



MEDICAL FACULTY PROMOTION INFORMATION FOR PROVINCIAL HEADS

General Information:

- There are one set of [College of Medicine's Standards for Promotion and Tenure](#) for in-scope faculty and out-of-scope faculty which Department Heads must be familiar with.
- As Provincial Head, your responsibilities with respect to managing the promotion process are very similar for medical faculty and USFA faculty. In-scope faculty processes are governed according to the [Collective Agreement](#), while medical faculty processes are governed according to the [Procedures Manual for Medical Faculty](#).
- After being reviewed by the Department committee, all promotion cases are then reviewed by the College Review Committee. The CRC will treat all case files the same whether in scope or medical faculty.
- Case files for promotion to full Professor are also assessed by a third committee at the university level, the URC or University Review Committee.
- It is your responsibility as Provincial Head to have an initial discussion with any faculty appointee who indicates an interest in promotion. The promotion standards should be reviewed with the candidate in conjunction with their CV, teaching record, and scholarly activity record. In some cases, you might advise that it is too early to seek promotion, specifying which criteria the candidate should focus on before submitting a stronger case file in the following year or thereafter. Nonetheless, it is the faculty appointee's prerogative to seek promotion in any year.
- There is no specific given time to go forward for promotion but in general it would be a minimum of 5-7 years to gain the requirements at each level.

Timelines for promotion:

Current timelines are determined by the University processes:

It is encouraged to have an annual review with faculty prior to May to discuss academic performance and the interest/progress toward promotion. An [Annual Review template](#) is recommended and the [Promotion Checklists](#) should be reviewed together each year.

by June 15	Candidate advises Provincial Head of decision to seek or not seek promotion
by August 1	Candidate provides case file information in support of promotion to Provincial Head
by Oct. 21	Department promotions committee shall consider case and make recommendation to the College Review Committee
by Dec. 7	College Review Committee shall consider case and make recommendation to the University Review Committee (in the case of a Full Professor)*
by Feb. 15	The University Review Committee considers all cases and submits its recommendations to the President for transmission to the Board of Governors
by March 31	The President advises all candidates of the decision of the Board, except those pending before the Promotion Appeals Committee
by April 15	The Promotions Appeal Committee considers all appeals and submits its positive recommendations to the President for transmission to the Board
by May 15	The Board considers all cases for promotion, the President advises all candidates of the Board's decision



Department Promotions Committee:

- A Department Promotions Committee needs to be constructed with members holding academic rank above that held by the candidate.
- If the department does not have enough members contact the College Review Committee through Faculty Engagement. Typically, qualified faculty from other clinical departments will then be co-opted to bring the membership of your promotions committee up to a minimum of 5 members.
- The role of a department promotions committee is to evaluate a colleague's readiness to be granted a promotion in academic rank. As such, committee members must be familiar with the college's promotion standards and must have attained an academic rank above that of the applicant seeking promotion ie for assessing promotion to Associate the committee includes those who are Associate or Full Professor (not Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor), similarly for promotion to full Professor the committee includes only those at the Professor rank (not Clinical Professor).
- In addition to determining whether candidates meet the requirements the department promotions committees should:
 - be chaired by the DH, irrespective of the DH's academic rank
 - have at least five members in addition to the chair, with a minimum of 4 members for quorum
 - be composed of members holding rank as described above
 - not include the DH if it is the DH seeking promotion, in which case the committee should be chaired by a committee member at the rank of promotion being sought by the DH
 - not include the Dean of Medicine, the VP Academic, the Provost, the President, or any person currently serving as a member of the CRC or the URC
 - make their recommendations according to the majority view, with recorded votes in all categories as well as to the overall question "Shall promotion be recommended?"
 - document the rationale for both majority and minority views
 - provide the committee's decision* in writing to the candidate via the committee chair, within one week of the decision being made
 - if the committee's decision* is not to recommend promotion, the written communication to the candidate must also specify the standards which the candidate failed to satisfy, and advise that the candidate can now withdraw or make a written appeal to the CRC within one week
 - structure and submit their recommendation to the CRC in a manner expediting CRC review, as may be required and revised by the CRC from time to time

Review Period:

- The CV will contain information that may be outside of the period of review. The review period begins either on the date of initial appointment for faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor, or from the date when the last case file was submitted for promotion.
- The review period ends at the end of the academic year (June 30) in the calendar year in which promotion is being requested.
- The department reviews the candidate's case file during August-October of that year, with a recommendation being submitted to the College Review Committee before October 21st.



