into account the approximate proportionality of contributions in each year of the MCL faculty member's term. This information should be incorporated by the department into the reappointment or promotion "long form" so that evaluating bodies at the departmental, School and University levels are cognizant of the proportionality of contributions and may give appropriate weight to each area during the review process.

3. Clinical Care Proportionality

Typically, MCL faculty members will spend the majority of their time on clinical care and teaching. While there is flexibility regarding proportionality of contribution, excellence in clinical practice or clinical care is required for MCL faculty members regardless of the level of their time commitment.

4. Scholarship Proportionality

The intensity of contributions in the area of scholarly activity will be tempered by clinical and teaching commitments of most faculty members and, for some, by the demands of institutional service. However, because scholarly activity is a requirement for appointment, reappointment and promotion of faculty in the MCL, departments must allocate and protect time for academic pursuits. There must be an explicit written plan for academic time; this is typically formalized initially at the time of the job offer, and should in general be reconfirmed annually at the faculty member's counseling session.

All MCL faculty should normally have a minimum of approximately 20% FTE protected for scholarly research from required clinical care, teaching and, if relevant, administrative duties. This is particularly important for Assistant Professors. The department chair should work cooperatively with the faculty member to establish and maintain the minimum threshold of protected time.

Under certain limited circumstances, MCL faculty may, with the agreement of their department chair, allocate the highest proportion of their time and effort to scholarship. Among the distinguishing characteristics of an MCL faculty member versus a tenure line faculty member with a similar proportion of time allocated for scholarship are that MCL faculty members are also required to demonstrate excellent clinical performance. In addition, MCL faculty members' scholarship may result in achievement in a more narrowly defined field than that expected of a tenure line faculty member.

Recognizing the complexity of clinical practice, it should be understood that this allocation of academic time can be scheduled in various ways compatible with the clinical obligations of the faculty member. In some instances, this may correspond to blocks of time allocated for academic purposes, but in many cases more creative schedules may be required. Monitoring of academic time by Departmental or Divisional leaders (as well as by the faculty member himself or herself) is necessary to ensure that this allocation of academic time is both respected and appropriately utilized.

2.3.K. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Assistant Professors

1. Appointment

Individuals appointed as Assistant Professors will have completed their house staff training and, where appropriate, postdoctoral fellowship training. They must demonstrate excellence or promise of excellence in the overall mix of contributions in clinical care, teaching and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine appropriate to the programmatic need upon which the appointment will be based. There should be evidence that candidates have the promise to attain *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions. If these individuals have not had formal teaching experience, they should have demonstrated during their house staff and fellowship training a commitment to teaching, and they should have the potential to meet or exceed acceptable standards in teaching.

The initial term of appointment will generally be for four years.

2. Reappointment

Although term appointments are frequently made with the clear possibility of reappointment or promotion, there is no entitlement to such action at the end of the term, and it is not automatic. Given the

structure of an Assistant Professor's initial appointment (four years) and, if successful, reappointment (up to six years), the reappointment review represents a particularly pivotal milestone, both for the Assistant Professor and the department, and the performance of the candidate will be carefully measured against the criteria for reappointment.

Assistant Professors in the MCL are assessed for reappointment on the basis of their performance and achievements in the areas of clinical care, teaching and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine. They may be reappointed based on evidence of progress, high-level performance, and continuing programmatic need. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for reappointment to the rank of Assistant Professor. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to successfully fill the programmatic need for which the reappointment is made and to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School. There should be evidence that candidates have the promise to attain *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions.

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an Assistant Professor will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in clinical care, teaching and scholarship. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

The term of reappointment will generally be for six years.

During the seventh year in rank, the department chair (or designate) will prepare a written counseling memo, which will evaluate and document the Assistant Professor's performance in light of the criteria for promotion.

Annual counseling will continue to be required to monitor progress toward reappointment, as well as the subsequent promotion review (which, under normal circumstances, will be initiated at the beginning of the tenth year). Serious concerns regarding the faculty member's progress that could impede reappointment or promotion will need to be discussed with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs as soon as they emerge.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.3.G**.

2.3.L. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors

1. Appointment

Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor in the MCL will be considered for those who have demonstrated excellence in the overall mix of clinical care, teaching and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. There should be evidence that candidates have attained *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions. There should be evidence that candidates will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and to make meritorious contributions to their discipline and to the School.

The term of appointment will generally be for five years.

2. Reappointment

Reappointment to the rank of Associate Professor in the MCL will be considered for those who have demonstrated excellence in the overall mix of clinical care, teaching, scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine, and institutional service (if applicable) during their terms of appointment as Associate Professors at Stanford. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for the rank of Associate Professor. There should be evidence that candidates have attained *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions. There should be evidence that the candidates will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and to make meritorious contributions to their discipline and to the School.

The term of appointment will generally be for five years, renewable (based on fulfillment of the criteria and continuing programmatic need – including budgetary considerations). There is no limit on the number of reappointments at the rank of Associate Professor.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.3.G.**

3. Promotion

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the MCL will be considered for those who have demonstrated excellence in the overall mix of clinical care, teaching, scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine, and institutional service (if applicable) during their terms of

appointment as Assistant Professors at Stanford. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for the rank of Associate Professor. There should be evidence that candidates have attained *regional* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions. There should be evidence that candidates will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and to make meritorious contributions to their discipline and to the School.

The term of appointment will be generally for five years, renewable (based on fulfillment of the criteria and continuing programmatic need – including budgetary considerations). There is no limit on the number of reappointments at the rank of Associate Professor.

For the timing of promotion consideration, see **Section 2.3.G.**

2.3.M. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors

1. Appointment

Appointment to the rank of Professor in the MCL will be reserved for individuals who have demonstrated excellence in the overall mix of clinical care, teaching and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine, and who are widely recognized as leaders in their field. There must be evidence that these individuals have attained *national* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions, that they have demonstrated continuing excellence and progressive maturation as physicians, teachers and scholars, and that they will successfully fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and will continue to make outstanding contributions to their discipline and to the School. They may be recognized nationally as leaders of the health care system or of organizational change and measurement of health care systems. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for the rank of Professor. The main emphasis of written contributions should be on peer-reviewed articles, regardless of the proportion of time and effort dedicated to scholarship. Such contributions may be made through first or senior authorship or through substantive contributions to multi-author works. To complement the record of peer reviewed articles, other written work such as books, chapters, reviews and commentaries may be considered as long as their impact in advancing clinical medicine can be established. The intensity of personal contributions to the advancement of clinical medicine will be tempered by the administrative commitments of those with major ongoing institutional leadership roles.

Initial appointment at the rank of Professor will generally be for a term of five years.

2. Reappointment

Reappointment to the rank of Professor in the MCL will be reserved for individuals who have demonstrated excellence in the overall mix of clinical care, teaching and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine during their term of appointment as at Stanford, and who are widely recognized as leaders in their field. There must be evidence that these individuals have attained *national* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions, that they have demonstrated continuing excellence and progressive maturation as physicians, teachers and scholars, and that they will successful continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and to make outstanding contributions to their discipline and to the School. They may be recognized nationally as leaders of the health care system or of organizational change and measurement of health care systems. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for the rank of Professor. The main emphasis of written contributions should be on peer-reviewed articles, regardless of the proportion of time and effort dedicated to scholarship. Such contributions may be made through first or senior authorship or through substantive contributions to multi-author works. To complement the record of peer reviewed articles, other written work such as books, chapters, reviews and commentaries may be considered as long as their impact in advancing clinical medicine can be established. The intensity of personal contributions to the advancement of clinical medicine will be tempered by the administrative commitments of those with major ongoing leadership roles within the institution.

Reappointment at the rank of Professor may be for a continuing term or as otherwise expressly specified (for special circumstances for which an appointment for a term of years is appropriate). For further details on continuing term appointments, see **Section 2.3.F**. Term of years appointments are renewable (based on fulfillment of the criteria and continuing programmatic need – including budgetary considerations).

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.3.G**.

3. Promotion

Promotion to the rank of Professor in the MCL will be reserved for individuals who have demonstrated excellence in the overall mix of

clinical care, teaching and scholarly activity that advances clinical medicine during their terms as at Stanford, and who are widely recognized as leaders in their field. There must be evidence that these individuals have attained *national* recognition for excellence in the overall mix of contributions, that they have demonstrated continuing excellence and progressive maturation as physicians, teachers and scholars, and that they will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and to make outstanding contributions to their discipline and to the School. They may be recognized nationally as leaders of the health care system or of organizational change and measurement of health care systems. *Written* scholarship that advances the field will nearly always be required for the rank of . The main emphasis of written contributions should be on peer-reviewed articles, regardless of the proportion of time and effort dedicated to scholarship. Such contributions may be made through first or senior authorship or through substantive contributions to multi-author works. To complement the record of peer reviewed articles, other written work such as books, chapters, reviews and commentaries may be considered as long as their impact in advancing clinical medicine can be established. The intensity of personal contributions to the advancement of clinical medicine will be tempered by the administrative commitments of those with major ongoing leadership roles within the institution.

Promotion to the rank of Professor may be for a continuing term or as otherwise expressly specified (for special circumstances for which an appointment for a term of years is appropriate). For further details on continuing term appointments, see **Section 2.3.F**.

Term of years appointments are renewable (based on fulfillment of the criteria and continuing programmatic need – including budgetary considerations).

For the timing of promotion consideration, see **Section 2.3.G**.

2.4 UNIVERSITY TENURE LINE (UTL): Criteria and Guidelines for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

2.4.A. Definition

Scholarship and teaching (and in some cases, clinical care activities) are the critical components of faculty appointments in the University Tenure Line (UTL). Under normal circumstances, the proportion of time and effort dedicated to scholarship and teaching will be more than that devoted to clinical care. (For those faculty whose primary commitment is to clinical care, appointment in the Medical Center Line [MCL] is normally more appropriate.)

Since both laboratory research and clinical research are valued in the School of Medicine, UTL faculty may be appointed in either the basic science or clinical science departments. Whereas laboratory research is typically regarded as the acquisition of new knowledge through basic science, clinical research is the acquisition of new knowledge through the study of individuals in the clinic, at the bedside, or in the field. Translational research may be performed in either setting.

Major discoveries have frequently come from application of new knowledge derived from laboratory research. Clinical research which is creative or innovative and which develops significant new knowledge considered leading in its field will also be recognized as an important accomplishment that can meet the criteria in regard to research for appointment, reappointment and promotion of tenure-line faculty in the School.

All appointments, reappointments and promotions in the UTL are dependent upon excellence that is consistent with the high standards of Stanford University. Such actions are also dependent upon programmatic need (including budgetary considerations), which may be evaluated in the context of the research and teaching programs and/or of the individual's specific contributions.

UTL faculty are members of the Professoriate and of the Academic Council of Stanford University, as well as of the School of Medicine's Faculty Council.

2.4.B. Billet Authorization

Appointments in the University Tenure Line are initiated by departmental or joint departmental action. Although appointments may also be initiated by one of the School's five institutes, the appointment must be made in a department. A department chair must present the case for a new faculty position to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and obtain formal

authorization from the Dean before a search can be launched. A billet number (representing a previously approved commitment) must accompany each search request.

By default, every position that becomes vacant for any reason normally returns to the Dean's Reserve; to retain the position, the department chair must submit a request to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. In some circumstances, the position will be returned to the department for a replacement or for a search in another field. In other cases, the Dean may reallocate the position to another department or hold it in the Dean's Reserve.

Departmental leadership and the School administration must regard every search authorization as a potential long-term commitment. The Dean's search authorization is based upon factors including the availability of resources (including a billet commitment and funding), an assessment of the department's present and predicted future needs in clinical, research and teaching activities, and the specific programmatic need for the requested search; it reflects priority judgments both within the department and between departments. Contributions to interdisciplinary institutes may also play a role in assigning search authorizations to departments.

2.4.C. Searches and Waivers of Search

As is the case for other faculty lines, it is expected that a rigorous and comprehensive search normally will be conducted for new appointments in the University Tenure Line. (The Office of Academic Affairs' [Guide to Faculty Searches](#) provides information on policies and procedures related to searches; see also University Faculty Handbook Chapter [2.7.C.\(5\)](#).) On occasion, however, a search waiver may be approved when an exceptionally talented person (usually an eminent scholar who is clearly a leader in his or her field) is unexpectedly available.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consider waivers of search for appointments on a case-by-case basis. Under certain circumstances, a waiver of search may be pursued when convincing evidence is presented that a candidate, either internal or external to Stanford, not only meets the criteria for the position but that he or she would have emerged as a leading candidate had a national search been conducted. Search waivers for junior faculty appointments are granted only in extraordinary circumstances. There may be rare programmatic reasons that warrant a search waiver; inquiries should be addressed to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Under other circumstances, a determination may be made that a national search is the most appropriate way to proceed in filling the position. When the search is launched, the advertisement should not be tailored to fit a special

candidate or candidates. Furthermore, the search committee should be instructed that although the credentials of internal candidates may be more easily assessed than those of others, its members are still obliged to consider by all appropriate means the credentials of candidates having no prior association with the University. This obligation should be made clear to any internal candidate who holds or has held a non-faculty Stanford appointment.

