

PANEL #4:

What do we need to do to ensure that the “Stanford Culture” encourages translational and interdisciplinary research across the University and also fosters career development and academic success?

1. How can we ensure an appropriate balance between team-based and individual scholarship?

Summary of Comments:

- Problem of senior A&P reviewers from traditional disciplines commenting on young collaborative investigators.
- “Breadth rather than depth of field” challenge. In clinical areas, many make their achievements through team-based projects. The contribution of each individual within the team needs to be identified.
- Another challenge is to determine how to evaluate the proportion of individual contributions to interdisciplinary and collaborative research.
- The Long Form now includes a description of collaborative research activities – it should be the expectation rather than the exception.
- Need to see process of recruitment-to-tenure as a continuum. Need to counsel and advise them all along the way.

Suggested Action Items:

- Convene an A&P Task Force to consider modifications to traditional processes appropriate to interdisciplinary and team-based faculty, including:
 - Reverse Site Visits:
 - Better to bring individuals together to hear/challenge/defend work.
 - Multi-authored papers – rather than writing letters to someone, have outstanding faculty come and listen to faculty as they defend what they did; ask them questions; determine if they are leaders or followers (like a reverse site visit). Spend 4-5 hours asking them questions.
 - Smart chair needs to convene a review group that is appropriate to the science of the individual under review. System fails at the department level.
 - An assembly of expertise inside and outside of the department is needed to craft the story.
 - In a new field, have the candidate go out and speak and get evaluations back.
 - Letters:
 - Talk to candidate at renewal time (closer to tenure) about who should provide letters.
 - Don't write for letters from people who have never directly interacted with the candidate.
 - Faculty member needs to actively engage in the identification of external letter authors who know the person (host faculty visits, etc.).
 - Teamwork training (included in CTSA) for scientists and associated evaluative metrics.
 - Need a separate evaluation path for people self-identified as being between fields.
 - Good citizenship is part of it and should be valued for what it is.

2. How can we adapt the “up or out” rules to the needs of a more diverse professoriate?

Summary of Comments:

- MCL: there needs to be a clear path and a clear set of appropriate rules, no reason for short timeframe (given no money and no space, can at least give them a little more time).
- Confirming continuing term at Professor level seems incongruous with “up or out” at Associate Professor level. MCL are brought in for primarily a clinical role (not to fill a research need). There needs to be some congruency between the job description and appointment review criteria.
- CE are often appointed because the program need won't support MCL – even though individual should be on the MCL. The business processes define appointment options.
- How do we create a community of excellence across all faculty titles?

Suggested Action Items:

- Convene a Task Force to consider:
 - Congruency between the job description and appointment review criteria:
 - Evaluate them based on what we hire them for.
 - Need to create some similarities across tracks in order to avoid social hierarchy.
 - Evaluative criteria:
 - Need a robust way of quantifying and evaluating clinical skill.
 - Maybe convene a scholarly oversight committee.
 - Provide metrics to the individual that represent the bases on which they will be evaluated.
 - We need to create a community of faculty that similarly values different roles.
 - Hold a town hall meeting to get both sides/opinions out in the open.
 - SHC/LPCH should consider options for using NP/PA staff resources.