



Department of Radiology

Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure

University of North Dakota School of Medicine & Health Sciences

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Faculty	3
A.	Faculty Titles	3
B.	Academic Title Series	4
C.	Research Faculty Title Series	7
D.	Teaching Faculty	8
E.	Clinical Title Series	10
F.	Adjunct Faculty	12
G.	Joint Faculty	14
H.	Emeritus Faculty	14
III.	Faculty Appointments and Contracts	14
A.	Probationary Appointments	14
B.	Tenure Appointments	15
C.	Emeritus Appointments	16
IV.	Evaluations of Faculty	16
A.	Purpose	16
B.	Expectations for Participants	17
C.	Composition of the Committee	18
D.	Expectations for Documents	18
V.	Departmental Standards	19
A.	Standards and Criteria	19
B.	Schedule for Evaluation of Faculty	20
i.	Probationary Faculty	20
ii.	Special Appointment Faculty: Scientist Scholar, Educator Scholar, or Clinician Scholar	22
iii.	Tenured Faculty	23
iv.	Special Appointment Faculty: Research Faculty, Teaching Faculty, Clinical Faculty	23
C.	Processes	24
i.	Evaluation Process	24
ii.	Promotion Process	26
iii.	Tenure	30
iv.	Administrative Appointments	34
	Appendices	35
I.	Role of the Faculty Member	36
II.	Examples of Activities which Address Criteria for Advancement	
A.	Academic Title Series	36
i.	Scientist Scholar	37
ii.	Educator Scholar	44
iii.	Clinician Scholar	50
B.	Non-Academic Title Series	58
i.	Research Faculty	58
ii.	Teaching Faculty	61
iii.	Clinical Faculty	64
III.	Employer Evaluation Form of Clinical Competence of Medical School Faculty	68
IV.	Probationary (Tenure Track) Checklist	69
V.	Special Appointment (Non-Tenure) Checklist	70
VI.	Post Tenure Checklist	71

VII.	Clinical Faculty Promotion Request	72
VIII.	Promotion Checklist	73
IX.	Promotion and Tenure Checklist	74
X.	Recommendation for Promotion in Academic Rank	75
XI.	Recommendation for Tenure in Academic Rank	76
XII.	Faculty Promotion Sample Timeline	77
XIII.	External Reviewers	78

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Radiology and its faculty have unique characteristics and responsibilities and because of that, parts of this document will differ from the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and from the University Faculty Handbook. For all matters not dealt with in the enclosed document, the SMHS Guidelines and the Faculty Handbook should be used as the guides.

The criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Radiology and the process of faculty review are consistent with the University of North Dakota School of Medicine and Health Sciences Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure and the Faculty Handbook. The following guidelines include criteria that may be used to evaluate the performance of faculty members for promotion, tenure and post-tenure performance.

As of September 2019, all faculty appointments in the Department of Radiology are clinical faculty appointments. Because of this, and since it is expected that most if not all appointments in the future will continue as clinical faculty appointments, the sections concerning clinical faculty appointments have been bolded red.

Each faculty member is to undergo an academic evaluation for the purpose of promotion and tenure as specified in the School of Medicine and Health Sciences (SMHS) Guidelines. The purpose of the evaluation is to help the faculty improve their performance.

The information required for the evaluation process includes documentation of faculty activities in the areas of teaching, patient care, scholarly and creative activity, contribution to one's discipline or profession, and professional and community service. Not all faculty members will have similar duties and responsibilities in these areas, but all faculty members must have activity in areas spelled out in their contract and/or position description, which is consistent with his/her academic appointment. The departmental chair and individual faculty member will mutually agree upon the contribution to each area. The position description and percentage of effort form will reflect the effort of each faculty member in each area. Each faculty member will be evaluated relative to his or her individual duties and responsibilities.

The evaluation instrument is the faculty portfolio, which documents activities in teaching, patient care, scholarly and/or creative activity, contribution to one's discipline or profession, and professional and community service. The document also contains the faculty position description and percentage of effort in each area. The Chair of the Department of Radiology Committee reviews all faculty portfolios.

Faculty Responsibilities:

Each faculty member should be familiar with the University Faculty Handbook and the *Guidelines*.

Administrator Responsibilities:

The administrator should be familiar with UND Faculty Handbook and the *Guidelines*. The administrator should nurture an atmosphere of mutual trust and honesty based on good communication (Faculty Handbook I-1, 1.2).

Departmental Responsibilities:

The Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.2 recognizes the uniqueness of individual faculty and the departments within which they serve by stating that the main responsibility for implementation of evaluation has been placed in the departments. Therefore, the radiology department uses the school of medicine guidelines as the basis while taking into account its specificity.

The departmental CPT must base its evaluation and recommendations solely upon the information supplied by the faculty member; it is imperative that the faculty member supply all necessary data and appropriate documentation. A fact cannot be assumed as known, if not stated or documented.

Promotions and tenure are to be based on the consistency and quality of:

- Scholarly and creative activities, including distinctive, peer accepted contributions to one's discipline or profession;
- Performances in teaching, including curriculum design, course development, content delivery, and assessment; and
- Service to the department, the School, the University, the profession, and society.

Faculty members' contributions to each of these areas may vary within the confines of a written job description and percent of effort distributions. Furthermore, excelling in only one aspect of academic responsibility may slow promotion (such as promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor) or may make promotion impossible (such as promotion from Associate to Professor).

Definitions of Scholarship, Scholarly Teaching, and Service

Scholarship: Like the School, the Department of Radiology utilizes the following criteria to define what we consider to be the essential characteristics of scholarship:

- The faculty member's efforts result in a tangible product or output (hereafter "work");
- The work is made public and is available outside of the institution and region;
- The work is subjected to external peer review and critique by other scholars in the field;
- The work must be able to be reproduced and forms the foundation to be built on by other scholars.

Teaching: School faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly teaching.

Scholarly teaching is teaching that is constantly evolving and improving. Scholarly teachers establish clear goals for the course, focusing on what students will learn rather than the content they will "cover". They prepare adequately, and they research and use a variety of appropriate methods. They reflect on their own practice and invite critique on their teaching from students and peers, and administrators if appropriate, their teaching results in significant student learning.

(Adapted from: Activities of Scholarly Teachers. From The Centre for Discovery in Learning, University of Saskatchewan)

Service: Service includes contributions and activities that promote the general welfare of a department, the School, or the University. Service also includes activities that contribute to the development of a professional discipline, a professional society, or an outside agency or community. For all faculty members, regardless of appointment or rank, the concept of "service" includes displaying a collegial spirit of cooperation and avoidance of disruptive behavior. (Adapted from Emory University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 8: Service and Emory College of Arts and Sciences *Principles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure*).

II. FACULTY

A. FACULTY TITLES

Academic Titles (see SMHS Guidelines for description, Section II. A.)

Scientist Scholar

Educator Scholar

Clinician Scholar

Faculty members with an academic appointment, scientist scholar, educator scholar or clinician scholar, contribute to the mission of the School and UND in **all three areas** of scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. An academic appointment may be probationary, tenured, or special (non-tenured).

Scientist Scholar

The Scientist Scholar designation is for faculty members with demonstrated excellence in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge or new insights into existing knowledge. Scientist Scholars are effective teachers and actively involved in academic or professional service.

Educator Scholar

The Educator Scholar designation is for faculty members with demonstrated excellence in teaching, educational leadership, curriculum development, faculty development, and/or administration. Faculty members in this title series are engaged in either the scholarship of teaching and learning, or scholarship/creative activities within their discipline or profession. Educator Scholars are actively involved in academic or professional service.