2.4.D. Medical Staff Privileges

Before a member of the UTL faculty is permitted to assume responsibilities for the care of patients at Stanford Hospital and Clinics and/or Lucile Packard Children's Hospital, he or she must apply for Medical Staff membership and be approved through a formal credentialing process that results in clinic privileges. Similarly, a UTL faculty member who serves in a non-Stanford facility must obtain and maintain in good standing the privileges at that facility applicable to his or her duties.

University Tenure Line appointments are contingent upon and coterminous with the UTL faculty member obtaining and maintaining in good standing the privileges necessary for the performance of the faculty member's intended clinical role. Failure to obtain and maintain in good standing such privileges will generally result in the immediate termination of the faculty member's faculty appointment.

2.4.E. Ranks and Titles

The Tenure Line ranks are:

Assistant Professor
Associate Professor
Professor

Individuals may also be appointed in the UTL as an Assistant Professor with a "Subject to Ph.D." contingency. (For further information, see [Chapter 2.6.A. of the University Faculty Handbook](#).) Those holding appointments "Subject to Ph.D." do not accrue time toward tenure by length of service.

2.4.F. Duration of Appointments

Tenure Line appointments are made either for a term of years, or “without limit of time” (commonly referred to as “with tenure”). The total length of time spent in untenured term appointments in the UTL at any rank may not exceed seven years, except in specified circumstances such as those described in the guidelines below. The usual duration of an appointment (subject to relatively rare exceptions granted by the Provost for good cause and on a case-by-case basis) for each rank is:

Rank	Initial Appointment	Reappointment at or Promotion to
Assistant Professor	Normally 4 years	Normally 3 years; not to exceed a total of seven years without tenure
Associate Professor	With tenure, or for a term of generally 4 years	With tenure, or for a term of years not to exceed a total of seven years without tenure
Professor	With tenure, or for a term of up to 6 years when special circumstances warrant an appointment for a term of years	With tenure, or for a term of up to 6 years when special circumstances warrant an appointment for a term of years; not to exceed a total of seven years without tenure.

1. Term Appointments

Although term appointments are frequently made with the clear possibility of reappointment or promotion, there is no entitlement to such action at the end of the term and it is by no means automatic. Instead, decisions on reappointment and promotion, like decisions on initial appointment, are subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by the School’s departmental faculty and the School’s academic leadership.

Deans and department chairs are reminded that consideration of reappointment and promotion cases (especially those with term appointments) should include an account of the future of the department/division and/or School, which may include consideration of programmatic need (including budgetary considerations).

Reappointment and promotion reviews are generally (but not always) initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. (For further information on the timing of reviews, see **Section 2.4.G.**) At such time, the faculty member will receive a communication from the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs that confirms the initiation of the review and includes information regarding criteria for

the reappointment or promotion action, along with a general description of the process. Departments are then responsible for following up with more specific information, and it is the faculty member's obligation to provide materials that are requested, such as an up-to-date curriculum vitae and candidate's statement. The Office of Academic Affairs will work with departments to create a schedule so that the reappointment or promotion review is conducted in a timely manner.

Term appointments may be extended under certain circumstances; see **below (4. Tenure Clock Calculations)**.

2. Tenure

Tenure is security of appointment which continues to the date of academic retirement. Security of appointment is defined as the right not to be dismissed, involuntarily retired early, or subjected to discriminatory reduction of salary before the expiration of the term of an academic appointment except on the basis of situations outlined in [Chapter 4.4.B.](#) of the University Faculty Handbook. (See also Chapter 4.4.F(5).)

Appointments, reappointments and promotions without limit of time automatically carry tenure. Candidates for these actions are evaluated against the standards set forth in **Sections 2.4.H. and 2.4.I.** Material to aid in this evaluation is accumulated and prepared during the appointment, reappointment or promotion review process; documentation that explicitly and tangibly supports both the quality of performance and quantity of contributions is required.

3. Tenure by Length of Service

Tenure may also be acquired by length of service. (The rules concerning tenure by length of service can be found at [Chapter 4.4.D.](#) of the University Faculty Handbook.) Since a comprehensive review process is integral to the appointment, reappointment or promotion of faculty at Stanford University, situations in which tenure may be awarded on the basis of length of service should be strictly avoided. As a result, it is important for departments and schools to closely and accurately track and calculate both the seven-year tenure clock and ten-year appointment clock deadlines by keeping in mind that:

Full-time service in the UTL at Stanford at the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor (or a combination thereof) beyond seven years without the initiation of a review for tenure normally confers tenure by length of service.

Untenured service in a UTL rank may not normally exceed ten years, irrespective of the circumstances that might extend the seven-year tenure clock deadline as described below.

Accordingly, untenured service in a UTL rank beyond ten years normally confers tenure by length of service. The ten-year appointment clock deadline can only be extended by a Provostially-granted exception for extraordinary personal or institutional circumstances.

4. Tenure Clock Calculations

In determining tenure by length of service, both the seven-year tenure clock deadline and the ten-year appointment clock deadline must be calculated. The following should be taken into consideration:

Service in the Tenure Line: Only periods of service in the UTL as an Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor (or a combination thereof) count toward tenure by length of service. Persons holding acting or visiting appointments or “Subject to Ph.D.” appointments, or appointments in the Medical Center Line or Non-Tenure Line do not accrue time toward tenure by length of service.

Breaks in Tenure Line Service: Periods of service in the UTL at Stanford University need not be continuous to count toward acquisition of tenure by length of service. For a faculty member who departs Stanford University and is subsequently rehired, all service at Stanford in the UTL counts toward the seven-year tenure clock and the ten-year appointment clock deadlines.

Service at Other Institutions: Academic service at other institutions does not count toward acquisition of tenure by length of service at Stanford University.

Initiation of Tenure Review: Periods of service after the initiation of the tenure review process do not count toward tenure by length of service.

[Sample tenure clock calculations](#) are available on the Office of Academic Affairs website.

Circumstances that may stop the tenure clock and extend the seven-year deadline include part-time appointments, administrative appointments, leave without salary, childcare leave, New Parent

Tenure Clock Extension, and (with the approval of the Provost) some personal circumstances that may significantly disrupt teaching and scholarly activities for an extended period.

Circumstances that do not extend the seven-year tenure clock deadline include sabbatical leave, leave for periods of pure research, short-term disability, and pregnancy disability leave.

Untenured service in a UTL rank may not normally exceed ten years, irrespective of the circumstances that might extend the seven-year tenure clock deadline described above. The ten-year appointment clock deadline can only be extended by a Provostially-granted exception for extraordinary personal or institutional circumstances.

2.4.G. Progression through the Ranks

1. Career Trajectory

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an Assistant Professor will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) other activities. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

Evidence for reappointment as or promotion to Associate Professor without tenure must show that the faculty member is on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) other activities. Candidates should have compiled a record of excellent scholarly accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment or reappointment. There must be a realistic chance for reappointment or promotion with tenure in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work. Evidence for non-tenured promotions must show that the candidate's performance, including scholarly work and teaching, has been sufficiently strong to justify advancement in rank.

Reflecting an upward trajectory, candidates for promotion from tenured Associate Professor to Professor should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure review and met the criteria for the higher rank.

2. Timing of the Reappointment Review

Under normal circumstances, reappointment reviews for Assistant Professors (and, if applicable, for untenured Associate Professors) are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. However, the timing of the initiation of the evaluation process at the departmental level is at the discretion of the department chair, taking into account factors including the end date of a current appointment, the possible start date for the reappointment if the outcome of the School and University process is favorable, and considerations relating to notice of non-renewal and possible terminal year requirements if the outcome is negative. University policies regarding negative reappointment and promotion decisions and notice of non-renewal are found in the University Faculty Handbook at Chapter [2.8.C.](#) and [4.4.E.](#)

In cases where reappointment reviews are initiated more or less than one year in advance of the appointment end date, the department chair should inform the Senior Associate Dean, who will then need to endorse the timing of the review.

3. Timing of the Promotion Review

UTL Assistant Professors may spend a total of seven years in rank before promotion to Associate Professor (or, with approved extensions, up to ten years). Typically, promotion reviews for Assistant Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date, that is, at the beginning of the seventh year in rank.

Under certain circumstances, however, UTL faculty who have made accelerated progress in scholarship, teaching and, if relevant, clinical care (or who have had prior years of faculty experience at their current rank) may be proposed for early promotion. In most cases, this will typically occur in one of the years following reappointment. In rare instances, promotion may be considered in lieu of reappointment.

Since, in many cases, the University is being asked to evaluate a person who may have a shorter track record, there should be *unequivocal* evidence that the quality of the faculty member's contributions meets the criteria for promotion to the higher rank. When this standard is met, time in rank at another institution or a retention scenario may be cited as additional support for early promotion consideration.

Consultation between the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is essential prior to initiating a review

process leading toward early promotion. The process can only be initiated with the consent of the candidate and with the approval of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Unsuccessful candidates for early promotion may be proposed again at the normal time if that remains desirable to the candidate and the department. However, in order to avoid potential awkwardness following a negative promotion decision, it is prudent to initiate an early promotion review only when a positive outcome can be anticipated with reasonable confidence based on the available evidence.

There is no formal timeline for promotion from tenured Associate Professor to Professor. Candidates should be brought forward for consideration for promotion when there is evidence that they have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure review and that criteria for the higher rank have been met.

2.4.H. Criteria

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure initial appointment, reappointment and promotion, according to field or discipline. Scholars come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. Nevertheless, all faculty appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

Excellence in scholarship and teaching (and clinical care, if applicable) is an important prerequisite for a tenured appointment at Stanford because the University is dedicated to outstanding achievement in both. The purpose of the appointment, reappointment or promotion evaluation is to appraise, on the basis of the record to date, the candidate's standing in and impact on his or her scholarly discipline (broadly defined) and the candidate's quality as a teacher (and as a clinician, if applicable).

The criteria detailed below should be considered in concert with **Sections 2.4.I. (Application of the Criteria) and 2.4.J., 2.4.K. and 2.4.L**, which address specific criteria for the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, respectively.

1. Scholarship

The first criterion for a UTL appointment at Stanford is that the candidate must have achieved (or, in the case of Assistant Professors, have the promise to achieve) true distinction in scholarship. For the Associate Professor rank, the scholarship must reveal that the

candidate is not only among the best in his or her experience cohort in a broadly defined field, but is also likely to become one of the very best in that field. At the rank of Professor, the scholarship must reveal that the candidate is one of the very best in the broadly defined field. In short, the judgment is comparative and (for the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks) predictive.

For further information regarding the application of criteria for scholarship, see **Section 2.4.I**.

2. Teaching

The second criterion for a UTL appointment is promise – or a record demonstrating – that the candidate is capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program during his or her career at Stanford.

For further information regarding the application of criteria for teaching, see **Section 2.4.I**.

3. Clinical Care

Excellence in clinical practice or clinical care is a requirement for those candidates whose duties include such practice.

For further information regarding the application of criteria for clinical care, see **Section 2.4.I**.

4. Institutional Service

UTL candidates for appointment, reappointment or promotion are primarily assessed on the basis of their achievements in the areas of scholarship, teaching and, if relevant, clinical care, as noted above. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship), although relevant, is *not* a primary criterion.

The quality of the institutional service, however, may be considered in the appointment, reappointment or promotion process; in most cases, this will be at the rank of Professor and, less frequently, Associate Professor. Since a major commitment to service activities detracts from the time available for the primary areas of scholarship, teaching and, if relevant, clinical care, Assistant Professors are discouraged from significant administrative commitment and departments are discouraged from requiring such.

2.4.I. Application of the Criteria

1. Scholarship

In assessing whether a candidate has met the criteria of being one of the best scholars at his or her level of professional development in a broadly field, and of having achieved – or (in the case of Assistant Professors) having the promise to achieve – true distinction in scholarship, judgments should be informed by such considerations as whether the candidate is performing the kind of innovative, cutting-edge research on important questions in the field that breaks new ground, changes the way the field is viewed, broadens our understanding of the field, or opens up new methods or new areas of investigation, and thereby has (or is likely to have) the fundamental impact on the field that is expected from the very best scholars in the field.

Factors considered in assessing research performance or promise include (but are not limited to) the following: scholarly activity and productivity; impact, innovation and creativity; recognition in the field; ability to work effectively as part of a research team (if applicable); effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics.

Investigative independence (or, for Assistant Professors, the promise of investigative independence) is expected since it can be a useful marker of substantive scholarly contributions. It is anticipated that, in many cases, faculty members appointed or reappointed as or promoted to Associate Professor or Professor will have a record of external funding, which is often viewed as an indicator of how the work is regarded in the field and may likewise be relevant to an assessment of the ability of a faculty member to carry out an excellent program of scholarly activity.

Uniqueness of function is not, in and of itself, a primary criterion for an appointment, reappointment or promotion. The fact that a candidate is the only individual teaching in a specific area or doing scholarship on a certain subject, for example, is not relevant to the process of judging the quality of teaching and scholarship and is not determinative in the decision to appoint, reappoint or promote the candidate.