Promotion standards:

The CoM's standards contain a number of tables summarizing the requirements necessary for promotion. Table A summarizes which categories of evaluation are applicable for which faculty.

- clinical faculty having health authority appointments and clinical responsibilities will be evaluated under Category 5.1a.
- Most clinical faculty will also be evaluated according to Category 5.2a criteria,
- "Medical educators" will usually be the group evaluated according to Categories 5.1b and 5.2b. These individuals usually spend the majority of their time in medical education.
- Category 4 is meant for use by faculty primarily involved in research.

The College standards must conform to the university standards and we are required to use the same seven evaluation categories. We are also required to adopt the 'teacher-scholar' model of faculty development, as described in the university standards.

It is critical to review the **Case File Check List** to ensure there is all the information the university requires for consideration of promotion case files. Some of that information is provided by you alone, some in collaboration with the candidate, and the rest by the candidate alone. Missing information or incomplete case files at the CRC level of review will contribute to significant delays or an outright refusal to consider.

Forms Required to be Completed/Collected by Department Head:

- **Department Head** must provide a **letter of recommendation** that affirms eight practice characteristics, as identified in Table E of the standards. [A sample letter of recommendation](#) is Appendix 1 of this document.
- You will need to obtain **letters of support from three of the candidate's colleagues** who would be familiar with the candidate's clinical practice. The candidate will likely be able to provide you with some suggested contact names, but the choice is entirely yours. The content of these letters must address Category 5.1a requirements, as described in Table E of the standards. [A sample letter of collegial support](#) is Appendix 2 of this document.
- For promotion to full Professor you will need to provide the names of 3 to 4 **external reviewers** who are at the full Professor level at their institution and familiar with the area of work of the candidate to provide an opinion on readiness for promotion, with regard to category 5 only and based on the College of Medicine's Standards. The candidate must also provide 3-4 names, and endorse the full list of potential external reviewers. There must be no conflict of interest ie. having worked, researched or published together. (See the [University Standards](#), pg 11 for all details concerning this process; and the CoM's VDFE office for samples of letters to be sent to the reviewers.)

Promotion case files:

Promotion case files must be assembled exactly as specified by the university. Case file preparation is described on the Faculty Engagement website. Department Promotion committee deliberations must be submitted on the [standardized form](#) ('Department Promotion Recommendation' is also appended) which aside from the title, is similar to USFA department recommendation.



Appendix 1: DH statement of recommendation (sample)

Date: _____

Dear College Review Committee Members:

This statement of recommendation is provided on behalf of Dr. _____ in accordance with the requirements laid out in the CoM Standards for Promotion and Tenure, Table E, Category 5.1a. Dr. _____ is seeking promotion to the _____ rank.

In consultation with (his/her) colleagues, it is my belief that Dr. _____ is clinically competent and provides expert advice to colleagues on request. Clinical record-keeping is timely and accurate and I have not been made aware of any issues regarding either professionalism or clinical practice performance.

Dr. _____ communicates appropriately in the clinical context with colleagues, learners, staff, patients, and other health professionals. (He/she) has demonstrated a willingness to share appropriately in the clinical workload of our department, including the performance of duties outside of regular work hours or in emergencies, as applicable and expected.

There has been a willingness to participate in provincial, local or department-based administrative or quality-improvement activities such as audits, department meetings, committee meetings and clinical program meetings, and such participation has been satisfactory. Further, Dr. _____ has demonstrated good stewardship with respect to the mindful and efficient use of health care resources.

Dr. _____ and I will provide additional documentation regarding (his/her) clinical practice, as required in the first part of Table E, CoM Standards for Promotion and Tenure. In my opinion, Dr. _____ meets the requirements laid out in the second part of Table E. I am comfortable in offering this statement of recommendation, in support of his application for promotion.