Clinician Scholar

The Clinician Scholar designation is for faculty members with demonstrated excellence in patient care, teaching, and administrative service as well as scholarship and creative activities that typically relate to these areas. Clinician Scholars are actively involved in academic or professional service.

Additional Faculty Titles:

Faculty members who actively contribute to the mission of the School in **one or more primary areas** of scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and service may have a special appointment (non-tenured) in the following series:

Research Faculty

Research faculty are dedicated to supporting the research mission of the school. These faculty members have a primary focus in research but may also contribute to other missions of the department.

Teaching Faculty

Teaching faculty are dedicated to supporting the teaching mission of the school. These faculty members have a primary focus in teaching but may also contribute to other missions of the department.

Clinical Faculty (see SMHS Guidelines for description, Section II. A.)

Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are primarily clinicians who are or have been employed by regional health care systems or facilities. Their primary role is to contribute to the educational mission of the School although they may occasionally contribute to the service, scholarship and administrative missions as well.

Research Faculty (see SMHS Guidelines for description, Section II. A.)

Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty appointments are for individuals from business, industry, research institutions, government agencies, or other academic institutions. UND faculty or staff members who do not have a primary appointment at the School may also be eligible for an adjunct faculty appointment within the School. Adjunct faculty members help fulfill the educational, research, or service missions of the School.

Joint Faculty

Joint appointments are made for faculty members with a primary appointment in one department or discipline within the School or at the University who are actively contributing to the teaching or research mission of another department or discipline within the School or University.

Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus status may be conferred upon retirement or after retirement to faculty or senior administrators or professionals pursuant to institution policies and procedures. Criteria for emeritus status may include, but are not limited to, length of service to the institution, significant contributions to the institution and the State of North Dakota, or particularly distinguished service to an academic discipline. Emeritus/emerita status shall not include salary or other compensation or other rights, except privileges specified in institution policies or procedures (SBHE Policy, 430.2).

B. ACADEMIC TITLE SERIES

**RANKS, CRITERIA FOR RANK, and CHARACTERISTICS of ACADEMIC RANK:
SCIENTIST SCHOLAR, EDUCATOR SCHOLAR, and CLINICIAN SCHOLAR FACULTY**

Recognized Ranks

Instructor
Assistant Professor
Associate Professor
Professor

CHARACTERISTICS OF ACADEMIC RANK

Listed below are characteristics of academic rank to be used for appointment or promotion to Instructor, Assistant, Associate and full Professor. These are intended to be the usual criteria and are not intended to exclude qualified candidates who possess equivalent training and/or experience.

Instructor

Education:

- Earned Bachelor's degree, Master's degree or equivalent training and/or
- Significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree

Experience:

- Demonstrated potential as a teacher, researcher or both
- Engaged in professional development

Assistant Professor

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered a terminal degree by the discipline, and/or
- Significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree

Postgraduate training:

Postgraduate training criteria apply to Associate Professor and Professor ranks as well

- Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate
- Board certification in the discipline, if available or applicable
- Faculty members with the Ph.D. or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed postdoctoral training or equivalent experience, if appropriate in their area of specialization at the time of training
- Others should be eligible for professional certification in their fields, as available or applicable

Experience:

- Potential for effectiveness in teaching
- Effective patient care
- Potential for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activity
- Potential for effectiveness in professional and community service

Associate Professor

Education:

- Earned M.D. and/or Ph.D. or significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree
- Postgraduate training:

Faculty members with a M.D. degree should be board certified in their specialty or subspecialty. Non-M.D. faculty members should be certified in their fields if such certification is available or applicable.

If appropriate to the discipline, faculty members with other terminal degrees should have completed a postdoctoral experience.

Experience:

- Consistent and demonstrated effectiveness in teaching
- Scholarly and creative activity of appropriate quality and quantity for time in rank
- Local or regional recognition for scholarly activity
- Consistent and substantial contributions and service to their department, profession and school
- Demonstrated community service

Professor

The rank of Professor is awarded on the basis of documented recognition for continued solid and Superior performance and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Associate Professor.

- Earned M.D. and/or Ph.D. or significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree.
- Postgraduate training:

Faculty members with a M.D. degree should be board certified in their specialty or subspecialty. Non-M.D. faculty members should be certified in their fields, if such certification is available or applicable.

If appropriate to the discipline, faculty members with other terminal degrees should have completed a postdoctoral experience.

Education:

- Earned doctorate

Postgraduate training: As delineated for appointment as Assistant Professor

Experience:

- Recognition for continued excellence in teaching
- National or international recognition for continued scholarly activity of high quality and appropriate quantity
- Demonstrated leadership and superior service contributions to the department, school and profession
- Recognition for professional and community service

RANKS, CRITERIA FOR RANK, and CHARACTERISTICS of RANK: RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND CLINICAL FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

C. RESEARCH FACULTY TITLE SERIES

Recognized Rank

Research Assistant Professor
Research Associate Professor
Research Professor

Criteria for Research Rank

Individuals possessing appropriate degrees and whose primary area of emphasis is research and research-related activities within biomedical, social, population, health or clinical sciences, may be eligible for a research rank. The research faculty member may participate in the educational activities of the department.

A research faculty person may be a member of a Basic Science, Health Science, or Clinical Science department.

Research Assistant Professor

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline

Postgraduate training:

Postgraduate training criteria apply to Associate Professor and Professor ranks as well.

- Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate.
- Faculty members with the Ph.D. or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed postdoctoral training or equivalent experience, if appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of training.
- Others should be eligible for professional certification in their fields, if such is available or applicable.

Experience:

- Demonstrated ability in research
- Potential to develop an independent extramurally funded research program
- Potential for effectiveness in departmental and professional service

Research Associate Professor

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline

Postgraduate Training:

As delineated for appointment as Research Assistant Professor

Experience:

- Demonstrated record of excellence in research, either as a principal investigator or in support of a principal investigator
- Demonstrated research productivity as a contributor to the dissemination of research outcome through publication or presentation or other methods appropriate to the department
- Effectiveness in departmental and professional service

Research Professor

The rank of Research Professor is awarded on the basis of documented recognition for continued superior performance and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Associate Professor.

The individual must have demonstrated a leadership role in departmental activities and/or the professional discipline.

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline.

Postgraduate training: As delineated for appointment as Research Assistant Professor

Experience:

- Evidence of being an independent investigator with extramural funding
- Evidence of maintaining a research program of high quality and appropriate quantity
- Demonstrated research productivity, i.e., publications including peer-reviewed articles, book chapters and invited reviews.
- Recognition for continued contributions to the department and profession

D. TEACHING FACULTY

Recognized Teaching Ranks

Teaching Instructor

Teaching Assistant Professor

Teaching Associate Professor

Teaching Professor

Criteria for Teaching Rank

Individuals possessing appropriate degrees and whose primary area of emphasis is teaching and teaching-related activities within basic, social, population, health, or clinical science, may be eligible for a teaching rank. The teaching faculty member may participate in the research activities of the department.

A teaching faculty person may be a member of a Basic Science, Health Science, or Clinical Science department.

Characteristics of Teaching Ranks

Teaching Instructor:

Education:

- Earned Bachelor's degree, Master's degree or equivalent training, and/or
- Significant teaching experience commensurate with a terminal degree
- Potential for effectiveness as a teacher

Teaching Assistant Professor

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline, and/or significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree.

Postgraduate training:

Postgraduate training criteria apply to Associate Professor and Professor ranks as well.