Moreover, a department's faculty and/or the dean (and, similarly, the Provost, University Advisory Board and/or President) may on occasion decide that a candidate does not warrant an appointment, reappointment or promotion even though that person may be the best

within a field. That is, the reviewing group or individual may decide that the best candidate in a weak or overly narrow professional field, for example, should not be appointed, reappointed or promoted to a position at Stanford.

Deans and department chairs must try to avoid such situations by ensuring that initial searches and appointments are made in areas in which the quality of scholarship is relatively strong, and in which the subject area is sufficiently broad. If teaching needs exist in potentially weak areas, then non-faculty appointments should be considered until that field improves or a strong candidate in it emerges.

2. Teaching

A UTL candidate should show promise – or have a record demonstrating -- that he or she is capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program during his or her career at Stanford.

Teaching is broadly defined to include: the classroom, laboratory, or clinical setting; advising; mentoring; program building; and curricular innovation. Teaching may include undergraduates, graduate students, medical students, residents, postdoctoral fellows and in postgraduate and continuing medical education. It is recognized that many UTL faculty in clinical departments teach in small group sessions or with individual trainees.

Factors considered in assessing teaching performance or promise include (but are not limited to) the following: knowledge of the material; clarity of exposition; style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; and ability to stimulate further education; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

3. Clinical Care

Excellence in clinical practice or clinical care is a requirement for those faculty members whose duties include such practice. Under normal circumstances, the proportion of time and effort dedicated to clinical care will be less than that devoted to scholarship and teaching. (For those faculty whose primary commitment is to clinical care, appointment in the Medical Center Line [MCL] is normally more appropriate.)

UTL faculty in the clinical departments may assume responsibilities for the care of patients to create the conditions necessary for medical research and for the teaching of medicine. Although the development

and nurturing of the clinical skills necessary for patient care places demands on the time and the attention of the faculty who provide that care, appointments, reappointments and promotions will still be made primarily on the basis of scholarship and teaching.

Factors considered in assessing clinical performance may include (but are not limited to) the following:

General Clinical Proficiency: maintains up-to-date knowledge base appropriate to scope of practice; maintains current technical/procedural proficiency; applies sound diagnostic reasoning and judgment; applies sound therapeutic reasoning and judgment; applies evidence from relevant scientific studies; seeks consultation from other care providers when appropriate; maintains appropriate clinical productivity; and demonstrates reliability in meeting clinical commitments.

Communication: communicates effectively with patients and their families, physician peers, trainees, and other members of the health care team (for example, nurses, nurse practitioners, therapists, pharmacists); and maintains appropriate medical documentation.

Professionalism: treats patients with compassion and respect; serves as patient advocate (puts the patient first); shows sensitivity to cultural issues; treats physician peers, trainees, and other members of the health care team (for example, nurses, nurse practitioners, therapists, pharmacists) with respect; is available to colleagues; responds in a timely manner; and respects patient confidentiality.

Systems-Based Practice: effectively coordinates patient care within the health care system; appropriately considers cost of care in medical decision-making; participates in quality improvement activities; and demonstrates leadership in clinical program development and administration.

The UTL may include faculty members who contribute indirectly to patient care in clinical environments that heavily emphasize technology and/or a multidisciplinary approach. For example, a radiation physicist may play an integral role in treatment planning for individual oncology patients or a biomedical engineer may work closely with a surgeon or interventional cardiologist to develop and implement new treatment strategies. In such cases, factors considered in assessing clinical performance may include (but are not limited to) the applicable factors described above.

4. Respectful Workplace

The School of Medicine is committed to providing a work environment that is conducive to teaching and learning, research, the practice of medicine and patient care. Stanford's special purposes in this regard depend on a shared commitment among all members of the community to respect each person's worth and dignity. Because of their roles within the School of Medicine, faculty members, in particular, are expected to treat all members of the Stanford Community with civility, respect and courtesy and with an awareness of the potential impact of their behavior on staff, students, patients and other faculty members.

As detailed earlier in this section, application of criteria for evaluating the quality of scholarship, teaching and clinical care include specific expectations regarding a faculty member's professional behavior in the workplace. They are reiterated here to emphasize their importance as factors in appointment, reappointment and promotion actions.

In scholarly activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for scholarship have been met may include: the ability to work effectively as part of a research team; effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics

In teaching activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for teaching have been met may include: a positive style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism; institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

In clinical care activities, such factors relevant to evaluation of whether the standards for clinical performance have been met may include: professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; humanism; ability to work effectively as part of the health care team; and effective communication with colleagues, staff, students and patients.

Results from the distribution of clinical excellence and teaching evaluation forms, as well as from referee letters, will aid reviewing bodies in assessing a faculty member's performance in the workplace.

2.4.J. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Assistant Professors

1. Appointment as Assistant Professor (for a term of years)

Individuals appointed as Assistant Professors in the UTL will have completed housestaff training (where applicable) and, additionally, one or two years of postdoctoral research experience. Their accomplishments during graduate and postgraduate training should already have stamped them as creative and promising investigators. If these individuals have not had formal teaching experience, they should have demonstrated during their postdoctoral training a commitment to develop the skills necessary for first-rate teaching. In short, the successful candidate must have demonstrated true distinction (or the promise of achieving true distinction) in research, and the capability of sustaining first-rate performance (or the promise of this) in teaching, and excellence in patient care (if applicable) appropriate to the programmatic need upon which the appointment is based.

The initial term of appointment will be four years.

2. Reappointment as Assistant Professor (for a term of years)

Assistant Professors in the UTL are assessed for reappointment on the basis of their performance and achievements in the areas of scholarship, teaching and, if applicable, clinical care. They may be reappointed based on evidence of progress, high-level performance, and their continuing to fill a programmatic need. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School.

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an Assistant Professor will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) clinical care. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

The term of reappointment will be three years. Total time in service at Stanford in an untenured rank is normally limited to seven years (or, with approved extensions, up to ten years).

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.4.G.**

2.4.K. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors

1. Appointment as Associate Professor (conferring tenure)

Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure will be reserved for an individual who has achieved true distinction in research and who is not only recognized as among the best in his or her cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. The candidate should be capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program, and (if he or she has clinical responsibilities) be an excellent clinician. There should be evidence that the candidate will successfully fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and to the School.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor (conferring tenure)

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure will be reserved for an individual who has achieved true distinction in research and who is not only recognized as among the best in his or her cohort in a broadly defined field but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. The candidate should be capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program, and (if he or she has clinical responsibilities) be an excellent clinician. There should be evidence that the candidate will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and to the School.

For the timing of promotion consideration, see **Section 2.4.G.**

3. Appointment as Associate Professor (without tenure)

Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor (without tenure) is based upon evidence of the candidate's performance at another institution of exceptionally meritorious research and a high level of teaching and clinical care (if applicable) activity.

At the time of appointment, it is expected that the candidate's qualifications will be more advanced than those described for an Assistant Professor but less than those described for an Associate Professor with tenure, and that he or she will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) clinical care. There must be a realistic chance for the candidate to become tenured in the future on the basis of continuation of his or her work.

The term of appointment will generally be four years; time in service at Stanford without tenure is limited to seven years (or, with approved extensions, up to ten years).

4. Reappointment as Associate Professor (without tenure)

Associate Professors in the UTL are assessed for reappointment on the basis of their performance and achievements in the areas of scholarship, teaching and, if applicable, clinical care. They may be reappointed based on evidence of progress, high-level performance, and their continuing to fill a programmatic need. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School.

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an untenured Associate Professor will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, teaching and (if applicable) clinical care. Candidates for reappointment should have compiled a record of excellent scholarly accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment. There must be a realistic chance for the candidate to become tenured in the future on the basis of continuation of his or her work.

The term of reappointment will customarily be up to three years; time in service at Stanford without tenure is limited to seven years (or, with approved extensions, up to ten years).

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.4.G.**

5. Promotion (without tenure)

This is rarely used; consult the Office of Academic Affairs.

2.4.L. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors

1. Appointment as Professor (conferring tenure)

Appointment to the rank of Professor with tenure will be reserved for an exceptionally distinguished individual who has performed outstanding research and who is recognized as one of the very best in a broadly defined field. The candidate should be capable of sustaining a first-rate teaching program and (if he or she has clinical responsibilities) be an excellent clinician. There should be evidence that the candidate will successfully fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and to the School.

2. Promotion to Professor (with tenure)

For Associate Professors with tenure at Stanford, promotion to Professor should reflect continuing distinguished performance in research, teaching and clinical care (if applicable). In order to be promoted to full Professor, a faculty member should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the tenure review. In general, the evidence should show that the person being proposed for promotion is recognized as one of the very best in a broadly defined field and will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and to the School. While the primary criteria for promotion are distinguished performance in scholarship, teaching, and (if applicable) clinical care, service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

3. Promotion to Professor (without tenure)

This is rarely used; consult the Office of Academic Affairs.

2.5 NON-TENURE LINE (RESEARCH) [RESEARCH LINE]: Criteria for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

2.5A. Definition

Faculty in the School of Medicine are predominantly in the University Tenure Line or Medical Center Line. The Non-Tenure Line (Research), also known as the Research Line, is used for special programmatic needs that are not fulfilled by faculty in these other lines. Appointments are made coterminous with continued salary or other support from sponsored projects.

Faculty appointed in the Research Line generally have special expertise in a relatively narrow field that is of particular benefit to a broader clinical or research program. Typically, such special expertise expands the academic impact of strong clinical or other research programs ongoing in the School of Medicine. Such faculty have been especially attractive to the clinical departments where a successful academic program may depend upon the expertise of a focused Research Line faculty member whose work addresses issues pertinent to a busy clinical program. Most of the faculty in the Research Line are recruited to be part of a program with a multidisciplinary need.

A position in the Research Line may be especially attractive to basic investigators who desire an intensive collaboration with clinical programs and for whom the stimulation of the clinical program is critical to the expression of their research. Indeed, the ability to collaborate effectively with others is generally a critical factor in a Research Line faculty member's ability to fill successfully the programmatic need for which the position was created.

Since this faculty line is specifically designated for research, there is no formal teaching obligation. However, Research Line faculty often teach actively in their laboratories, and they may also teach departmental courses. The School of Medicine generally discourages significant clinical time commitments for faculty in this line.

Research Line faculty are members of the Professoriate and of the Academic Council of Stanford University and of the School of Medicine's Faculty Council.

2.5.B. Billet Authorization

Appointments in the Research Line are initiated by departmental or joint departmental action. Although appointments may also be initiated by one of the School's five institutes, the appointment must be made in a department. A department chair must present the case for a new faculty appointment to the

Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and obtain formal authorization from the Dean before a search can be launched. A billet number (representing a previously approved commitment) must accompany each search request.

By default, every position that becomes vacant for any reason normally returns to the Dean's Reserve; to retain the position, the department chair must submit a request to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. In some circumstances, the position will be returned to the department for a replacement or for a search in another field. In other cases, the Dean may reallocate the position to another department or hold it in the Dean's Reserve.

Departmental leadership and the School administration must regard every search authorization as a potential long-term commitment. The Dean's search authorization is based upon factors including the availability of resources (including a billet commitment and funding), an assessment of the department's present and predicted future needs in clinical, research and teaching activities, and the specific programmatic need for the requested search; it reflects priority judgments both within the department and between departments. Contributions to interdisciplinary institutes may also play a role in assigning search authorizations to departments.

2.5.C. Funding

Appointments to the Research Line, even if stated as for a term of years, are normally coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored projects, or the continuation of contract support. Should such funding cease, the appointment normally would end at that same time – without the completion of the term or the requirement of a period of notice. Although University funding beyond the point at which the faculty member's funding support terminates may be possible in certain instances, it is not an entitlement. Such situations are handled on a case-by-case basis, as are cases when a reduction (as opposed to a complete cessation) of the faculty member's support will result in the immediate termination of the appointment.

In the School of Medicine, department chairs have discretion regarding the definition of the level and duration of insufficient support (so as to constitute the failure of coterminous support), with the consequential termination of an appointment of a faculty member. Their decisions should be guided by programmatic need and departmental resources. The decision to terminate should be made only with the advice and consent of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The general School guidelines are as follows:

1. A new faculty member will be expected to have eighty percent of salary and benefits supported from external sources by the end of the third year of appointment.
2. Existing faculty members previously funded with salary and benefits support from external sources at eighty percent or more may be permitted (in the discretion of the department chair) to have up to two years to re-establish external support at the minimum level of eighty percent of salary and benefits.
3. After such a period of interim departmental support (if any) as is granted by the department chair in his or her discretion, the position may be terminated without any period of notice.
4. Insufficient support at any time should not be addressed by a reduction in effort; faculty members are generally expected to be full-time.
5. To reiterate, all such matters relating to insufficient support are left to the discretion of the department and Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
6. Members of the Research Line in clinical departments may be included in a departmental bonus plan, with eligibility for a bonus based on their research or, if applicable, teaching (subject to budgetary considerations). They should not be eligible for a direct bonus based on clinical work alone, although a bonus determined under the discretion of the chair may be made for clinical or other work in combination with their primary duties.
7. The department will be responsible for the base salary and benefits expense not supported by external sources.

