

## The Institute for Education Research Scientist Review Policy: Requirements and Procedures for Progression for Scientists

### Scientist Review Policy

This document outlines the membership review policy for the Scientist category at The Institute for Education Research (TIER), which includes the appointments at the level of Scientist and Senior Scientist. The TIER review policy for the categories of Affiliate Scientist, Education Investigator 1, Education Investigator 2, Academy Scholar and Academy Research Trainee is outlined in a separate document called TIER Member Review Policy.

### Overview/Review Expectations

**Annual Review** Annual Activity Reports for all members will be submitted to the Research Institute in April of each year. Theme Leads and Research Institute Directors will review the annual activity report plus the goals and objectives for the previous year. Mutually agreed upon goals and objectives will be set for the following year. Summaries of these data will be provided to the Leadership Council.

**Initial Appointment** TIER Appointments Committee will review the applications of all candidates and recommend an appropriate membership category. All appointments are subject to regular review according to the procedures outlined below. Scientist appointments will be further reviewed by the Scientist Review Committee (comprised of The Research Institute Director, Scientific Director and Director of The Wilson Centre) to determine the Scientist's appropriate level within the category.

**First Review** An initial Scientist appointment is typically for a 3-year term. It is the expectation that the full 3-year term will be completed before review by the Scientist Review Committee. Satisfactory performance consists of making reasonable efforts to establish a research program. Significant problems, such as failure to submit grant applications or the failure to engage in education research activities, are grounds for rescinding a Scientist appointment. Upon completion of a successful initial review, Scientists are granted an additional 5-year term to allow them (i) to establish a research program with the potential of national impact on the field, and (ii) to demonstrate involvement in the Institute.

**Second Review** 3-5 years into the second term, the second review must be conducted. The Scientist Review Committee will determine whether the candidate (i) has developed a nationally recognized research program that demonstrates impact on the field, and (ii) is an active contributor in the life of the Institute. Upon completion of a successful second review the Scientist will be granted an additional 5-year term as a Senior Scientist.

**Third Review** No earlier than 5 years into their first term as Senior Scientist, a candidate may be considered for promotion to Senior Scientist 2. The goal for this period is: (i) to maintain an internationally-recognized research program that demonstrates major impact on the field, and (ii) to be an active research or administrative leader within TIER.

### **Ongoing Senior Scientist Review**

All Senior Scientists will be reviewed every 5 years following their appointment to a Senior Scientist level. Senior Scientists are expected to maintain a nationally-recognized research program and remain active contributors to life within the institute.

## **Scientist Review Process and Procedures**

### **a. First Review**

3 months prior to the end of their initial 3-year term, a Scientist is expected to submit the following:

1. **An up-to-date CV.** This should include publications, grant support, invitations, and other information that shows evidence for progress in establishing an independent research program.
2. **Supporting Letters.** Please provide supporting letters from at least 2 individuals based in Toronto who are knowledgeable in the candidate's area of expertise and can attest to their local engagement and/or impact.
3. **A Report.** Please provide a report (maximum 3 pages) describing research progress and future directions.

Members of the Scientist Review Committee will review these documents and recommend one of the following:

- i. that the candidate pass and be granted a 5-year term as a **Scientist**
- ii. that the candidate be reviewed again in 1 year, following the same procedure
- iii. that the candidate not be renewed

Candidates who are not renewed will be given a working extension term that will allow them reasonable time, not to exceed 1 year, to complete ongoing research activities at UHN.

#### **b. Second Review**

3 months prior to the end of their term, a Scientist must be reviewed. This review is consistent with the expectations for academic promotion to the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Toronto.

The candidate should submit:

1. **An up-to-date CV.** This should include publications, grant support, invitations, and other information that shows evidence for progress in establishing an independent research program.
2. **A List of References.** This list should name at least 5 individuals, world-wide, whose research accomplishments in health professions education research indicate their competence to review the progress of the candidate.

The Research Appointments Committee will use this list, as well as other sources of information, to elicit at least **3 letters of assessment**. At least 2 letters must be received from individuals outside the University of Toronto and its affiliated Hospitals. (Candidates will also have the option of submitting up to 5 names of individuals who the candidate does not wish to be reviewed by).

3. **A Report.** Please provide a 3-page report describing research progress, evidence of national impact and future directions.