- Faculty members with the M.D. degree should have completed residency training to board eligibility, if appropriate.
- Faculty members with the Ph.D. or other terminal degree will be expected to have completed postdoctoral training or equivalent experience, if appropriate to their area of specialization at the time of training.
- Others should be eligible for professional certification/licensure in their fields, if applicable

Experience:

- Demonstrated ability in teaching with good student and/or peer evaluations
- Potential for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activity
- Potential for effectiveness in departmental and professional service

Teaching Associate Professor

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline, and/or significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree

Postgraduate Training:

As delineated for appointment as a Teaching Assistant Professor.

Experience:

- Demonstrated record of excellence in teaching with excellent student and/or peer evaluations
- Demonstrated teaching productivity
- Potential to assume leadership roles in education and curriculum development

- Demonstrated scholarly productivity in the area of education
- Demonstrated regional/national reputation in education
- Demonstrated effectiveness in Departmental, School, and professional service

Teaching Professor

The rank of Teaching Professor is awarded on the basis of documented recognition for continued superior performance and not simply on the basis of time in rank as Teaching Associate Professor.

Education:

- Earned doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline, and/or significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree

Postgraduate Training:

As delineated for appointment as a Teaching Assistant Professor.

Experience:

- Continued superior performance, achievement, and recognition as a scholarly teacher
- Demonstrated sustained scholarly productivity in the area of education
- Demonstrated leadership roles in education and curriculum development
- Evidence of funding
- Demonstrated leadership in departmental activities and/or the professional discipline
- Recognition for continued contributions to the Department, School and Profession

E. CLINICAL TITLE SERIES **Recognized Clinical Faculty**

Ranks:

Clinical Instructor

Clinical Assistant Professor

Clinical Associate Professor

Clinical Professor

Criteria for Clinical Rank

Individuals possessing an earned Bachelor's degree, graduate degree, doctorate or other degree considered to be a terminal degree by the discipline, or significant clinical experience commensurate with a terminal degree and willing to contribute to the School in teaching, scholarly activity and/or service missions are eligible for clinical rank.

Characteristics of Clinical Rank

Clinical Instructor

- Previously demonstrated teaching experience not required.
- Willing to spend up to 100 hours/year teaching
- Demonstrates potential as an educator

Clinical Assistant Professor

- Board eligible or certified in his/her discipline, if applicable; post-degree experience, if applicable
- Demonstrated three years teaching experience
- Willing to spend up to 100 hours/year teaching or engaged in scholarly activity
- Demonstrates promise of excellence in their primary professional activity.

Clinical Associate Professor

- Board certified (if applicable)
- Three or more years teaching or research experience
- Demonstrates effective teaching or research
- Plays important role in departmental teaching activities
- Willing to spend 100 hours or more/year teaching or engaged in scholarly activity
- Demonstrates excellence in their primary professional activity.

Clinical Professor

- Board certified (if appropriate)
- Eight or more years teaching or research experience
- Demonstrates effective teaching
- Plays important role in departmental teaching/research and leadership activities
- Willing to spend 200 or more hours/year teaching or 100 hours engaged in scholarly activity
- Demonstrates excellence in their primary professional activity.

FACULTY RANKS, CRITERIA FOR RANK, AND CHARACTERISTICS OF RANK FOR ADJUNCT, JOINT, AND EMERITUS FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

F. ADJUNCT FACULTY

Adjunct Faculty Recognized Ranks

Adjunct Instructor

Adjunct Assistant Professor

Adjunct Associate Professor

Adjunct Professor

Criteria for Adjunct Rank

Individuals possessing the appropriate degree for their profession from an accredited institution and who can demonstrate ability in research, teaching, or clinical activity, depending on the proposed role as an adjunct faculty member may be eligible for appointment as an Adjunct Faculty member. The adjunct faculty member may be appointed from elsewhere in the University or from the community at large.

Characteristics of Adjunct Rank

Adjunct Instructor

Education:

- Earned Bachelor's degree or equivalent training

Experience:

- Demonstrated potential as a teacher or researcher
- Engaged in professional development

Adjunct Assistant Professor

Education:

- Possession of a terminal degree for the profession

Experience:

- Demonstrated ability in clinical activity, scholarly and/or creative activity or teaching, depending on the proposed role as an adjunct faculty member

Adjunct Associate Professor

Education:

- Possession of a terminal degree for the profession

Experience:

- Demonstrated sustained role in departmental educational activities in ONE or more of the following areas:

direct teaching; advising or mentoring; learner assessment; the creation of educational materials.

- Local and regional recognition in research (if applicable)
- Demonstrated evidence of high impact and quality teaching in departmental educational or research programs
- Local and regional recognition in the practice of clinical specialty (if applicable)
- Demonstrated effectiveness in departmental and professional service
- Evaluations reflecting satisfactory performance by students, residents and other faculty members

Adjunct Professor

Education:

- Possession of a terminal degree for the profession

Experience:

- Demonstrated high impact, high quality, and excellence in activities of direct teaching; advising or mentoring; learner assessment; or creation of educational materials
- Recognition as a role model, teacher and leader in educational practices
- Demonstrated and sustained scholarly activity within his or her discipline, and consistent with his or her role as an adjunct faculty member
- Demonstrated leadership in clinical activity, teaching or research consistent with his or her role as an adjunct faculty member
- National or international recognition for clinical care, clinical or basic research, education, and/or service
- Demonstrated leadership in national and international organizations

G. JOINT FACULTY

Joint Faculty

Rank

Joint appointments reflect the contribution of the faculty member to the School and departments and may or may not be at the same rank as the appointment in the home department.

Criteria for a Joint Faculty

Individuals possessing the criteria for rank as defined by each department and who are willing to contribute to the missions of the School and Department in one or more areas of scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and service may be eligible for a joint rank.

H. EMERITUS FACULTY

Emeritus status may be conferred upon retirement or after retirement to faculty or senior administrators or professionals pursuant to institution policies and procedures. (Faculty Handbook I-3, 3.4).

Emeritus Faculty Rank

Equivalent to the rank at which the faculty member was appointed prior to retirement.

Criteria for Emeritus Faculty

Criteria for emeritus status may include, but are not limited to, length of service to the institution, significant contributions to the institution and the State of North Dakota, or particularly distinguished service to an academic discipline.

III. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS and CONTRACTS

Faculty appointments shall be probationary, tenured, or special (non-tenured) (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 4; SBHE Policy 605.1, 4).

A. Probationary Appointments

Probationary Appointments entail tenure-track contracts. Probationary contracts of the faculty of the School will be based on two criteria: source of funding and academic rank, i.e., in order for faculty members to be considered tenure eligible, they must

1. Be initially (or subsequently) fully funded from State General Fund appropriations available for that individual's tenured salary, and
2. Carry a probationary academic faculty rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor).

Failure to satisfy both of these conditions simultaneously prevents issuance of a probationary contract. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, G)

* This provision, under special circumstances, may have to be modified by the UND School of Medicine, with the approval of the State Board of Higher Education, in order to fit those situations unique to a state-wide, community-based medical school. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, G*)

Probationary contracts may lead to a full-time tenured appointment. Early tenure (after four or five years) will be recommended only in exceptional cases (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, E). A probationary contract will not be granted for a period longer than six years, under normal circumstances. The term may be extended beyond six years or the continuous service requirement may be waived in exceptional circumstances. If tenure is not granted and a seventh-year contract is issued, it must be terminal, unless an extension has been granted (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3c; I-8, 8.1.1, 4a; I-8, 8.2,P and SBHE Policy 605.1, 4a).