Faculty in this line are also expected to engage in activities that are complementary or in addition to their primary focus of research. For example, some faculty may have a teaching role, serve on departmental committees or perform in an administrative role. Since grants and contracts provide salary support only for research-related activities, other sources must be identified to cover the small percentage of time and effort dedicated to other activities as described above. This is commonly known as the “five percent rule”: that is, a minimum of five percent effort is presumed to be dedicated to activities other than research and should be funded through a source or sources other than grants and contracts. In other words, at no time may 100% of salary and benefits be supported exclusively through grants and contracts.

Some leeway is allowed for departmental discretion in determining the percentage of salary support that may be covered from sources other than grants and contracts. As stated above, the minimum amount is five percent; the maximum is generally twenty percent, which aligns with the expectation that eighty percent of salary and benefits of Research Line faculty will be supported from external sources by the end of the third year of appointment.

2.5.D. Searches and Waivers of Search

As is the case for other faculty lines, it is expected that a rigorous and comprehensive search normally will be conducted for new appointments in the Research Line. (The Office of Academic Affairs' [Guide to Faculty Searches](#) provides information on policies and procedures related to searches; see also University Faculty Handbook Chapter [2.7.C.\(5\)](#).) While this is the goal, as a practical matter, a specific programmatic need may be best fulfilled by personnel already affiliated with Stanford. In some cases, such individuals may have started new areas of investigation during fellowship training or as Research Associates or Senior Research Scientists that contribute to the research of a clinical program or multidisciplinary need. In other cases, potential candidates who are affiliated with Stanford may already be sponsored by grants especially focused on a specific area of research and programmatic need, or there may be apparent practical problems in maintaining funding and substituting a new faculty member or investigator.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consider waivers of search for appointments in the Research Line of internal candidates on a case-by-case basis. Under certain circumstances, a waiver of search may be pursued when convincing evidence is presented that a candidate internal to Stanford not only meets the criteria for the position but that he or she would have emerged as a leading candidate had a national search been conducted. Search waivers for junior faculty appointments are granted only in extraordinary circumstances. There may be rare programmatic reasons that warrant a search waiver; inquiries should be addressed to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Under other circumstances, a determination may be made that a national search is the most appropriate way to proceed in filling the position. When the search is launched, the advertisement should not be tailored to fit a special candidate or candidates. Furthermore, the search committee should be instructed that although the credentials of internal candidates may be more easily assessed than those of others, its members are still obliged to consider by all appropriate means the credentials of candidates having no prior association with the University. This obligation should be made clear to any internal candidate who holds or has held a non-faculty Stanford appointment.

2.5.E. Ranks and Titles

The Non-Tenure Line (Research) ranks are:

- Assistant Professor (Research)
- Associate Professor (Research)
- Professor (Research)

In everyday usage, the parenthetical designation may be removed from the titles of Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors holding Non-Tenure Line (Research) appointments, but it must remain in the titles in personnel files, CVs, appointment, reappointment and promotion papers, administrative records and other similar documents.

2.5.F. Duration of Appointments

It is the normal practice in the School of Medicine that new appointments, reappointments and promotions in the Research Line be made for a term of years. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, reappointment or promotion to Associate Professor (Research) or Professor (Research) may be considered for a continuing term (see below).

The usual duration of an appointment (subject to relatively rare exceptions granted by the Provost for good cause and on a case-by-case basis) for each rank is:

Rank	Initial Appointment	Reappointment at or Promotion to
Assistant Professor (Research)	Normally 4 years	Normally 3 years; the total length of time spent in rank is not to exceed 7 years
Associate Professor (Research)	Normally 5 years	Renewable for an unlimited number of 5 year terms or for a continuing term
Professor (Research)	Normally 5 years	Renewable for an unlimited number of 5 year terms or for a continuing term

1. **Term Appointments**

Although term appointments are frequently made with the clear possibility of reappointment or promotion, there is no entitlement to such action at the end of the term, and it is not automatic. Instead, decisions on reappointment and promotion, like decisions on initial appointment, are subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly

judgment and discretion by the School's departmental faculty and the School's academic leadership.

Reappointment and promotion reviews are generally (but not always) initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. (For further information on the timing of reviews, see **Section 2.5.G**. At this time, the faculty member will receive a communication from the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs that confirms the initiation of the review and includes information regarding criteria for the reappointment or promotion action, along with a general description of the process. Departments are then responsible for following up with more specific information.

Deans and department chairs are reminded that consideration of reappointment and promotion cases (especially those with term appointments) should include an account of the future of the department/division and/or School, which may include consideration of programmatic need (including budgetary considerations).

Appointments to the Research Line, even if stated as for a term of years, are normally coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored projects, or the continuation of contract support. Should such funding cease, the appointment normally would end at that same time – without the completion of the term or the requirement of a period of notice. Although School funding beyond the point at which the faculty member's funding support terminates may be possible in certain instances, it is not an entitlement. Such situations are handled on a case-by-case basis.

2. Extension of Term Appointments

Circumstances that *may* extend a term appointment in the Research Line include part-time appointments, leave without salary, New Parent Extension, childcare leave, and (with the approval of the Provost) some personal circumstances that significantly disrupt teaching and scholarly activities for an extended period.

Circumstances that do *not* extend a term appointment in the Research Line include pregnancy disability leave, short-term disability leave, sabbatical leave, leave for periods of pure research, and administrative appointments.

Service at the rank of Assistant Professor in the Research Line may not normally exceed ten years, irrespective of the circumstances that might be offered to extend the term or terms. Any exceptions can only be

granted by the Provost for extraordinary personal or institutional circumstances.

Further information on extensions of term appointments and the request and approval process for such extensions is available in Chapter 2.5.C. and 2.5.D. of the University Faculty Handbook.

3. Continuing Term Appointments

As stated previously, it is the normal practice in the School of Medicine that new appointments, reappointments and promotions be made for a term of years. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, reappointment or promotion to Associate Professor (Research) or to Professor (Research) may be considered for a continuing term appointment, which provides security of appointment without requiring formal reappointment. (See University Faculty Handbook Chapter 2.2.C(2).) Continuing term appointments may also carry certain additional benefits (e.g., enhanced housing assistance).

Reappointment or promotion to a continuing term presumes that the programmatic need has been firmly established. In recommending a continuing term appointment, it is particularly important to provide evidence of an established history of outstanding scholarly contributions and the basis for departmental confidence in future scholarly productivity, including the ability to obtain sustained external funding.

Appointments to the Research Line, even if stated as for a continuing term, are normally coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored projects, or the continuation of contract support. Should such funding cease, the appointment normally would end at that same time – without the requirement of a period of notice. (See University Faculty Handbook Chapter 2.8.C(1).) Although School funding beyond the point at which the faculty member's funding support terminates may be possible in certain instances, it is not an entitlement. Such situations are handled on a case-by-case basis.

Continuing term appointments may be terminated for just cause, or (upon proper notice) when satisfactory performance ceases or for programmatic reasons (including budgetary considerations). Although a department or school may expect a continuing programmatic need at the time of reappointment or promotion to a continuing term appointment, that need may change and, in rare cases, could lead to termination of the appointment. For example, a department or school

may decide to phase out a particular area altogether, or an area may simply be scaled down, decreasing the required number of faculty. Alternatively, a department or school may decide to develop or treat an existing program in ways that may require either the reassignment of duties to another faculty line, or an appointment in a faculty line other than the Research Line. Other reasons may involve funding considerations.

Termination of any continuing term appointment must be discussed in advance with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and subsequently approved by him or her.

2.5.G. Progression through the Ranks

1. Career Trajectory

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an Assistant Professor (Research) will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship and (if applicable) other activities. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

Reflecting an upward trajectory, candidates for promotion from Associate Professor (Research) to Professor (Research) should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment or last reappointment and met the criteria for promotion to the higher rank.

2. Timing of the Reappointment Review

Under normal circumstances, reappointment reviews for Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. However, the timing of the initiation of the evaluation process at the departmental level is at the discretion of the department chair, taking into account factors including the end date of a current appointment, the possible start date for the reappointment if the outcome of the School and University process is favorable, and considerations relating to notice of non-renewal and possible terminal year requirements if the outcome is negative. University policies regarding negative reappointment and promotion decisions and notice of non-renewal are found in the University Faculty Handbook at Chapter [2.8.C.](#) and [4.4.E.](#)

In cases where reappointment reviews are initiated more or less than one year in advance of the appointment end date, the department chair should inform the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who will then need to endorse the timing of the review.

3. Timing of the Promotion Review

An Assistant Professor (Research) may spend a total of seven years in rank before being reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor (Research) or, with approved extensions, up to ten years. Typically, promotion reviews for Research Line Assistant Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date, that is, at the beginning of the seventh year in rank.

Under certain circumstances, however, Research Line faculty who have made accelerated progress in scholarship and, if relevant, other activities (or who have had prior years of faculty experience at their current rank), may be proposed for early promotion. In most cases, this will typically occur in one of the years following reappointment. However, in rare cases promotion may be considered in lieu of reappointment.

Since, in many cases, the University is being asked to evaluate a person who may have a shorter track record, there should be *unequivocal* evidence that the quality of the faculty member's contributions meets the criteria for promotion to the higher rank. When this standard is met, time in rank at another institution or a retention scenario may be cited as additional support for early promotion consideration.

Consultation between the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is essential prior to initiating a review process leading toward early promotion. The process can only be initiated with the consent of the candidate and with the approval of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Unsuccessful candidates for early promotion may be proposed again at the normal time if that remains desirable to the candidate and the department. However, in order to avoid potential awkwardness following a negative promotion decision, it is prudent to initiate an early promotion review only when a positive outcome can be anticipated with reasonable confidence based on the available evidence.

Associate Professors (Research) are normally considered for promotion to Professor (Research) one year in advance of the

appointment end date, that is, at the beginning of the fifth year of the appointment or reappointment term. However, promotions may be initiated at any time when there evidence that the faculty member has compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment or reappointment and that criteria for the higher rank have been met.

2.5.H. Criteria

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure initial appointment, reappointment and promotion, according to field and discipline. Faculty or faculty candidates come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. Nevertheless, all faculty appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

The overriding requirement for faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion in the Research Line is that the individual is one of the best scholars at his or her level of professional development in the relevant field. The definition of the field may be narrower for faculty in the Research Line than in the University Tenure Line. The programmatic need (including financial viability) that contributes to the academic program of the department should be evaluated and must be established for each appointment, reappointment and promotion.

A candidate must have achieved (or, in the case of Assistant Professors, have the promise to achieve) true distinction in scholarship. For the Associate Professor rank, the scholarship must reveal that the candidate is not only among the best in his or her experience cohort in the field, but is also likely to become one of the very best in that field. At the rank of Professor, the scholarship must reveal that the candidate is one of the very best in the field.

There should be evidence of outstanding performance (or, in the case of Assistant Professors, the promise of outstanding performance) as a supervisor of graduate students.

While there is no requirement for formal teaching or clinical care in the Research Line, there must be acceptable performance (or in the case of assistant professors, the promise of acceptable performance) in any teaching roles, as well as excellence in clinical care, appropriate to the programmatic need the individual is expected to fulfill. Such programmatic need (including financial viability) that contributes to the academic program of the department should be evaluated and must be established for each appointment, reappointment and promotion.

2.5.I. Application of the Criteria

1. Scholarship

Unlike faculty in the University Tenure Line whose research is conducted in a broadly defined field, faculty appointed in the Research Line generally have special expertise in a relatively narrow field that is of particular benefit to a broader clinical or research program.

Typically, such special expertise expands the academic impact of strong clinical or other research programs ongoing in the School of Medicine. Most of the faculty in the Research Line are recruited to be part of a program with a multidisciplinary need.

Investigative independence (or, for assistant professors, the promise of investigative independence) is expected since it can be a useful marker of substantive scholarly contributions. The main emphasis of written contributions should be on peer-reviewed articles. Other written work such as books, chapters, reviews and commentaries may be considered as long as their impact in advancing clinical medicine or basic science can be established. With respect to multi-author works, it is expected that contributions (especially by associate professors and professors) will be made through senior authorship or through other substantive contributions.

In addition, the quality of scholarship will generally be reflected in peer-reviewed grants and contracts, which are an important indicator of success in the field, as well as being the source of funding that is a prerequisite for appointment in the Research Line.

Factors considered in assessing research performance may include (but are not limited to) the following: scholarly activity and productivity; impact, innovation and creativity; recognition in the field; ability to work effectively as part of a research team (if relevant); effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics.

2. Other Considerations

a. Teaching

Since positions in this faculty line are specifically designated for research, there is no formal teaching obligation. However, such faculty often teach actively in their research laboratories, and they may also teach departmental courses. In these cases, there must be acceptable performance (or, in the case of Assistant

Professors, the promise of acceptable performance) in any teaching role appropriate to the programmatic need the individual is expected to fulfill.

b. Clinical Care

The School of Medicine generally discourages significant clinical time commitments for Research Line faculty. However, in cases where there is such activity, the performance must be excellent.

c. Institutional Service

Faculty members in the Research Line are primarily assessed for reappointment and promotion on the basis of their achievements in the area of scholarship, as noted above. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration. Since a major commitment to administrative activities detracts from the time available for scholarship, Assistant Professors are discouraged from significant administrative activities and departments are discouraged from requiring such.

d. Respectful Workplace

The School of Medicine is committed to providing a work environment that is conducive to teaching and learning, research, the practice of medicine and patient care. Stanford's special purposes in this regard depend on a shared commitment among all members of the community to respect each person's worth and dignity. Because of their roles within the School of Medicine, faculty members, in particular, are expected to treat all members of the Stanford Community with civility, respect and courtesy and with an awareness of the potential impact of their behavior on staff, students and other faculty members.

