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Initial Perceptions

1) Promotion is a mysterious process
2) Promotion is uncertain and frustrating process
3) No transparency in the process
4) Women faculty are not being treated fairly
5) Promotion for a clinical faculty is more difficult

Note: Promotions are handled by COSFAP that reviews only senior ranks
Areas of Excellence for Promotion

I. Teaching
II. Research and/or scholarly activity
III. Clinical service
IV. Administrative service.

- Minimum two categories are needed to be eligible for promotion
- Rush has a single track
Measures undertaken to improve the process of promotions

I. Revised the policies and procedures:
   - Redefined the standards and requirements
   - Four areas of excellence were identified and clearly explained.

II. Created standardized documents/templates:
   - CV template
   - Template for letter of evaluation request
   - Chair’s letter template
   - “Assessment Grid” to guide the reviewers

III. Educational outreach campaign:
   1) University-wide seminars;
   2) Open-panel discussions: promotion at the Medical College vs other colleges at the university;
   3) Education of junior faculty from the research mentoring program;
   4) Group and individual meetings with department chairpersons;
   5) Seminars/round table discussions within individual departments.
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IV. Proactive actions:

1) “hot-line” or tutoring to guide the chairs and/or the faculty to avoid tabling and denials

2) All packets are being reviewed by the COSFAP chair prior to submission to assure they fulfill the requirements

3) Quantitative analysis of promotions by rank/gender/departments (last 4 years)

4) Departments with a low promotion activity have been identified and the concerns were addressed

5) Identified a pipeline of faculty that may be eligible for promotion within the next 1-3 years and offered consultations and guidance

6) Assistance with faculty annual review.

V. Promotion is overseen by the office of Academic Affairs
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### Male/Female faculty ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male/Female Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4-year data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Male/Female Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Files reviewed, Professor rank</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Files approved, Professors rank</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Files reviewed, Assoc Prof rank</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Files approved, Assoc Prof rank</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3-year data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by gender relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to total faculty pool</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>19.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed by gender relative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to categories eligible for promotion</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>29.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof reviewed by gender</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>20.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for promotion to Assoc Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof reviewed by gender</td>
<td>44.12</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Quantitative Analysis showed:
   - More than 2-fold difference in the numbers of women vs men faculty at RMC, which leads to a similar difference between the number submitted for promotion
   - But, relative to corresponding gender pool, the percentage of promotion is comparable between the genders

2. Our new model/approach to the promotion process resulted in:
   - Period between the package submission and approval is reduced to minimally possible; Waiting period is eliminated
   - In the last two years no denials have been issued
   - Satisfaction of the Chairs and faculty is improved;
   - Process is totally transparent and preventive measures are implemented across the College;

Various approaches are undertaken to recognize newly promoted faculty