Special appointment contracts do not typically involve either tenure credit or status (SBHE Policy 605.1, 4c). However, they also do not exclude an opportunity for a tenured appointment: “The Board may, following review and recommendation made pursuant to the procedures established at an institution award tenure in exceptional circumstances, defined by the institution's procedures, to any person appointed to the faculty who has not met the eligibility requirements of subdivisions 3(b) and 3(c) of this policy, provided that the person has a documented record of outstanding achievement and consistent excellence in a discipline or profession gained through research, scholarly or professional activities, or service.” (SBHE Policy 605.1, 4biii). Faculty employed under a special appointment contract may be considered for tenure after six years of full-time continuous service based upon two criteria (criteria identified previously and in the Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, G):

1. The availability of fully funded salaries from state general fund appropriations assigned to an academic salary budget in the department to which the faculty member belongs.
2. The faculty member carries an academic faculty rank (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor) in that department.

The following types of special appointments do not involve tenure credit or status: courtesy adjunct appointments, research title appointments, teaching title appointments, clinical title appointments, visiting appointments, graduate teaching assistant appointments, postdoctoral fellowships and clinical appointments, appointments of retired faculty on special conditions, any initial appointment funded wholly or partially by other than state general funds, appointments clearly limited to a temporary association of normally no more than three years, special title appointments, lectureship appointments, part time appointments, or administrative or coaching positions. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 4 b & c and SBHE Policy 605.1, 4 b & c).

B. Tenure Appointments

Tenure Appointments: Eligibility for tenure typically requires a probationary period of six years of continuous academic service to the School. A faculty member may be recommended for tenure by satisfying the criteria developed by the department, School, and University. The criteria shall include scholarly teaching; contribution to a discipline or profession through research; other scholarly or professional activities; and service to the institution and society. (adapted from Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3 b & c).

If any individual is appointed to an academic (or) administrative position from outside the University, academic rank and/or tenure offered concurrently with or subsequent to such appointment will be determined only after recommendation of the department/college in which the rank is to be given. The criteria for rank and/or tenure for administrator-teachers, especially those relating to scholarly activity and service to students, will be similar to those regularly used in the department/college. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, J).

C. Emeritus Appointments

Emeritus Appointment: Emeritus status may be conferred upon retirement or after retirement to faculty or senior administrators or professionals pursuant to institution policies and procedures. (Faculty Handbook I-3, 3.4).

IV. EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY

A. Purpose

The major purpose of an evaluation is to help the faculty member improve his or her performance.

An evaluation should focus on the departmental and school criteria and the faculty member's accomplishments as related to his or her title, rank, and percent of effort distributions. Evaluations by departmental and School Committees address the faculty member's accomplishments in scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and service; administrative components of a contract are not evaluated by committees on promotion and tenure. For joint appointments, evaluations will be conducted by the primary department with input from the secondary (joint) department if requested.

Faculty evaluations within the Academic Faculty title series shall occur at the time of initial appointment, periodically as specified in the *Guidelines* ([Table I](#) & [Table II](#)), at the time of proposed promotion, and at the time of proposed awarding of tenure. Evaluations of tenured faculty will also occur periodically as specified in the *Guidelines* ([Table III](#)).

For Research and Teaching Faculty, evaluations by the School CPT will only be conducted upon request for promotion within these title series, or upon request for a transfer to the academic faculty title series ([Table IVa](#)).

For Clinical Faculty, School CPT evaluations will only be conducted upon request of the faculty member, departmental chair, departmental CPT, or Dean ([Table IVb](#)).

Procedures and guidelines for the evaluation of probationary, tenured, and special appointment faculty provide means whereby the performance of individual faculty members and their contributions to the department and University community may be equitably assessed and documented. (Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.2). An evaluation should commend faculty for outstanding performance and/or encourage faculty to strengthen weaknesses as well as improve in already strong areas.

Evaluation instruments are the means whereby information is gathered to provide a basis for evaluation. They do not constitute an evaluation in themselves. "Evaluation" in terms of this document is the process whereby the information acquired by evaluation instruments, i.e., peer and student evaluations, administration and external comments, etc. are analyzed and evaluated to determine the quality of performance by an individual faculty member as measured against criteria and objectives set by the department (Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.2).

The evaluation has two distinct purposes: formative and summative. Formative evaluation is that which gathers information for use by the instructor in improving his or her own performance in scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and/or service. Summative evaluation gathers information to be used by colleagues and administrators for the purpose of making decisions about retention, tenure, promotion, and merit salary increases. (Adapted from Faculty Handbook, I-4, 4.3, 4 & 5).

SBHE Policy 605.1, 6 states that ‘evaluations of all teaching faculty must include significant student input.’ (Specifically, any faculty member with a percent of effort distribution in teaching must include student input in his or her evaluation.) In order to present a broad and accurate view of teaching, summative data should be gathered regularly, from a wide range of classes over several semesters.

Informal Feedback. In addition to soliciting formal feedback for summative purposes, faculty are encouraged to solicit frequent informal feedback on their teaching for formative purposes—that is, for the sole purpose of improving teaching and learning. This *informal* feedback may take the form of Small Group Instructional Diagnoses (SGIDs), informal surveys, or other classroom assessment techniques and may be used by the individual teacher as he or she sees fit. Unless and until the instructor chooses to offer such data to evaluators, it should not be part of the summative evaluation process. (Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.3, 5e)

Results of the formal (summative) teaching evaluations will become part of the information used in making promotion, tenure, and retention decisions. In the case of reviews, identification of a performance that falls below the minimal acceptable level shall be used as cause for professional development, assistance, career guidance, or remediation of the faculty rather than for applying punitive actions.

For any faculty member undergoing evaluation, the findings of fact, conclusions and decisions subsequent to the evaluation shall be based solely on the evidence received by the Committee. In the event that substantial chronic deficiencies are identified in the performance of a faculty member, the faculty member, in consultation with the chair, shall formulate a development plan which addresses the deficiencies. The plan shall identify problem areas or weaknesses; state goals for addressing weaknesses; describe actions to be taken on the part of the faculty member to achieve goals; identify resources and/or allocations necessary to support the development plan; specify criteria for assessment; specify a timeline for achievements within the plan; describe the process for preparing progress reports, and outline possible courses of action in the event the professional development plan is not successfully completed. The faculty member and chair will annually review progress on the plan and send a progress report to the Dean.

B. Expectations for All Participants in the Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Processes

Confidentiality: The overall evaluation, promotion and tenure processes allow for feedback to faculty candidates at appropriate times and through appropriate academic administrators. All aspects of the evaluation, promotion and tenure processes are otherwise confidential, including deliberations in committees and the specific decisions that are made at each review level, which will be revealed at the appropriate times by the appropriate persons. Members of promotion and tenure committees participate with the understanding that all matters

related to their deliberations remain confidential. In addition, faculty candidates under review are discouraged from approaching committee members at any time concerning the disposition of their review and should understand that inquiries of this type are deemed entirely inappropriate. Confidentiality of the promotion and tenure process is to be respected at all times, not just during that particular year of review.

C. Composition of the Departmental Committee on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

The departmental committee for evaluation, promotion, and tenure must consist of a minimum of three faculty members, and all committee members must hold senior-level rank (i.e., associate professor or professor). In the event that fewer than three senior-level faculty members reside in a department, senior-level non-tenured or tenured faculty members will be recruited from other suitable departments. Outside faculty members must be approved by a majority vote of the departmental faculty.

For those evaluations that involve a tenure recommendation, the departmental committee will include all tenured faculty members in the department, excluding the chair, and must consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members. In the event that fewer than three tenured faculty members reside in a department, tenured faculty members will be recruited from other suitable departments. Outside faculty members must be approved by a majority vote of the departmental faculty.