As detailed above in this section, application of criteria for evaluating the quality of scholarship include specific expectations regarding a faculty member's professional behavior in the workplace. They are reiterated here to emphasize their importance as factors in appointment, reappointment and promotion actions.

In scholarly activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for scholarship have been met may include: the ability to work effectively as part of a research team; effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics

For Research Line faculty who are engaged in teaching activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for teaching have been met may include: a positive style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism; institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

The School of Medicine generally discourages significant clinical time commitments for faculty in this line. However, for Research Line faculty who are engaged in clinical care activities, such factors relevant to evaluation of whether the standards for clinical performance have been met may include: professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; humanism; ability to work effectively as part of the health care team; and effective communication with colleagues, staff, students and patients.

2.5.J. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Assistant Professors

1. Appointment as Assistant Professor (Research)

Individuals appointed as Assistant Professors in the Research Line will have completed one or two years of postdoctoral research experience and, where applicable, will have completed housestaff training. Their accomplishments during graduate and postgraduate training should already have stamped them as creative and promising investigators. There should be evidence of the ability to obtain external funding as well as the promise of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. Appointment is based on evidence of (or the promise of) high-level performance in research, and (if applicable) teaching and clinical care.

The initial term of appointment will be four years. This appointment is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

2. Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Research)

Assistant Professors in the Research Line are assessed for reappointment on the basis of their performance and achievements in the areas of scholarship, and, if applicable, teaching and clinical care. They may be reappointed based on evidence of progress, high-level performance, and their continuing to fill a programmatic need. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School. There should also be evidence of the ability to obtain external funding, as well as the promise of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students.

At the time of reappointment, it is expected that an Assistant Professor will be on a career trajectory consistent with both Stanford standards and the standards of his or her discipline in scholarship, and (if applicable) teaching and clinical care. The reappointment process should include an evaluation of whether there is a realistic chance for promotion in the future on the basis of continuation of the candidate's work.

The term of reappointment will be three years. Total time in service at Stanford as Assistant Professor (Research) is normally limited to seven (or, with approved extensions, up to ten years). This reappointment is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored projects.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see Section 2.5.G.

2.5.K. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors

1. Appointment as Associate Professor (Research)

Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor (Research) will be reserved for an individual who has achieved true distinction in research and who is not only recognized as among the best in his or her cohort but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. If applicable, there should be acceptable performance in teaching and excellence in clinical care. There should be evidence that the candidate will make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School. There should also be evidence of the ability to obtain external funding. In addition, there should be evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. Potential service may also be given some consideration.

The term of appointment will generally be five years. This appointment is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

2. Reappointment as Associate Professor (Research)

Associate Professors in the Research Line are assessed for reappointment on the basis of their performance and achievements in the area of scholarship, and (if applicable) teaching and clinical care. They may be reappointed based on evidence of true distinction in research, and their continuing to fill a programmatic need. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School. There should also be evidence of the ability to obtain external funding. In addition, there should be evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration

Terms of reappointment as Associate Professor (Research) are normally five years and are renewable without limit. See **Section 2.5.F.** for special considerations regarding recommendation of reappointment for a continuing term. This reappointment, whether for a term of years or for a continuing term, is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.5.G.**

3. Promotion to Associate Professor (Research)

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (Research) will be reserved for an individual who has achieved true distinction in research and who is not only recognized as among the best in his or her cohort but also is likely to become one of the very best in the field. If applicable, there should be acceptable performance in teaching and excellence in clinical care. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School. There should also be evidence of the ability to obtain external funding. In addition, there should be evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

The term of appointment will normally be for five years and is renewable without limit. See **Section 2.5.F.** for special considerations regarding recommendation of promotion for a continuing term. This promotion, whether for a term of years or for a continuing term, is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

For the timing of promotion consideration, see **Section 2.5.G.**

2.5.L. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors

1. Appointment as Professor (Research)

Appointment to the rank of Professor (Research) will be reserved for an exceptionally distinguished individual who has performed outstanding research and who is recognized as one of the very best in the field. There should be evidence that the candidate will successfully fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and to the field. There must be evidence of the candidate's ability to obtain sustained external funding. In addition, there should be evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. There should be evidence (if applicable) of acceptable performance in teaching and/or excellence in clinical care. Service may also be given some consideration.

The term of appointment will normally be for five years. This appointment is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

2. Reappointment as Professor (Research)

Reappointment as Professor (Research) is based upon evidence of continuing outstanding performance of research, and (as applicable) acceptable performance in teaching and/or excellence in clinical care. There must also be evidence of the ability to obtain sustained external funding. In addition, there should be evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration

Terms of reappointment as Professor (Research) will generally be five years and are renewable without limit. See **Section 2.5.F.** for special considerations regarding recommendation of reappointment for a continuing term. This reappointment, whether for a term of years or for a continuing term, is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.5.G.**

3. Promotion to Professor (Research)

For Associate Professors in the Research Line, promotion to Professor should reflect continuing distinguished performance in research and (if applicable) acceptable performance in teaching and/or excellence in clinical care. There also must be evidence of the candidate's ability to obtain sustained external funding. In addition, there should be evidence of outstanding performance as a supervisor of graduate students. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

In order to be promoted to Professor (Research), a faculty member should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since appointment as Associate Professor (Research) or promotion to Associate Professor (Research). In general, the evidence must show that the person being proposed for promotion is recognized as one of the very best in his or her field, and will successfully continue to fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and the School.

The term of appointment will normally be five years. See **Section 2.5.F.** for special considerations regarding recommendation of promotion for a continuing term. This promotion, whether for a term of years or for a continuing term, is coterminous with continued salary and other research support from sponsored research projects.

For the timing of promotion consideration, see **Section 2.5.G.**

2.6 NON-TENURE LINE (TEACHING) [TEACHING LINE]: Criteria and Guidelines for Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

2.6.A. Definition

Faculty in the School of Medicine are predominantly in the University Tenure Line or Medical Center Line. The Non-Tenure Line (Teaching), also known as the Teaching Line, is used for special programmatic needs that are not fulfilled by faculty in these other lines.

Faculty appointed in the Teaching Line generally have special expertise in teaching, broadly defined, that meets a specific departmental programmatic need. Typically, such special expertise enhances or expands the academic impact of strong clinical or research programs ongoing in the School of Medicine. Teaching Line faculty are expected to spend a large proportion of their time on teaching and pedagogical activities and, at the rank of Associate Professor, to have earned a regional reputation for these activities. At the rank of Professor, faculty members should be recognized nationally for their efforts in teaching and pedagogical activities.

Since this faculty line is specifically designated for teaching, there is no formal research obligation. However, since teaching and scholarship are closely intertwined, there is an expectation that, in many cases, candidates will be strong scholarly contributors, though not necessarily leaders in the field. The School of Medicine generally discourages significant clinical time commitments for faculty in this line.

Teaching Line faculty are members of the Professoriate and of the Academic Council of Stanford University and of the School of Medicine's Faculty Council.

2.6.B. Billet Authorization

Appointments in the Teaching Line are initiated by departmental or joint departmental action. Although appointments may also be initiated by one of the School's five institutes, the appointment must be made in a department. A department chair must present the case for a new faculty position to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and obtain formal authorization from the Dean before a search can be launched. A billet number (representing a previously approved commitment) must accompany each search request.

By default, every position that becomes vacant for any reason normally returns to the Dean's Reserve; to retain the position, the department chair must submit a request to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. In some circumstances, the position will be returned to the department for a

replacement or for a search in another field. In other cases, the Dean may reallocate the position to another department or hold it in the Dean's Reserve.

Departmental leadership and the School administration must regard every search authorization as a potential long-term commitment. The Dean's search authorization is based upon factors including the availability of resources (including a billet commitment and funding), an assessment of the department's present and predicted future needs in clinical, research and teaching activities, and the specific programmatic need for the requested search; it reflects priority judgments both within the department and between departments. Contributions to interdisciplinary institutes may also play a role in assigning search authorizations to departments.

2.6.C. Searches and Waivers of Search

As is the case for other faculty lines, it is expected that a rigorous and comprehensive search normally will be conducted for new appointments in the Teaching Line. (The Office of Academic Affairs' [Guide to Faculty Searches](#) provides information on policies and procedures related to searches; see also University Faculty Handbook Chapter [2.7.C.\(5\)](#).) While this is the goal, as a practical matter, a specific programmatic need may sometimes be best fulfilled by personnel already affiliated with Stanford.

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will consider waivers of search for appointments in the Teaching Line of internal or known external candidates on a case-by-case basis. Under certain limited circumstances, a waiver of search may be pursued when convincing evidence is presented that a candidate internal to Stanford not only meets the criteria for the position but that he or she would have emerged as a leading candidate had a national search been conducted. Search waivers for junior faculty appointments are granted only in extraordinary circumstances. There may be rare programmatic reasons that warrant a search waiver; inquiries should be addressed to the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

However, under most circumstances (including when there are internal candidates), a determination will usually be made that a national search is the most appropriate way to proceed in filling the position. When the search is launched, the advertisement should not be tailored to fit a special candidate or candidates. Furthermore, the search committee should be instructed that although the credentials of internal candidates may be more easily assessed than those of others, its members are still obliged to fully consider by all appropriate means the credentials of candidates having no prior association with the University. This obligation should be made clear to any internal candidate who holds or has held a non-faculty Stanford appointment.

2.6.D. Ranks and Titles

The Non-Tenure Line (Teaching) ranks are:

- Associate Professor (Teaching)
- Professor (Teaching)

In everyday usage, the parenthetical designation may be removed from the titles of Associate Professors and Professors holding Non-Tenure Line (Teaching) appointments, but it must remain in the titles in personnel files, CVs, appointment, reappointment and promotion papers, administrative records and other similar documents.

2.6.E. Duration of Appointments

It is the normal practice in the School of Medicine that new appointments at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor be made for a term of years. Likewise, reappointments as Associate Professor are normally for a term of years. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, reappointment as Associate Professor (Teaching) may be considered for a continuing term (see below).

Conversely, reappointments as and promotions to Professor (Teaching) are generally made for a continuing term. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, such actions may be considered for a term of years.

The usual duration of an appointment (subject to relatively rare exceptions granted by the Provost for good cause and on a case-by-case basis) for each rank is:

Rank	Initial Appointment	Reappointment at or Promotion to
Associate Professor (Teaching)	Generally 5 years	Renewable for an unlimited number of 5 year terms or for a continuing term
Professor (Teaching)	Generally 5 years	Renewable for a continuing term or for an unlimited number of 5 year terms.

1. Term Appointments

Although term appointments are frequently made with the clear possibility of reappointment or promotion, there is no entitlement to such action at the end of the term, and it is not automatic. Instead, decisions on reappointment and promotion, like decisions on initial

appointment, are subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by the School's departmental faculty and the School's academic leadership.

Reappointment and promotion reviews are generally (but not always) initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. (For further information on the timing of reviews, see **Section 2.6.F**. At this time, the faculty member will receive a communication from the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs that confirms the initiation of the review and includes information regarding criteria for the reappointment or promotion action, along with a general description of the process. Departments are then responsible for following up with more specific information, and it is the faculty member's obligation to provide materials that are requested, such as an up-to-date curriculum vitae and candidate's statement. The Office of Academic Affairs will work with departments to create a schedule so that the reappointment or promotion review is conducted in a timely manner. Deans and department chairs are reminded that consideration of reappointment and promotion cases (especially those with term appointments) should include an account of the future of the department/division and/or School, which may include consideration of programmatic need (including budgetary considerations).

2. Extension of Term Appointments

Circumstances that *may* extend a term appointment in the Teaching Line include part-time appointments, leave without salary, New Parent Extension, childcare leave, and (with the approval of the Provost) some personal circumstances that significantly disrupt teaching activities for an extended period.

Circumstances that do *not* extend a term appointment in the Teaching Line include pregnancy disability leave, short-term disability leave, sabbatical leave, and administrative appointments.

Further information on extensions of term appointments and the request and approval process for such extensions is available in Chapter **2.5.C**. and **2.5.D**. of the University Faculty Handbook.

3. Continuing Term Appointments

Promotion to the rank of Professor (Teaching) usually confers a continuing term, which provides security of appointment without requiring formal reappointment. Continuing term appointments may also carry certain additional benefits (e.g., enhanced housing assistance.)

As stated previously, it is the normal practice in the School of Medicine that reappointments as Associate Professor in the Teaching Line be made for a term of years. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, reappointment as Associate Professor (Teaching) may be considered for a continuing term.

Reappointment or promotion to a continuing term presumes that the programmatic need has been firmly established. In recommending a continuing term appointment, it is particularly important to provide evidence of an established history of outstanding teaching contributions and the basis for departmental confidence in future excellence and productivity that will fulfill programmatic need.