The Review Committee will be comprised of The Research Institute Director, Scientific Director and Director of the Wilson Centre, and at least 1 person external to Institute (but from the local community and familiar with the field of the candidate) to serve as an external reviewer.

The Review Committee will convene a meeting at which the candidate will be asked to present a progress report, outline future directions and respond to questions posed.

The Review Committee will recommend one of the following:

- i. that the candidate pass and be granted a 5-year term as a **Senior Scientist**
- ii. that the candidate be reviewed again within 1-2 years
- iii. that the candidate not be promoted.

Candidates who fail to be promoted will be given a working extension term that will allow them reasonable time, not to exceed 1 year, to complete ongoing research activities at UHN.

### c. **Third Review**

No earlier than 5 years after achieving the rank of Senior Scientist, a Scientist may choose to undergo a Review for promotion to **Senior Scientist 2**. This review is consistent with the expectations for academic promotion to the rank of Full Professor at the University of Toronto.

The candidate should submit:

1. **An up-to-date CV.** This should include publications, grant support, invitations, and other information that demonstrates leadership of an independent research program with appreciable originality and ingenuity with a sustained record of high-level, continued scholarly and scientific contributions to his or her discipline.
2. **Evidence of Recognition.** Please provide evidence that the candidate is recognized nationally and internationally as a world expert in his or her field.
3. **Evidence of Contributions.** Please provide evidence of substantial contributions to the organization including, participating in the ongoing fulfillment and/or formulation of the mission, strategic direction and goals.
4. **A List of References.** This list should name at least 5 individuals, world-wide, whose research accomplishments in health professions education research indicate their competence to review the progress of the candidate.

The Research Appointments Committee will use this list, as well as other sources of information, to elicit at least **3 letters of assessment**. All letters must be received from individuals outside the University of Toronto and its affiliated Hospitals.

5. Candidates will also have the option of submitting up to **5 names of individuals who the candidate does not wish to be reviewed by**.
6. **A Report.** Please provide a 3-page report describing research progress, evidence of international impact and future directions.

The Review Committee will be comprised of The Research Institute Director, Scientific Director and Director of the Wilson Centre, and at least 1 person external to institute (but from the local community and familiar with the field of the candidate) to serve as an external reviewer. The Review Committee will convene a meeting at which the candidate will be asked to present a progress report, outline future directions and respond to questions posed.

The Review Committee will recommend one of the following:

- i. that the candidate pass and be granted a 5-year term as a **Senior Scientist 2**
- ii. that the candidate be reviewed again within 1-2 years
- iii. that the candidate not be promoted

Candidates who fail to be promoted may remain at the level of Senior Scientist 1, or be given a working extension term that will allow them reasonable time, not to exceed 1 year, to complete ongoing research activities at UHN, at the discretion of the Review Committee.

### **Ongoing Senior Scientist Review**

All Senior Scientists will be reviewed every 5 years following their appointment to a Senior Scientist level.

The candidate should submit:

1. **An up-to-date CV. This should include publications, grant support, invitations, and other information that demonstrates leadership of an independent research program with appreciable originality and ingenuity with a sustained record of high-level, continued scholarly and scientific contributions to his or her discipline.**
2. **Evidence of Recognition.** Please provide evidence that the candidate is recognized nationally and internationally as a world expert in his or her field.

3. **Evidence of Contributions.** Please provide evidence of substantial contributions to the organization including, participating in the ongoing fulfillment and/or formulation of the mission, strategic direction and goals.

The Review Committee will recommend one of the following:

- i. that the candidate pass and be granted another 5-year term as a Senior Scientist
- ii. that the candidate be reviewed again within 1-2 years
- iii. that the candidate not be approved for another term

Candidates who fail to be approved for another term will be given a working extension term that will allow them reasonable time, not to exceed 1 year, to complete ongoing research activities at UHN.

It is recognized that although the timelines for reviews as outlined in this document are preferred, exceptions may occur. Scientists may have lost significant research time because of illness, other Hospital/University activities, parental leave, or other similar legitimate activities that may impact progression to the category of Senior Scientist. The Scientist Review Committee retains discretion to grant additional terms to any Scientist as needed.

**All recommendations for appointments from the Scientist Review Committee are brought to the TIER Leadership Council for final approval.**