In addition to departmental faculty members, departments may also choose to include outside faculty members in their evaluation committees, but such additional members must be at the level of associate professor or professor and approved by a majority vote of the departmental faculty members.

For faculty seeking promotion, the deadlines will be communicated annually to faculty. (See Appendix XII)

D. Expectations for the Use and Disposition of Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure Documents:

The Office of Education and Faculty Affairs is the office of record for the faculty member's personnel file, which includes the evaluation files. A copy of the evaluation files should be retained by the Department as well. A faculty member's evaluation files may be utilized only by the procedures and personnel identified in Section II-3, 3.2, IV, A-D of the Faculty Handbook. Specifically, the Academic Personnel Action Files may be utilized by the following personnel under these conditions:

- A. The individual may review his/her own file at any time that the custodian is available to withdraw it from the file. The review must be by appointment with and in the presence of the custodian, and file returned to the custodian upon its completion.
- B. The dean and/or the department chairperson may review an individual file, but again it must be done in the vicinity of the repository.
- C. Provision shall be made in colleges/departments for the utilization of the Academic Personnel Action Files in the University-wide review procedures for academic personnel decisions.

D. In all cases, the person or persons requesting an individual file to be utilized for whatever purpose shall sign the Control Card for that file, both when receiving it from and returning it to the custodian, noting the date/time of each. The Control Card will be maintained in the file repository at all times (excluding when it is being signed).

All reviews of faculty are confidential personnel matters. Neither issues arising nor contents of the evaluation file relating to a faculty review are to be discussed or disseminated outside of meetings of the departmental or School CPT. When a review has a specific outcome (e.g., a decision to promote and/or tenure), the outcome is communicated to the Department by the Department Chair at the appropriate time.

VI. DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS

Areas of Evaluation

Faculty will be evaluated in the areas of scholarly and creative activity, teaching, and professional and community service. The contribution of individual faculty members to each area will be mutually agreed upon by the departmental chair and individual faculty member, as well as based upon the needs of the department and the background, abilities and interests of the faculty member. Contributions within each area will be reflected in the percentage of effort form submitted annually. Evaluation criteria shall relate to a faculty members' duties and goals and be appropriately weighted in accordance with the terms of the faculty member's contract. (SBHE Policy 605.1, 6; Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1, 8.1.1, 6)

A. Standards and Criteria

Departmental standards will include the following elements for evaluating faculty:

- A clear statement informing individual faculty members as to the method by which they will be evaluated. This would include the process, criteria and minimum expectations for evaluation, promotion and for tenure. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 6; SBHE Policy 605.1, 6)
- *A statement about the use, confidentiality, and disposition of the evaluation documents, including provisions for their review and use by the Dean and CPT in deliberations on such matters as promotion, retention, tenure and due process.* Information may be found at: Faculty Handbook II-3.
- The procedures whereby a faculty member may, in writing, withdraw a consideration of a promotion at any level of review. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, A, 2).
- The procedure for informing individual faculty members about the results of evaluations, and the procedure for the faculty member's response, in the form of a written statement, to material in his or her file. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 1).
- A provision for the evaluation of scholarly teaching: the faculty member being evaluated is expected to provide evidence of effective teaching in the form of at least three sources of data, one of which must be students. (Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.3, 1).
- The timetable for evaluations, see Appendix XII. (Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.1; I-8, 8.1.1, 6.; SBHE 605.1.6)

Departmental Responsibilities

“Procedures and guidelines for the evaluation of tenured and non-tenured faculty are established to provide the means whereby the performance of individual faculty members and their contributions to the University community may be equitably assessed and documented. The uniqueness of individual faculty members, and the departments of which they are a part, has been acknowledged in the development of these guidelines and procedures; and because of that uniqueness, the main responsibility for implementation of evaluation procedures has been placed in the departments” (Faculty Handbook I-4.4.2).

Each department shall establish guidelines with criteria for the documentation and demonstrated faculty accomplishments in scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and professional and community service. The criteria shall differentiate ‘good,’ ‘high,’ and ‘outstanding’ performances at each rank. Each department shall establish minimal expectations of performance for promotion, and also for faculty members at rank, i.e. those faculty members already tenured or special appointment faculty not seeking promotion. Each department will have established expectations for accomplishments in scholarly and/or creative activity, in teaching, and in service. Examples of conditions whereby the faculty member would NOT meet expectations should also be clearly articulated.

In the event that substantial chronic deficiencies are identified in the performance of a faculty member, the faculty member and departmental chair shall formulate a professional development plan. The faculty member and departmental chair will annually review progress on the plan and send a progress report to the Dean.

The professional development plan shall identify problem areas or weaknesses, state goals for addressing weaknesses, describe actions to be taken on the part of the faculty member to achieve goals, identify resources and/or allocations necessary to support the development plan, specify criteria for assessment, specify a timeline for implementation (a maximum of 3 years), describe the process for preparing progress reports, and outline possible courses of action in the event the professional development plan is not successfully implemented and demonstrating progress.

SCHEDULE AND PROCESSES FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY:

Probationary, Special Appointment (Non-Tenured), and Tenured Faculty. Research Faculty, Teaching Faculty, and Clinical Faculty

B. Schedule

As per SBHE Policy, “all benefitted university system employees shall have an annual written and verbal performance development review...” (SBHE Policy 604.3) This annual evaluation is typically accomplished by the departmental chair. Additional evaluations are conducted by departmental and School Committees on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure. The schedule of reviews by various parties is provided in Tables I – IV.

“When a faculty member begins a tenure eligible appointment midyear, he/she is normally considered for tenure with the group who started at the beginning of that appointment year.” (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, D) ***“For persons hired at mid-year, the half year of service shall count as a full year toward promotion.”*** (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, A, 2). Within the School, for an individual hired at a date *other than July 1 or January 1*, an individual's time in rank will be calculated from the July 1st nearest his or her official start date.

The fiscal calendar, July 1 through June 30 will be used to organize and quantify content and support documents included in a faculty member's dossier.

Final reviews by the chairperson and departmental evaluation committee will be kept in the faculty member's departmental file. Final reviews by the School CPT (which will include the chairperson and departmental CPT evaluations) will be kept in the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs.

i. Probationary Faculty (Table I)

Evaluation of probationary appointees shall be conducted early the second semester of their first year, and toward the end of their third semester so that there will be a reasonable basis for decisions to reappoint in accordance with the schedule in the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure; Academic Appointments.

Evaluation of probationary appointees shall also be conducted during the Spring semester of their third and fourth years and during the Fall semester of their fifth and sixth years. See Table I.

Table I: Evaluation Schedule for Probationary (tenure-track) Faculty

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Chair	Dept. CPT	School CPT	Dossier Content for School CPT <u>Checklist for Probational Faculty</u>
1		X	X	X		
2		X	X	X		
3		X	X	X	X	Complete CV Chair & Dept. CPT Letters, Years 1-3 Content/Support Documents from Years 1-3
4		X	X	X		
5	X		X	X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT Letters, Years 1-5 Dossier Content/Support Documents, Years 1-5
6	X		X	X	X	Complete CV Chair & Dept. CPT Letters, Years 1-6 Content/Support Documents, Years 1-6

A tenure-eligible Assistant Professor ordinarily must put forth an application for promotion to Associate Professor and the award of tenure in his or her sixth year. If the Assistant Professor does not achieve promotion to Associate Professor, then the President will recommend that his or her tenure application also be denied. (Faculty Handbook Section I-8, 8.2, P).