Continuing term appointments may be terminated for just cause, or (upon proper notice) when satisfactory performance ceases or for programmatic reasons (including budgetary considerations). Although a department or school may expect a continuing programmatic need at the time of reappointment or promotion to a continuing term appointment, that need may change and, in rare cases, could lead to termination of the appointment. For example, a department or school may decide to phase out a particular area altogether, or an area may simply be scaled down, decreasing the required number of faculty. Alternatively, a department or school may decide to develop or treat an existing program in ways that may require either the reassignment of duties to another faculty line, or an appointment in a faculty line other than the Teaching Line. Other reasons may involve funding considerations.

Termination of any continuing term appointment must be discussed in advance with the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and subsequently approved by him or her in consultation with the Dean.

2.6.F. Progression through the Ranks

1. Career Trajectory

In order to be reappointed in the Teaching Line, Associate Professors should continue to make meritorious contributions to their discipline and to the School. Reflecting an upward trajectory, candidates for promotion from Associate Professor (Teaching) to Professor (Teaching) should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment or last reappointment and met the criteria for promotion to the higher rank.

2. Timing of the Reappointment Review

Under normal circumstances, reappointment reviews for Associate Professors and Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. However, the timing of the initiation of the evaluation process at the departmental level is at the discretion of the department chair, taking into account factors including the end date of a current appointment, the possible start date for the reappointment if the outcome of the School and University process is favorable, and considerations relating to notice of non-renewal and possible terminal year requirements if the outcome is negative. University policies regarding negative reappointment and promotion decisions and notice of non-renewal are found in the University Faculty Handbook at Chapter [2.8.C.](#) and [4.4.E.](#)

In cases where reappointment reviews are initiated more or less than one year in advance of the appointment end date, the department chair should inform the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who will then need to endorse the timing of the review.

3. Timing of the Promotion Review

Associate Professors (Teaching) are normally considered for promotion to Professor (Teaching) one year in advance of the appointment end date, that is, at the beginning of the fifth year of the appointment or reappointment term. However, promotions may be initiated at any time when there evidence that the faculty member has compiled a significant record of accomplishment since the time of the initial appointment or last reappointment and that criteria for the higher rank have been met.

Consultation between the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is essential prior to initiating a review process leading toward early promotion. The process can only be initiated with the consent of the candidate and with the approval of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Unsuccessful candidates for early promotion may be proposed again at the normal time if that remains desirable to the candidate and the department. However, in order to avoid potential awkwardness following a negative promotion decision, it is prudent to initiate an early promotion review only when a positive outcome can be anticipated with reasonable confidence based on the available evidence.

2.6.G. Criteria

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure initial appointment, reappointment and promotion, according to field and discipline. Faculty or faculty candidates come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. Nevertheless, all faculty appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

The overriding requirement for faculty appointment, reappointment and promotion in the Teaching Line is excellence in teaching, broadly defined.

Faculty in the Teaching Line have a different institutional role than the Tenure Line professoriate and are evaluated (in general) by higher standards with respect to teaching, the area in which they are expected to spend a large portion of their time and effort. Typically, the prospective or current faculty member's expertise enhances or expands the academic impact of strong clinical or research programs ongoing in the School of Medicine.

Under most circumstances, it is expected that Teaching Line faculty will extend their successes at Stanford to broader regional or national audiences. For appointment or reappointment to the rank of Associate Professor, there should be evidence that candidates have attained *regional* recognition for excellence in teaching and pedagogical activities. For appointment, reappointment or promotion to the rank of Professor, there should be evidence that candidates have attained *national* recognition for excellence in teaching and pedagogical activities. Such regional or national recognition should normally be confirmed in letters from independent external referees who do not have mentoring, collaborative or other relationships with the candidate that might raise a question about objectivity.

While there is no formal research obligation, there must be acceptable performance in any research role appropriate to the programmatic need the individual is expected to fulfill. Such programmatic need (including financial viability) that contributes to the academic program of the department should be evaluated and must be established for each appointment, reappointment and promotion. Although faculty in this line are discouraged from clinical care commitments, if such activity takes place, the performance must be excellent.

2.6.H. Application of the Criteria

1. Teaching

A Teaching Line candidate should have compiled a record of excellent teaching and pedagogical contributions that clearly reveals that he or

she is able to sustain a first-rate teaching program during his or her career at Stanford.

Teaching is broadly defined to include didactic teaching, advising, mentoring, program building, curricular innovation and administrative teaching leadership. Teaching may include undergraduates, graduate students, medical students, residents, postdoctoral fellows and postgraduate and continuing medical education. It is recognized that many Teaching Line faculty in clinical departments teach in small group sessions or with individual trainees.

Factors considered in assessing local teaching performance include (but are not limited to) the following: knowledge of the material; clarity of exposition; style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; ability to stimulate further education; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

As noted previously, it is expected that Teaching Line faculty will extend their successes at Stanford to broader regional or national audiences. In addition to recognition garnered from teaching and other pedagogical successes at Stanford, regional (for Associate Professors) or national (for Professors) recognition may be gained through and evidenced by such activities as leadership roles in professional societies, service on committees or commissions, authorship of authoritative textbooks, funding to support educational innovation (e.g., materials, methods, assessment tools or programs), speaking invitations, consultancies, number and placement of trainees upon whom the candidate has had a major influence, development of initiatives related to educational diversity, service on editorial boards of journals related to education, adoption by others of courses, classroom teaching methods or programs developed by the faculty member, visiting professorships, and awards for teaching or mentoring beyond the home institution.

2. Other Considerations

a. Scholarship

While there is no formal research obligation in the Teaching Line, since teaching and scholarship are closely intertwined, it is anticipated that many faculty will make scholarly contributions. In such cases, there is an expectation that candidates will be strong scholarly contributors, though not necessarily leaders in the field. Therefore, where applicable, a

standard of acceptable performance should be met to complement excellence in teaching.

Written scholarship may take a wide variety of forms, including peer reviewed articles, chapters, commentaries, and case reports. Any of these types (as long as the quality is acceptable and the quantity is appropriate) may be considered sufficient evidence of scholarly work. As long as these can be objectively evaluated by persons qualified to perform such evaluations, scholarly contributions may also include teaching activities that may involve developing and implementing novel teaching methodologies for a new and innovative course, shaping a core curriculum, or creating educational software.

b. Clinical Care

The School of Medicine generally discourages significant clinical time commitments for Teaching Line faculty. However, in cases where there is such activity, the performance must be excellent.

c. Institutional Service

Faculty members in the Teaching Line are primarily assessed for reappointment and promotion on the basis of their achievements in the area of teaching, as noted above. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

d. Respectful Workplace

The School of Medicine is committed to providing a work environment that is conducive to teaching and learning, research, the practice of medicine and patient care. Stanford's special purposes in this regard depend on a shared commitment among all members of the community to respect each person's worth and dignity. Because of their roles within the School of Medicine, faculty members, in particular, are expected to treat all members of the Stanford Community with civility, respect and courtesy and with an awareness of the potential impact of their behavior on staff, students and other faculty members.

As detailed earlier in this section, application of criteria for evaluating the quality of teaching include specific expectations regarding a faculty member's professional behavior in the workplace. They are

reiterated here to emphasize their importance as factors in appointment, reappointment and promotion actions.

In teaching activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for teaching have been met may include: a positive style of interaction with students; availability; professionalism; institutional compliance and ethics; effective communication skills; helpfulness in learning; ability to stimulate further education; and ability to work effectively as part of the teaching team.

For Teaching Line faculty who are engaged in scholarly activities, such factors relevant to whether the standards for scholarship have been met may include: the ability to work effectively as part of a research team; effective communication with colleagues, staff and students; and professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics

The School of Medicine generally discourages significant clinical time commitments for faculty in this line. However, for Teaching Line faculty who are engaged in clinical care activities, such factors relevant to evaluation of whether the standards for clinical performance have been met may include: professionalism, institutional compliance and ethics; humanism; ability to work effectively as part of the health care team; and effective communication with colleagues, staff, students and patients.

2.6.I. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Associate Professors

1. Appointment as Associate Professor (Teaching)

Appointment to the rank of Associate Professor (Teaching) is based upon evidence of the candidate's excellence in teaching and pedagogical contributions at another institution. There should be evidence that the candidate will make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School and be able to sustain a first-rate teaching program at Stanford. There should also be evidence that the candidate has earned regional recognition for his or her teaching and pedagogical activities. If applicable, there should be a record of acceptable scholarship and excellence in clinical care. Potential service may also be given some consideration.

The term of appointment will generally be five years and is renewable without limit.

2. Reappointment as Associate Professor (Teaching)

Associate Professors in the Teaching Line are assessed for reappointment on the basis of their performance and achievements in the area of teaching and (if applicable) scholarship and clinical care. They may be reappointed based on evidence of excellence in teaching (and, if applicable, acceptable scholarship and excellence in clinical care), and their continuing to fill a programmatic need. There should be evidence that the candidate will continue to make meritorious contributions to his/her discipline and to the School. Regional recognition must be sustained or increased. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

The term of appointment will generally be five years and is renewable without limit. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, such actions may be considered for a continuing term.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.6.F**.

2.6.J. Specific/Supplementary Criteria for Professors (Teaching)

1. Appointment as Professor (Teaching)

Appointment as Professor (Teaching) is based upon evidence that the candidate is a nationally recognized educator whose work has made a significant impact upon his or her discipline. In general, the evidence must show that the person is recognized as one of the very best in his or her field and will successfully fill the programmatic need for which the appointment is made and make meritorious contributions to his or her discipline and the School. If applicable, there should be evidence of acceptable performance in scholarship and excellence in clinical care. There should also be evidence that the candidate has earned national recognition for his or her teaching and pedagogical activities. Service may also be given some consideration.

The term of appointment will generally be for five years.

2. Reappointment as Professor (Teaching)

Reappointment as Professor (Teaching) is based upon evidence of continuing excellence in teaching and (if applicable) acceptable scholarship and excellence in clinical care. National recognition should be sustained or increased.

Reappointment is for a continuing term. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, such actions may be considered for a term of years.

For the timing of reappointment consideration, see **Section 2.6.F**.

3. Promotion to Professor (Teaching)

For Associate Professors in the Teaching Line, promotion to Professor (Teaching) should reflect continuing excellence in teaching and (if applicable) acceptable scholarship and excellence in clinical care. Service (including what might be called institutional citizenship) may also be given some consideration.

In order to be promoted to Professor (Teaching), a faculty member should have compiled a significant record of accomplishment since appointment or last reappointment as Associate Professor. In general, the evidence must show that the person being proposed for promotion is nationally recognized as an educator who is one of the very best in his or her field, will successfully continue to fill the current programmatic needs of the department and will make meritorious contributions to her or her discipline and to the School.

Promotion is for a continuing term. However, at the discretion of the department, and with approval by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, such actions may be considered for a term of years.

For the timing of promotion consideration, see **Section 2.6.F**.

2.7

EVALUATION PROCESSES AT THE DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS

A. Overview

The purpose of the appointment, reappointment or promotion evaluation is to appraise, on the record to date, the candidate's standing in his or her field. Decisions on appointment, reappointment and promotion are subject to the exercise of professional and scholarly judgment and discretion by departmental faculty and academic leadership at the School and University levels. The criteria and guidelines outlined in Chapter 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6 of this Handbook should be read and applied by all those who cast a vote on an appointment, reappointment or promotion action.

The University recognizes that there are significant variations in how candidates qualify for and secure appointment, according to field and discipline. Candidates come from different backgrounds and receive different educational training. In addition, there may be great variation in emphasis among the components of activity (i.e., scholarship, teaching and clinical care) depending on faculty line. Nevertheless, all appointments have in common the requirement of excellence, however measured.

Procedures for the evaluation process at the department, School and University levels are described below. Departures from these guidelines should be rare and for good reason. Procedural questions should be addressed to the Senior Associate Dean or the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs.

Instructions for assembly of each component of the appointment, reappointment or promotion long form, including the process for compiling a list of proposed evaluators (external and internal referees and trainees) is available on the [Office of Academic Affairs' website](#).

B. Confidentiality

The entire appointment, reappointment, or promotion proceedings during which specific candidates are discussed are to be held in strict confidence by all participants. The opinions expressed by the school or department faculty or by internal or external referees shall not be discussed with the candidate or with other parties. This policy ensures that the candidacy of each person is treated with utmost confidentiality. It also provides an opportunity for those making the evaluation to have the freedom to provide written evaluation or to

discuss the candidates during committee meetings without fearing that their comments will be shared outside the deliberations.

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment, reappointment, or promotion case is a serious breach of professional ethics and may subject the individual to discipline.

The Dean or the Chair of the department (or his or her designee) shall convey whatever information needs to be transmitted to the candidate. Information regarding access to personnel files is provided in the Chapter 2.8.B. of the University Faculty Handbook (and see also Chapter 2.8.C(2) of that handbook).

C. Role of the Department Chair

The department chair is responsible for compliance with University and School guidelines regarding faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions. He or she is to ensure that those conducting faculty evaluations are fully informed about these guidelines in order to avoid delays and other problems due to deficiencies in procedure and documentation.