Sincerely,

Department Head, _____



Appendix 2: Colleague's letter of support (sample)

Date: _____

Dear Dr. _____

Faculty, Department of _____, College of Medicine

RE: Request for your assistance with Promotion Case File

Your colleague, Dr. _____, is seeking promotion to the academic rank of _____. To be promoted, (he/she) must meet the standards laid out in the College of Medicine's Standards for Promotion. One of the evaluation categories (5.1a – Table E) addresses specific components of clinical practice. Faculty appointees are expected to conduct their practices in a scholarly manner, with adequate attention to current scientific evidence and continuous quality improvement. Because you are aware of Dr. _____'s clinical practice, you are being asked, along with two other colleagues, to provide the Department Promotions Committee with assistance in evaluating the following specific promotion requirements:

1) As far as you are aware, Dr. _____ uses evidence-based clinical decision-making in the care of his/her patients.

Check one: Always _____ Most of the time _____ Sometimes _____ Rarely _____

2) As far as you are aware, Dr. _____ uses clinical practice guidelines and current scientific research while teaching medical students, residents and/or other learners.

Check one: Always _____ Most of the time _____ Sometimes _____ Rarely _____

3) As far as you are aware, Dr. _____ demonstrates a willingness to seek clinical and instructional guidance from established senior faculty colleagues.

Check one: Always _____ Most of the time _____ Sometimes _____ Rarely _____

4) As far as you are aware, Dr. _____ uses current evidence while participating in analysis and discussion of cases and conditions (e.g. on the wards, during grand rounds, during journal club, at meetings, etc.)

Check one: Always _____ Most of the time _____ Sometimes _____ Rarely _____

5) As far as you are aware, Dr. _____ interacts in a professional manner with colleagues and learners.

Check one: Always _____ Most of the time _____ Sometimes _____ Rarely _____

Comments: _____

Please sign and return this letter at your earliest convenience. Your assistance in this academic process is sincerely appreciated.

Dr. _____

Provincial Head

Colleague reviewer (Printed Name) _____ Signature _____

Date signed: _____



Appendix 3: Department MF Promotion Recommendation (sample)

Medical Faculty Promotion Recommendation

Year:

Name: _____ Department: _____ College: _____ Medicine

Rank to be Considered: _____

Recorded Vote of Department / College Promotions Committee (Number):

Vote:	<i>Yes:</i>	<i>No:</i>	<i>Abstentions:</i>	<i>Absent:</i>	<i>On Leave:</i>	<i>Excluded:</i> (Conflict of Interest)
--------------	-------------	------------	---------------------	----------------	------------------	--

Standards Used:	<i>Department Dated:</i>	<i>College Dated:</i>	<i>University Dated:</i>
------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

Meeting Date:

Number of Eligible Members:

Number of Members for Quorum:

Number of Members Present:

Please List Names of Members Departmental Promotions Committee:

Summary of Committee Evaluation:

In the available boxes for each category, record the committee vote or record that the category is not applicable.

		Meets the Standard at Superior Level	Meets the Standard	Does not Meet the Standard	Not Applicable	Not Required
1.	Academic Credentials					

Evidence Considered:¹

Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²

Minority View:³



2.	Teaching Ability and Performance					
Evidence Considered:¹						
Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²						
Minority View:³						
3.	Knowledge of Discipline and Area of Specialization					
Evidence Considered:¹						
Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²						
Minority View:³						
4.	Research, Scholarly, or Artistic Work					
Evidence Considered:¹						
Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²						
Minority View:³						
5.	Practice of Professional Skills					
Evidence Considered:¹						
Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²						
Minority View:³						
6.	Contributions to Administrative Responsibilities					
Evidence Considered:¹						
Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²						
Minority View:³						
7.	Public Service and Contributions to Academic and Professional Bodies					
Evidence Considered:¹						



Rationale with Reference to Appropriate Standards:²

Minority View:³

Evidence and Rationale for Evaluations:

- 1 For the evidence section please specify the methods of evaluation and summarize the aspects evaluated as required by the appropriate department, college, and university standards.
- 2 With respect to rationale please refer to the appropriate department, college, and university standards. Rationale statements should represent majority and, where applicable, minority views for evaluation in each required category.
- 3 Where applicable.

Date:	Committee Chair:	Signature:
--------------	-------------------------	-------------------

Departmental promotions committees shall forward this form, accompanied by the up-to-date case file and other documentation, as required, for consideration to the College Dean (Chair of the College Review Committee).

If the recommendation is negative, include a copy of the statement of reasons sent to the candidate. Retain a copy of this form for departmental reference.