Special Consideration:

Early tenure (after four or five years) will be recommended only in exceptional cases. The probationary period of six years of continuous academic service to the institution may be shortened under those unusual circumstances when the faculty member's qualifications support a grant of early tenure in less time than the ordinary probationary period. In these cases, the faculty member bears the burden of demonstrating that his or her achievements unequivocally meet the stated criteria for tenure as established the University. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3, b). The evaluation for the award of early tenure shall proceed in accordance with the procedures used for ordinary tenure reviews. (Faculty Handbook Section I-8, 8.2, E).

A faculty member may be considered for early tenure only once. If a faculty member does not receive a favorable evaluation for the award of early tenure, his or her established probationary period will continue, at the end of which their ordinarily scheduled evaluation for tenure will occur. (Faculty Handbook Section I-8, 8.2, E).

Evaluations of all faculty occur annually; for probationary contracts, evaluations during years one, two and four are for departmental use only. To ensure completion of the evaluations, a memo signed by the chair of the department and the faculty member indicating the evaluation date and a brief summary of the conclusions shall be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. No action by the School CPT is necessary for these evaluations. Evaluations of faculty on probationary contracts during years three, five and six shall be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs for review by the School CPT.

The final evaluation of faculty on probationary contracts shall be completed by the departments and submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs by November 15th of their fifth and sixth year.

ii. Special Appointment Faculty: Scientist Scholar, Educator Scholar, or Clinician Scholar (Table II)

Evaluations of all faculty occur annually. For special appointment contracts, evaluations are for departmental use only until the faculty member requests promotion or until the sixth year of appointment. In either situation, the evaluation will be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs for review by the School CPT. Thereafter the evaluation shall be conducted every three years, as is the case for tenured faculty; these evaluations are for departmental use only. To ensure completion of the evaluations, a memo signed by the chair of the department and the faculty member indicating the evaluation date and a brief summary of the conclusions shall be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. No action by the School CPT is necessary for these evaluations. If a department requests that a faculty member be promoted, the School CPT will evaluate the dossier and make a recommendation. *The faculty member considering promotion should have his or her dossier reviewed by the Departmental and School Committees on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure at least one year prior to requesting the promotion.* For instructors this will ordinarily occur in their fourth year in a rank. For Assistant Professors and Associate Professors this will ordinarily occur in their sixth year in rank.

Evaluations may be conducted at other times, if circumstances require it, as determined and requested by the individual faculty member, the department chair or the Dean.

Table II: Academic Faculty Evaluation Schedule: for Scientist Scholars, Educator Scholars, or Clinician Scholars on Special Appointments

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Chair	Dept. CPT	School CPT	Dossier Content for School CPT Checklist for Probational Faculty
1 - 5		X	X	X		
6		X	X	X	X	Complete CV. Dossier Content (Letters and Content/Support Documents) focused on all years since
9, 12, 15, 18, ...		X	X	X	every 6 years	Complete CV. Dossier Content (Letters and Content/Support Documents) focused on the past 6 years.*
One year prior to a request for promotion				X	X	Complete CV. Dossier Content (Letters and Content/Support Documents) focused on all years since appointment, or if previously promoted, the years since the last
Request for Promotion	X		X	X	X	Complete CV. Dossier Content (Letters and Content/Support Documents) focused on all years since appointment, or if previously promoted, the years since the last promotion.

*If the faculty member has been promoted within the middle of a 6-year cycle, the schedule for review (i.e., every 6 years), is reset to '0' at the year of promotion.

iii. Tenured Faculty (Table III)

The evaluation of tenured faculty shall occur every 3 years by the departmental chair and CPT, and every 6 years by the School CPT. Evaluations conducted every three years are for departmental use. To ensure completion of the evaluations, a memo signed by the departmental chair and the faculty member indicating the evaluation date and a brief summary of conclusions shall be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. Evaluations conducted every 6 years by the School CPT will be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs.

Evaluation by the School CPT will also occur when the faculty member is requesting promotion to Professor. It is recommended that a tenured faculty member that is considering promotion have his or her dossier reviewed by the departmental CPT at least one year prior to requesting the promotion.

Evaluations may be conducted at other times, if circumstances require it, as determined and requested by the individual faculty member, the department chair or the Dean.

Unless the tenured faculty member is requesting promotion, dossiers forwarded to the School CPT should focus on activities of the past 6 years. If a promotion is requested, the dossier should focus on the accomplishments since the last promotion or activities of the last 6 years, whichever is the longer timeframe.

Table III: Evaluation Schedule for Tenured Faculty

Post-Tenure Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Chair	Dept. CPT	School CPT	Dossier Content for School CPT <u>Checklist for Probational Faculty</u>
3, 9, 15...		X	X	X		
6, 12, 18 ...		X	X	X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT letters since last School CPT review (usually the past 6 years). Content/Support documents for all years since last School CPT review.
Promotion	X		X	X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT letters since last promotion. Content/Support documents for all years since last promotion.

iv. Special Appointment Faculty: Research Faculty, Teaching Faculty, Clinical Faculty

The evaluation of Research, Teaching, and Clinical Faculty on Special Appointments shall occur annually until the faculty member is promoted to associate professor or until the sixth year of appointment. Thereafter the evaluation shall be conducted every three years. Evaluations are for departmental use only. To ensure completion of the evaluations, a memo signed by the chair of the department and the faculty member indicating the evaluation date and a brief summary of the conclusions shall be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. Action of the School CPT is only necessary upon request for promotion.

Evaluations by the School CPT will only be conducted upon request for promotion within this title series. *The faculty member considering promotion should have his or her dossier reviewed by the departmental and School Committees on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure at least one year prior to requesting the promotion.* For instructors this will ordinarily occur in their fourth year in a rank. For Assistant Professors and Associate Professors this will ordinarily occur in their sixth year in rank.

Evaluations may be conducted at other times, if circumstances require it, as determined and requested by the individual faculty member, the department chair or the Dean.

Table IVa.: Evaluation Schedule for Research Faculty and Teaching Faculty

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Chair	Dept. CPT	School CPT	Dossier Content for School CPT <u>Checklist for Probational Faculty</u>
1 - 6		X	X	X		
9, 12, 15 ...		X	X	X		
One year prior to a request for promotion				X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT letters since last promotion. Content/Support documents for all years since last promotion.
Request for Promotion	X		X	X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT letters since last promotion. Content/Support documents for all years since last promotion.

Table IVb.: Evaluation Schedule for Clinical Faculty

Year	Fall Semester	Spring Semester	Chair	Dept. CPT	School CPT	Dossier Content for School CPT Checklist for Probational Faculty
1 - 6		X	X	X		
9, 12, 15 ...		X	X	X		
One year prior to a request for promotion				X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT letters since last promotion. Content/Support documents for all years since last promotion.
Request for Promotion	X		X	X	X	Complete CV. Chair & Dept. CPT letters since last promotion. Content/Support documents for all years since last promotion.

*Evaluations will be submitted to School CPT only if requested by the individual faculty member, departmental chair or the Dean.

C. PROCESSES

i. Evaluation Process

At the time of initial appointment, faculty shall be informed by the department chair of the process for evaluation, the criteria, and minimum expectations for promotion and for tenure. Evaluation criteria shall relate to the faculty member's duties and goals and be appropriately weighted in accordance with the terms of the faculty member's contract. Evaluations of all teaching faculty must include significant student input. (Faculty Handbook I-8.1.1.6.; SBHE Policy 605.1.6). Failure to provide these documents to new faculty at the time of initial appointment will jeopardize the faculty member's due process.

Faculty shall be informed promptly in writing and given adequate notice whenever there is a change made in those criteria by the department. Contract provisions shall be reviewed and, when appropriate, objectives may be revised as a part of the faculty member's periodic evaluations. (Section I-8, 8.11, 3, b, ii).