The ultimate decision on whether to forward the appointment, reappointment or promotion to the Senior Associate Dean with a positive or negative recommendation is made by the department chair in his or her judgment and discretion.

D. Timing of Evaluations

After a search reaches its conclusion, the department chair, or his or her designate, is responsible for seeing that the *appointment* long form is completed in a timely manner. For assistant professor appointments, the review and approval process should be completed within approximately six months. For associate and full professor appointments, the review and approval process should be completed within approximately seven months.

Under normal circumstances, *reappointment* reviews for Assistant Professors and Associate Professors are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. However, the timing of the initiation of the evaluation process at the departmental level is at the discretion of the department chair, taking into account factors including the end date of a current appointment, the possible start date for the reappointment if the outcome of the School and University process is favorable, and considerations relating to notice of non-renewal and possible terminal year requirements if the outcome is negative. University policies

regarding negative reappointment and promotion decisions and notice of non-renewal are found in the University Faculty Handbook at 2.8.C. and 4.4.E.

Typically, *promotion* reviews are initiated one year in advance of the appointment end date. In the case of promotion from tenured Associate Professor to Professor, candidates should be brought forward based on an assessment of when criteria for the higher rank have been met.

Consultation between the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean is essential prior to initiating a review process leading toward early promotion. The process can only be initiated with the consent of the candidate and with approval of the Senior Associate Dean.

E. Assessment by the Department Chair

The department chair initiates the appointment, reappointment or promotion evaluation after making an appropriate assessment of the candidate's credentials; in larger departments, the department chair may seek the advice of the candidate's division regarding its assessment. The department chair may choose to concur with or reject a positive or negative assessment by the division in reaching his or her own assessment.

If the department chair's assessment is negative, the negative recommendation will be forwarded to the Senior Associate Dean for consideration, with the appropriate documentation to explain the negative recommendation. In such cases for reappointment or promotion actions, it is expected that this documentation will include a summary of discussions held during annual counseling meetings with the faculty member.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance with the matter.

In instances where, in his or her judgment and discretion, the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, the case may be remanded back to the department for further consideration.

If the department chair's assessment is positive, the department chair proceeds to a full evaluation by appointment of a Departmental Evaluation Committee.

F. Departmental Evaluation Committee

If, after an appropriate assessment of the candidate's credentials, the department chair decides to proceed with the full evaluation, the department chair appoints a Departmental Evaluation Committee to conduct the formal evaluation of the candidate's qualifications and to prepare the long form. Departmental Evaluation Committees are advisory to the department chair, who ultimately makes the decision whether to recommend appointment, reappointment or promotion actions to the Senior Associate Dean.

Departmental Evaluation Committee members should be at or above the proposed rank of the candidate and are selected for their ability to make a critical and objective appraisal of the candidate's qualifications in relation to the academic standards and other criteria of the University and School. It is not required that any or all members of the Departmental Evaluation Committee be an authority in the specialty or research field of the candidate, although such representation is desirable, if appropriate.

The department chair may choose to use a standing Departmental Appointments and Promotions Committee as the Departmental Evaluation Committee or, in the case of a new appointment, the Search Committee previously appointed by the department chair may be used. Anticipating this, the department chair may wish to constitute the original Search Committee in accordance with the above guidelines on composition of a Departmental Evaluation Committee. (Further information regarding the composition of departmental search committees is available in Chapter VII.D. of the Guide to Faculty Searches.) Such responsibilities for candidate evaluation and appointment form preparation as may be delegated by the department chair to a division should be so defined as to maintain department and School perspective during this crucial phase of the review.

In reaching its decision on a candidate, it is the responsibility of the Department Evaluation Committee to decide the relative weight to be given to the information and opinions gathered, and to exercise its independent judgment within the context of University and School guidelines. In particular, Committee members should be familiar with the criteria for appointment, reappointment or promotion as outlined in Chapter 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 or 2.6 of this Handbook.

At the conclusion of its review, the Departmental Evaluation Committee should make a positive or negative recommendation to the department chair in a written report. The report should record the membership and the vote of the Departmental Evaluation Committee and any dissenting vote should be fully explained. The report should contain thorough documentation of the candidate's qualifications and should give the reasons for the recommendation. A favorable report should be based on a record of clearly outstanding performance that has every prospect of continuing.

G. Options of the Department Chair

1. When the Recommendation of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is Positive

Upon receiving a favorable recommendation from the Departmental Evaluation Committee, the department chair may request the completed appointment, reappointment or promotion long form and (if he or she does make such a request) shall -- where consistent with departmental practice -- consult the appropriate departmental faculty to review the recommendation and vote to approve or disapprove the proposed action. It is required that the faculty members given responsibility for the review shall be broadly representative of such faculty. The names of the faculty participating in the review and the vote to accept or reject the recommendation should be recorded on the long form. Any vote against approval of the recommendation should be fully explained.

The department chair also has the authority, in his or her discretion, not to proceed to request the completed long form. In such cases, the department chair should discuss the matter with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair's recommendation. In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may remand the matter to the department for further consideration.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance in this matter.

2. When the Recommendation of the Departmental Evaluation Committee is Negative

Upon receiving a negative recommendation from the Departmental Evaluation Committee, the department chair may decide to proceed no further with the contemplated appointment, reappointment or promotion action. In such cases, he or she should consult with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair's recommendation. In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may remand the matter to the department for further consideration.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance with the matter.

Alternatively, the department chair may request the completed long form and, in such a case, shall – where consistent with departmental practice -- consult the appropriate departmental faculty to review the recommendation and vote to accept or reject the Departmental Evaluation Committee's recommendation. It is required that the faculty members given responsibility for the review shall be broadly representative of such faculty. The names of the faculty participating in the review and the vote to accept or reject the recommendation should be recorded on the long form. Any vote against approval of the recommendation should be fully explained.

3. When the Recommendation of Departmental Faculty is Positive

If the department chair receives and concurs in a favorable recommendation from the appropriate departmental faculty, he or she forwards the completed long form to the Senior Associate Dean with a transmittal memorandum summarizing the reasons for the positive recommendation of the department and discussing the significance of any negative information or opinion.

If the department chair does not concur with a positive recommendation, he or she should discuss the matter with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair's negative recommendation.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance in this matter.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may either remand the matter to the department for further consideration or proceed to the next level of review by the Assistant Professors Review Committee or the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

4. When the Recommendation of Departmental Faculty is Negative

If the department chair receives and concurs in a negative recommendation from the appropriate departmental faculty, the department chair should discuss the matter with the Senior Associate Dean, who may, in his or her judgment and discretion, concur with or not concur with the department chair's recommendation.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean concurs with a negative recommendation by the department chair (after consultation with and with the approval of the Dean), certain protocols must be observed by the department chair in thereafter reporting the decision to the candidate. The Office of Academic Affairs should be consulted for assistance in the matter.

In cases where the Senior Associate Dean does not concur with a negative recommendation by the department chair, he or she may either remand the matter to the department for further consideration or proceed to the next level of review by the Assistant Professors Review Committee or the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

If the department chair does not concur with a negative recommendation, he or she should forward the completed long form to the Senior Associate Dean with a transmittal memorandum summarizing the reasons for his or her positive recommendation and discussing the significance of any negative information or opinion. In such cases, the Senior Associate Dean has the option of remanding the matter to the department for further consideration or proceeding to the next level of review by the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

H. Draft Long Form Review by the Senior Associate Dean

A draft of the appointment, reappointment or promotion long form is submitted by the department chair to the Office of Academic Affairs for review and comment by Academic Affairs staff and the Senior Associate Dean. At this stage, the Senior Associate Dean may:

1. consult with the department chair, Dean or others as appropriate in his or her judgment;
2. remand the file to the department with instructions;
3. give preliminary approval for the finalization of the file;
4. make a negative recommendation on the file to the Dean;
5. or take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

After having received such review by the Senior Associate Dean and after any suggested revisions have been incorporated or other issues have been resolved, approved long forms are then submitted to Academic Affairs for distribution to either the Assistant Professors Review Committee (for appointments and reappointments to Assistant Professor) or the Appointments and Promotions Committee (for appointments, reappointments and promotions to Associate Professor and Professor).

I. Assistant Professors Review Committee (APRC)

1. Purpose

The School of Medicine Assistant Professors Review Committee (APRC) is a standing committee, advisory to the Senior Associate Dean, and appointed to review and assess the academic credentials for initial appointment or reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor in the University Tenure

Line, the Medical Center Line and the Non-Tenure Line (Research).

2. Composition

Appointed by the Senior Associate Dean, the APRC is composed of seven members of the Professoriate, including two faculty members who also serve as Associate Deans for Academic Affairs. All members of the Committee must hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. Normally, no department will be represented by more than one member from a given unit.

The School recognizes the challenges associated with the assembly of regular meetings of busy senior faculty members. Accordingly, the Senior Associate Dean may appoint faculty to serve as alternate Committee members. Alternate members must be Associate Professors or Professors. Their appointment should complement the composition of the Committee's regular membership by faculty line and department affiliation.

3. Terms of Service

The Committee chair is appointed by the Senior Associate Dean for a term of up to three years. The two Associate Deans serve on the APRC concurrent with their administrative appointment. The other APRC members serve for staggered three-year terms, and each appointment is renewable for one additional term. The membership is reported annually to the School's Executive Committee.

4. Function

For each appointment or reappointment considered by the APRC, the Office of Academic Affairs provides the APRC with the long form and the transmittal memorandum of the department chair. Academic Affairs staff assigns two APRC members to serve as first and second reviewers (the "Committee Reviewers") to aid in the assessment of the candidate's credentials.

The department chair (or his or her designee) will be asked to make himself or herself available (on standby) to appear at the appropriate meeting of the APRC to present the department's recommendation and to answer questions posed by Committee members. During the opening of the meeting, the primary

and/or secondary reviewers will be queried regarding their assessment of the need for the department chair (or designee) to appear in support of the recommendation. Administrative staff will then immediately notify the department chair (or designee) if his or her attendance is required.

Upon request by an APRC member (and with the concurrence of the Committee chair), the discussion of a candidate may be deferred until a future meeting. An action may also be tabled by the Committee chair for a variety of reasons including (but not limited to) a request for further input from the department or a recommendation that the Senior Associate Dean pursue an alternate strategy with the department.

Although rarely necessary, the APRC and/or the Committee Reviewers, in their discretion, also may request and consider any other material or information to complete the evaluation of the candidate's credentials for the action recommended, including solicitation of additional letters of evaluation from external or internal referees, and consultation with others, such as Stanford faculty members, fellows, house staff or students. It is inappropriate for the APRC or the Committee Reviewers to consult with or receive advice from the candidate.

5. Meetings and Quorum

Normally, the APRC convenes once a month. Consideration of a recommendation by the Committee requires the presence of more than half of the current voting Committee membership, including either the primary or secondary Committee Reviewer assigned the file. Members who are on sabbatical or are recused are not counted toward the current Committee membership for purposes of quorum. Participation by alternate members will be counted for purposes of quorum and for purposes of voting as described below.

Minutes of the meetings are confidential and are retained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Minutes of a meeting of the APRC will be available only to Committee members who participated at that meeting. The minutes are to include copies of any additional correspondence and materials requested by or on behalf of the APRC and/or the Committee Reviewers.

6. Voting and Recusal

Members of the APRC are not to vote in the context of, and are not to be present during, the APRC's consideration of a candidate if they have (a) overseen, or participated in, preparation of the documentation on behalf of the candidate (including submission of letters of evaluation); (b) attended a departmental or division meeting during which the candidate's currently proposed appointment, reappointment or promotion was discussed; or (c) voted on the recommendation at the divisional or departmental level. Members of the APRC are expected to notify the Committee Chair and/or the Senior Associate Dean regarding such situations or other possible circumstances that might make appropriate their recusal from consideration of a recommendation.

All members present at a meeting are required to vote by a show of hands. The tabulation of the vote is recorded. To carry affirmatively, a yea vote must be cast by a majority of APRC members (including alternates) in attendance. The same number of nay votes (a majority) is required for a negative recommendation.

Abstentions are inappropriate, except under extraordinary circumstances. Absentee votes are not allowed; however, APRC members who cannot attend a meeting may submit written comments to be reviewed by the APRC.

J. Options of the Senior Associate Dean on Receiving Recommendations by the Assistant Professors Review Committee

Upon receipt of a recommendation (whether positive or negative) from the APRC, the decision rests with the Senior Associate Dean, in his or her judgment and discretion, whether to make a positive or negative recommendation to the Dean, whether to remand the file to the department with instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

K. Decision by the Dean on Assistant Professor Appointments and Reappointments

Following receipt from the Senior Associate Dean of a positive or a negative recommendation (such as following a review and recommendation by the APRC), the Dean, in his or her judgment and discretion, shall make his or her decision as to whether to forward the file with his or her positive recommendation to the Provost, whether to

remand the file with further instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

If the Dean's (and hence the School's) decision is negative, then notification of that negative decision is provided to the candidate, the department and the Provost's Office.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will occur only if the department presents convincing evidence that new and material information bearing on the case exists, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the Senior Associate Dean at appropriate intervals in the process.