For probationary (pre-tenure) faculty only, if evaluation criteria are changed at any time during the probationary period, a tenure candidate in years 1 - 3 will be evaluated under the new criteria. Probationary faculty in years 4 - 6 may choose to use the Guidelines in effect at the time of their initial appointment or the new criteria.

At the time of the initial appointment, the chair should provide the faculty member with a tenure plan (probationary faculty) or professional development plan (special appointment faculty). The plan should relate to a faculty member's duties and goals and be appropriately weighted in accordance with the terms of the faculty member's contract. (Faculty Handbook I-8.1.1.6).

It shall be the responsibility of the department chair to initiate evaluations at the appropriately scheduled intervals.

Evaluation materials submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs shall include:

- Job description, goals, objectives, and Percentage of Effort forms for each year of employment
- A current curriculum vita
- Documentation of activities in scholarly and/or creative activity, teaching, and professional and community service.
- External letters of evaluation as appropriate
- Summary of findings and recommendations by the departmental evaluating committee
- Summary of findings and recommendations by the departmental chair

See the appropriate checklists (probationary, post-tenure, and special appointment) for examples and to ensure correct documents are submitted.

Once the evaluation process has commenced, materials may not be removed from the dossier. If the faculty member desires to add any item to the dossier (e.g., a recently accepted manuscript or an external letter of support previously requested), the item must be accompanied by a dated letter explaining the reason for the late submission.

Routing for Approval of Evaluation Materials

The department chair, at the request of the faculty member, initiates the evaluation process by submitting the candidate's name and supporting documents to the departmental CPT. The departmental committee will submit its report to the chair. The chair will submit the departmental evaluation, his/her own letter of evaluation, and the dossier to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. The Office of Education and Faculty Affairs will distribute the materials to the School CPT according to the evaluation schedule.

The faculty member being evaluated will be informed in writing of the results of the evaluation by the departmental committee, the departmental chair, the School CPT and the Dean, as appropriate.

The faculty member may respond in the form of a written statement, if desired, to the results of the evaluation, recommendation, or other materials in his or her file. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 1).

Appeal of the Evaluation

All formal appeals of evaluation shall be made in accordance with the same “due process” procedures as provided for in cases of non-renewal of probationary faculty in the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education Regulations on Nonrenewal, Termination or Dismissal of Faculty (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.3; SBHE 605.3).

ii.Promotion Process

Recognition and Recommendation: Promotions are regarded as recognition and reward for academic attainment in three areas: teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity and service, including distinctive contributions to one's discipline, profession and school. It is recognized that special contributions to one particular area of his/her job responsibilities may limit the time and talent commitments that a faculty member might give to other areas. Therefore, it is not necessarily expected that each faculty member should demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in all of the areas. However, it is essential that chairs and faculty members understand that promotion, particularly to the academic ranks of associate professor and professor, will ordinarily occur only if:

1. Outstanding accomplishment is achieved in at least one of the areas
2. At least high accomplishment is achieved in a second area and
3. At least good accomplishment is achieved in the third area.

The relative importance of each area shall be determined by the Department and included in their “Departmental Guidelines” document. Performance expectations generally should match the effort that the faculty member expends in each of the activity areas (as reflected in the faculty member’s Percentage of Effort Form), with the best performance expected in the area where the faculty member devotes the majority of his/her time.

Because departments within the School have diverse missions and responsibilities, recommendations for promotion by the departmental chair, CPT, and the Dean must be consistent with the criteria established by the awarding department. The performance of individual faculty members should be judged in the context of resources and time made available to the faculty member to accomplish the goals as specified in his or her professional development/tenure plan.

Part time faculty may be considered for promotion. The evaluation for promotion should be consistent with the academic track and desired rank. Decisions regarding promotion should be made using the faculty member’s percent of effort distributions and dossier, and consistent with the faculty member’s part-time equivalent hours.

Promotions in rank are initiated by a written recommendation from the department chairs to the dean of their college or school. This recommendation must include a thorough evaluation of the qualifications of the candidate. This evaluation must take into account, and speak with reference to, the professional development/tenure plan or plans under which the candidate has served, specifying the candidate's duties and goals, identified by the candidate's contract(s) as required by SBHE Policy 605.1 Subpart 3.b.

Within the School of Medicine and Health Sciences, promotions in rank for probationary and tenured faculty are initiated by a written recommendation from the department chair to the Dean, who is also the University’s Vice President for Health Affairs. Recommendations from the Vice President for Health Affairs are forwarded to the President. In accordance with State Board Policy 305.1, 4, d, the President will approve or disapprove the recommendation. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.2). Within the School of

Medicine and Health Sciences, a departmental Committee on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure serves as a recommending body to the departmental Chair, and the School Committee on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure serves as a recommending body (advisory) to the Dean.

Promotion of faculty who do not have probationary or tenured appointments requires the adoption and application of appropriate departmental standards for promotion. In the absence of an approved plan for a specific college or school, the process used for evaluation of such promotion applications will be identical to the process for consideration of probationary and tenured faculty, with the exception that the final level of decision-making shall be the Vice President of Health Affairs. (Faculty Handbook I-5.3.)

Clinical Faculty may be under contract, or they may serve the School on a voluntary basis educating students in clinical practice. The *Guidelines* are not applicable to volunteer faculty. Evaluations and promotions of volunteer faculty are within the purview of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Promotion reviews will take place in the Fall semester. When a faculty member is being reviewed for tenure and promotion during the same academic year, recommendations at all levels are to be made simultaneously but on appropriate forms, and care is to be taken that appropriate forms are forwarded to the various advisory bodies. The faculty member being reviewed for promotion and tenure in the same academic year may submit the same supporting materials for both processes (Section I-5, 5.3, B, 3).

Criteria for Promotion

Characteristics of Rank for the [Scientist Scholar](#); [Educator Scholar](#); [Clinician Scholar](#); and [Research](#), [Teaching](#), and [Clinical Faculty](#) are listed earlier in the Guidelines, please click on link to take you there.

[Click to see examples of activities which address criteria for advancement](#)

Click below for tables of expectations/criteria to consider during processes of evaluation, promotion, and the award of tenure.

[Scientist Scholar](#)

[Educator Scholar](#)

[Clinician Scholar](#)

[Research Faculty](#)

[Teaching Faculty](#)

[Clinical Faculty](#)

Procedure for Promotion

Recommendations for promotion are normally initiated within the department either by the faculty member desiring promotion, a department committee, or the department chairperson. Because of the close and frequent professional association between the initiating committee or the department chairperson and the faculty member, appropriate consideration should be given to the chairperson's recommendation at all stages of the reviewing process. If the recommendation is negative, the faculty member must be informed in writing by the department chairperson of the basis for the recommendation. (Faculty Handbook Section I-5, 5.3, A, 1). A faculty member may, in writing, withdraw a consideration of a promotion at any level of review, (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, A, 2), with the exception of year 6 of a probationary contract.

Eligibility for promotion will be reviewed for instructors in their fourth year in rank, assistant professors in their sixth year in rank and associate professors in their seventh year in rank whenever promotion to the next rank has not been recommended earlier. The time periods specified are not intended to indicate normal or usual time spent in a particular rank prior to promotion. Promotion may occur at an earlier time; however, promotion after less than three years in rank will require clearly superior performance in all areas and/or unique circumstances. The criteria for evaluation of promotion should be the same regardless of when such a review occurs. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, A, 2),

For persons hired at midyear (*January 1*), the half year of service shall count as a full year toward promotion. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, A, 2). Within the School, for an individual hired at a date *other than July 1 or January 1*, an individual's time in rank will be calculated from the July 1st nearest his or her official start date. The Fiscal Calendar, July 1 through June 30, will be used to organize and quantify content and support documents included in a faculty member's dossier.