L. Appointments and Promotions Committee

1. Purpose

The School of Medicine Appointments and Promotions Committee ("A&P Committee") is a standing committee, advisory to the Senior Associate Dean, and appointed to review and assess the academic credentials for initial appointment, reappointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor in the University Tenure Line, Medical Center Line, Non-Tenure Line (Research), and Non-Tenure Line (Teaching).

2. Composition

Appointed by the Senior Associate Dean, the A&P Committee is composed of eleven members of the Professoriate. All members of the Committee must hold the rank of full professor and be tenured or on a continuing term appointment. The Committee membership will normally include three to five tenured faculty from the Clinical Science departments, three to five faculty from the Medical Center Line, and two to four tenured faculty from the Basic Science departments. Normally, no department will be represented by more than one member.

The Senior Associate Dean will attend meetings of the Committee contingent upon her or his availability.

The School recognizes the challenges associated with the assembly of regular meetings of busy senior faculty members. Accordingly, the Senior Associate Dean may appoint faculty to serve as alternate Committee members. Alternate members

must be full professors, who are tenured or on a continuing term of appointment. Their appointment should complement the composition of the Committee's regular membership by faculty line and department affiliation.

3. Terms of Service

The Committee chair is appointed by the Senior Associate Dean for a term of up to three years. The Senior Associate Dean also appoints a Vice Chair for a term of up to three years to provide leadership when the Chair is unable to attend. A&P Committee members serve for staggered three-year terms, and each appointment is renewable for one additional term. The membership is reported annually to the School's Executive Committee.

4. Function

For each appointment, reappointment or promotion considered by the A&P Committee, the Office of Academic Affairs provides Committee members with the long form, the department chair's transmittal memorandum, and reprints of up to five papers -- published, in press or submitted -- provided by the candidate for their review. The Office of Academic Affairs assigns two A&P Committee members to serve as primary and secondary reviewers (the "Committee Reviewers") to aid in the assessment of the candidate's credentials.

The department chair (or his or her designee) will be asked to make himself or herself available (on standby) to appear at the appropriate meeting of the A&P Committee to present the department's recommendation and to answer questions posed by Committee members. During the opening of the meeting, the primary and/or secondary reviewers will be queried regarding their assessment of the need for the department chair (or designee) to appear in support of the recommendation. Administrative staff will then immediately notify the department chair (or designee) if his or her attendance is required.

Upon request by an A&P Committee member (and with the concurrence of the Committee chair), the discussion of a candidate may be deferred until a future meeting. An action may also be tabled by the Committee chair for a variety of reasons including (but not limited to) a request for further input from the department or a recommendation that the Senior

Associate Dean pursue an alternate strategy with the department.

Although rarely necessary, the A&P Committee and/or the Committee Reviewers, in their discretion, also may request and consider any other material or information to complete the evaluation of the candidate's credentials for the rank recommended, including solicitation of additional letters of evaluation from external and/or internal referees, and consultation with others, such as Stanford faculty members, fellows, house staff or students. It is inappropriate for the A&P Committee or the Committee Reviewers to consult with or receive advice from the candidate.

5. Meetings and Quorum

Normally, the A&P Committee convenes twice a month. Consideration by the Committee of a recommendation requires the presence of more than half of the current voting Committee membership, including either the primary or secondary Committee Reviewer assigned the file. Members who are on sabbatical or are recused are not counted toward the current Committee membership for purposes of quorum. Participation by alternate members will be counted for purposes of quorum and for purposes of voting as described below.

Minutes of the meetings are confidential and are retained by the Office of Academic Affairs. Minutes of a meeting of the A&P Committee will be available only to Committee members who participated at that meeting. The minutes are to include copies of any additional correspondence and materials requested by or on behalf of the A&P Committee and/or the Committee Reviewers.

6. Voting and Recusal

Members of the A&P Committee are not to vote in the context of, and are not to be present during, the A&P Committee's consideration of a candidate if they have (a) overseen, or participated in, preparation of the documentation on behalf of the candidate (including submission of letters of evaluation); (b) attended a departmental or division meeting during which the candidate's currently proposed appointment, reappointment or promotion was discussed; or (c) voted on the recommendation at the divisional or departmental level. Members of the A&P Committee are expected to notify the

Committee Chair and/or the Senior Associate Dean regarding such situations or other possible circumstances that might make appropriate their recusal from consideration of a recommendation.

All members present at a meeting are required to vote by a show of hands. The tabulation of the vote is recorded. To carry affirmatively, a yea vote must be cast by a majority of A&P Committee members (including alternates) in attendance. The same number of nay votes (a majority) is required for a negative recommendation.

Abstentions are inappropriate, except under extraordinary circumstances. Absentee votes are not allowed; however, A&P Committee members who cannot attend a meeting may submit written comments to be reviewed by the A&P Committee.

L. Options of the Senior Associate Dean on Receiving Recommendations by the Appointments and Promotions Committee

Upon receipt of a recommendation (whether positive or negative) from the Appointments and Promotions Committee, the decision rests with the Senior Associate Dean, in his or her judgment and discretion, whether to make a positive or negative recommendation to the Dean, whether to remand the file to the department with instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

Before taking any of these options, the Senior Associate Dean may also refer the case back to the department chair (who may decide to withdraw it) or ask the A&P Committee to reconsider.

On a case-by-case basis, the Senior Associate Dean may further recommend to the Dean that the file be submitted to the School's Executive Committee for advice (see below).

M. The Role of the [Executive Committee](#) in Associate Professor and Professor Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

At the Dean's discretion, the Executive Committee may be asked to provide advice to him or her on an appointment, reappointment or promotion action; in certain situations, the Executive Committee may be asked to vote on such an action. If taken, a vote is advisory to the Dean; the ultimate decision on whether to forward the long form to the Provost with a positive recommendation belongs to the Dean.

Discussion at a meeting of the Executive Committee is held after the department chair members have read the file. Substitutes are allowed if they will be representing the department chair at the Executive Committee meeting during which the candidate will be discussed. Department chair members who read the full file but will be unable to attend the meeting will be allowed to submit their comments in writing or, if applicable, to cast a proxy vote.

Note that the Executive Committee can also choose to take up and provide advice to the Dean on a file sent to it as a report item. At the Dean's discretion, a vote may be called.

N. Decision by the Dean on Associate Professor and Professor Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions

Following receipt from the Senior Associate Dean of a positive or a negative recommendation (such as following a review and vote by the A&P Committee) or, where applicable, taking into consideration advice (or a vote) from the Executive Committee, the Dean shall make his or her decision as to whether to forward the file with his or her positive recommendation to the Provost, whether to remand the file with further instructions, or whether to take such other action as in his or her judgment is deemed appropriate.

If the Dean's (and hence the School's) decision is negative, then notification of that negative decision is provided both to the candidate, the department and the Provost's Office.

Reconsideration of a negative decision by the Dean will occur only if the department presents convincing evidence that new and material information bearing on the case exists, such as information that could not have been available in the original evaluation. Reconsiderations are rare and may be avoided by consultation between the chair and the Senior Associate Dean at appropriate intervals in the process.

P. Review by the Provost

“Recommendations for appointments, reappointments, and promotions are forwarded from the Dean to the Provost for his or her independent review and decision. Recommendations are reviewed by the Provost in consultation with University officers and members of the Provost's staff. This step in the review process is intended to evaluate and confirm the school's judgment: that the recommended action is a suitable one; that there has been (where appropriate) a satisfactory comparative search; that the documentation is complete; and that prescribed procedures have been followed. The Provost can obtain

additional information to help assess the action. He or she can then make a favorable decision, a negative decision, or remand the case to the department or school for further information or consideration.”

(Source: University Faculty Handbook)

Q. Review by the Advisory Board

“If the Provost’s view is favorable, the next step in the process (in general) is for the Provost to submit the case to the Advisory Board of the Academic Council for its review. The powers and functions of the Advisory Board are described in the Articles of Organization of the Academic Council. The Advisory Board normally assigns at least two, and sometimes more, of its members to read each file. The case is reviewed for adherence to procedural requirements, completeness of documentation, conformance with academic standards, and suitability. Occasionally, the Advisory Board may request additional information before voting on a recommendation or may table the matter for review by each member of the Board. After considering any issues raised by the assigned readers, the Advisory Board votes on the proposed action

The Provost may also ask the Advisory Board for informal advice on a file, in which case no vote is taken until the case is submitted formally by the Provost to the Advisory Board.

At the end of each Advisory Board meeting, the members report to the Provost and request additional follow-up, as necessary. Because the Advisory Board advises the President, the list of recommendations approved by the Advisory Board is forwarded by the Advisory Board Chair to the President for his or her final review and approval. A list of recommendations not approved by the Advisory Board is forwarded by the Chair to the President for his or her further consideration.”

(Source: University Faculty Handbook)

R. Review by the President

“The President, who makes the final decision, can choose to accept or not accept the recommendation by the Advisory Board. The President can obtain additional information on the file. He or she can make a favorable decision, a negative decision, or remand the case to the department or school for further information or consideration.

Approved actions are incorporated into the President’s Report to the Board of Trustees.” (Source: University Faculty Handbook)

S. Announcement of Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion Approvals

“Official notification of a successful appointment, reappointment, or promotion is contained in a letter from the Provost to the candidate. Deans, department chairs, and faculty members are often under pressure to offer assurances before the President renders his final decision, but this pressure should be resisted. Candidates should be generally informed of the University’s procedures and schedule for consideration of recommendations. Deans and department chairs, however, may report to the candidate in general terms on progress of the recommendation through the various stages and may indicate when final action may be expected.” (Source: University Faculty Handbook)

2.8 COTERMINOUS APPOINTMENTS

Certain faculty appointments can be made coterminous with specified circumstances, such as continued salary or other support from sponsored projects, or an administrative or other appointment at Stanford or an affiliated institution.

Examples of such appointments include, but are not limited to:

Non-Tenure Line (Research) appointments;

Certain School of Medicine appointments (including Tenure Line) with assignments at the Palo Alto Veterans Affairs Health Care System, the Northern California Cancer Center, Santa Clara Valley Medical Center, and the Palo Alto Medical Foundation;

Individuals with appointments that are coterminous with support from sponsored projects or from an affiliated institution are not subject to the same provisions for notice of non-renewal as appointees whose appointments are not coterminous.

As a general rule, the appointment (even if for a term of years or for a continuing term) ends at the same time the funding and/or other support or administrative assignment ceases. Although School funding beyond the point at which the faculty member's support terminates may be possible in certain instances, it is not an entitlement. Such situations are handled on a case-by-case basis, as are cases when a reduction (as opposed to a complete cessation) of the faculty member's support will result in the immediate termination of the appointment.

2.9 PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS

School policy allows appointment of faculty members at any rank on a part-time basis, usually for a fixed period of time. In particular, the School looks favorably upon family-related needs as a possible justification for granting temporary reductions from full-time to part-time status, such as when the part-time status is expected to exceed the limit of permitted leave.

Because a large number of part-time appointments within any one department could weaken its academic program, all FTE appointment reductions are made by the School in its discretion and by exception only, taking into consideration and balancing both the needs of the department and the faculty member. Such exceptions must be approved in advance by the department chair and the Senior Associate Dean.

Individuals who are requesting a temporary reduction in their appointment are not allowed to participate in activities that conflict or compete with the University in the roles in which they continue to be employed. In particular, no reductions in FTE will be granted to individuals intending to enter business or the practice of medicine.

2.10 JOINT APPOINTMENTS (UNDER REVISION)

A joint appointment may be considered when a faculty member makes a major contribution in terms of time, effort and programmatic need to the academic program of another department or school. The level of involvement of faculty members who hold joint appointments is normally sufficiently significant for the appointee to have voting privileges in the secondary department. All members of the faculty of the secondary department must vote on the recommendation for the joint appointment, with a majority in favor. Joint appointments are often, but not always, made at the time of the initial appointment, and the secondary department frequently provides a portion of the salary and/or other support. A non-tenured appointment will normally be made for the duration of the current appointment. A joint appointment for a tenured faculty member will normally be without limit of time. Similarly, for Non-Tenure Line faculty on continuing terms of appointments, the joint nature of the appointment should normally be for a continuing term.

The process to be used for joint appointments, reappointments, promotions and tenure reviews is explained in Chapter 2.6.B(4) of the University Faculty Handbook.

2.11 COURTESY APPOINTMENTS (UNDER REVISION)

Faculty members often make substantial contributions to departments other than their own, but in ways less formal than would justify a joint appointment. These contributions are sometimes recognized by means of courtesy appointments. There is usually no commitment of funds, space or other support involved in a courtesy appointment, and the faculty member has no voting privileges in the courtesy department. Courses taught by faculty members holding courtesy appointments are often cross-listed in both the primary and courtesy departments, if the course topic warrants it.

A courtesy appointment may be for the duration of the current professorial appointment or for a shorter period of time. Departments are encouraged to make courtesy appointments for the longest reasonable period. For tenured faculty, a minimum of three years is a reasonable guideline. For faculty members holding a term appointment, the typical length of time would be for the duration of the individual's current appointment; the courtesy appointment may not extend beyond the end date of the faculty member's primary appointment.

For further information on courtesy appointments, see Chapter 2.6.E. of the University Faculty Handbook.