All recommendations from the department chairperson, the dean, and the Vice President for Health Affairs, must be in writing, and each must include a statement supporting the recommendation. Both the recommendation and the statement must be made part of the promotion file. After each recommendation is made, the candidate for promotion must be informed of said recommendation and must be given access to the promotion file in order to review the recommendation and respond, if desired, in the form of a written statement, to any material in his or her promotion file. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 1).

Timeline

All the required documentation should be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs on or before November 15th.

Documentation for Requests for Promotion

When a probationary faculty member is being reviewed for promotion *and* tenure, recommendations at all levels are to be made simultaneously but on appropriate forms, and care is to be taken that appropriate forms are forwarded to the various advisory bodies. The faculty member being reviewed for promotion and tenure may submit the same supporting materials for both processes. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 3).

Documentation of the criteria for promotion shall include the following:

Completed forms: Appendix VIII for promotion and Appendix IX for tenure.

Letters of recommendation: From the department chair and the departmental CPT committee.

From external reviewers*

For promotion to the rank of associate professor and professor at least three outside letters that evaluate the suitability of the proposed promotion and/or awarding of tenure shall be solicited by the department chair from recognized peers outside the University. The candidate may submit a list of names to the department chair, but the department chair may solicit letters from other qualified peers. Previous mentors, co-authors or close collaborators cannot be external reviewers to minimize the appearance of personal bias. When external reviewers are confirmed, the chair should provide the faculty member's curriculum vitae and the departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure for the evaluative process. (In the event that the department does not yet have approved promotion and tenure guidelines, a copy of the School *Guidelines* should be included.) External reviewers are to specifically address their association, if any, with the faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure. External reviewers should receive instructions to evaluate the faculty member's performance based on the criteria stated in the departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure. Moreover, when evaluating faculty performance, external reviewers should utilize the standardized terminology for faculty performance (i.e., outstanding, high, or good). The external evaluation letters must be included in the initial review by the departmental committee and chair.

*External reviewers should be wholly disinterested, i.e., what has traditionally been known as “at arms- length.” The test for being wholly disinterested is that the potential reviewer should not have even the appearance of a vested interest based on his or her own career, nor a personal interest in the career advancement of the faculty member under review. (See Appendix XIII)

The School CPT determines that the documentation meets university, school, and departmental guidelines and that the characteristics necessary for promotion are evident.

Promotion and Tenure Checklist
Promotion Checklist

Routing for Approval

The department chair provides all necessary documentation to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs. After ensuring that the documentation is complete, the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs submits the material to School CPT; School CPT recommends an action to the Dean. For promotions of probationary and tenured faculty, the Dean submits his/her decision to the President. The President approves or disapproves the recommendation for promotion. For faculty members on Special Appointments, the final level of decision-making shall be the Vice President of Health Affairs.




Figure 1. Routing Sequence for Documents Related to Promotion

Recommending Authorities and Advisory Groups

Recommending Authorities: As previously noted, promotions for probationary and tenured faculty are normally made by the President upon recommendation by the department chairperson, the dean of the college or school involved, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (Campus) or the Vice President for Health Affairs (School).

(Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 1 and I-5. Promotion of Special Appointment Faculty). Promotion decisions for School special appointment faculty are complete at the level of the Vice-President for Health Affairs.

All recommendations from the department chairperson, the dean, and the Vice-President must be in writing, and each must include a statement supporting the recommendation. Both the recommendation and the statement must be made part of the promotion file. After each recommendation is made, the candidate for promotion must be informed of said recommendation and must be given access to the promotion file in order to review the recommendation and respond, if desired, in the form of a written statement, to any material in his or her promotion file. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 1). Advisory Groups: The department chairperson must seek the advice of a department committee. The Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean must seek the advice of the School CPT. All advisory groups must record votes for and against promotion, and the record of the votes

must be made a part of the promotion file. All written advice must be part of the promotion file. (Adapted from Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 2).

Appeal of a Decision on Promotion:

Outlined in Faculty Handbook, Section I-5. 5.3, C.

iii. Tenure

"A college or university is a forum for ideas, and it cannot fulfill its purpose of transmitting, evaluating, and extending knowledge if it requires conformity with any orthodoxy of content and method. Academic freedom and tenure are both important in guaranteeing the existence of such a forum. This policy is intended to enable institutions under the authority of the Board to protect academic freedom" (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, a; SBHE: 605.1, 1, a).

"The purpose of tenure is to assure academic freedom. Academic freedom applies to all scholarly pursuits. Freedom in scholarship is fundamental to the advancement of knowledge and for the protection of the rights of the faculty members and students. It carries with it duties and responsibilities correlative with rights. These duties and rights are set forth in SBHE policy 401.1, relating to Academic Freedom, and the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure (Rev. 1990), adopted by the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges. These policies apply to all institution faculty unless otherwise indicated" (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, b; SBHE: 605.1, 1, b).

"Tenure is awarded by the Board upon recommendation of the Chancellor, following review and recommendations made pursuant to the procedures established at an institution and a recommendation by the institution's president to the Chancellor. A favorable recommendation means that the applicant meets all of the prerequisites and criteria and the award of tenure is consistent with the sound fiscal management and academic priorities of the institution and the system of education under the control of the Board. Tenure recommendations submitted to the Board shall include a brief summary of the candidate's qualifications and reasons for the recommendation. Tenure is not an entitlement, and the granting of tenure requires an affirmative act by the Board. Tenure is limited to the academic unit or program area in the institution in which tenure is granted and shall not extend to an administrative or coaching position" (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, c; SBHE: Section 605.1, 1, c).

Criteria for the Award of Tenure

"The criteria for tenure evaluation and continuing evaluation of probationary and tenured faculty shall include scholarship in teaching, contribution to a discipline or profession through research, other scholarly or professional activities, and service to the institution and society. Institutions may adopt additional criteria. The regulations defining these criteria shall be consistent with the nature and mission of the institution." (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3, b; SBHE: Section 605.1, 3, b & c).

Departments shall establish various tenure "plans" appropriate to the diverse missions of individual departments, designed to encourage emphasis on scholarly and/or creative activity, scholarship in teaching, service and other areas of emphasis. Department regulations shall include guidelines for determining weight to be given each of the criteria for tenure evaluation and continuing evaluation. The guidelines shall provide for varying emphases on the enumerated criteria based upon the faculty member's plan, the needs of the (department) and the background, abilities and interests of the faculty member. (adapted, Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3, b, i; SBHE: 605.1, 3, b, i).

Tenured and probationary faculty contracts shall identify the faculty member's tenure plan/professional development plan and describe the faculty member's duties and goals. The contracts shall specify the weight to be given the criteria for evaluating performance. The contract provisions shall be reviewed and, when appropriate, revised as a part of the faculty member's periodic evaluations (adapted, Faculty Handbook I-8 1.1.3, b, ii; SBHE: 605.1, 3, b, ii).

Procedures for Tenure Evaluation

Tenure reviews will take place in the Fall semester. When a faculty member is being reviewed for tenure and promotion during the same academic year, recommendations at all levels are to be made simultaneously but on separate forms, and care is to be taken that appropriate forms are forwarded to the appropriate advisory bodies. The faculty member being reviewed for promotion and tenure in the same academic year may submit the same supporting materials for both processes. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 3).

The departmental process for evaluation of faculty, the criteria and minimum expectations for promotion and for tenure, and provisions concerning required notices, shall be made known to the appointee at the time of appointment. Such provisions are subject to change (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 6. SBHE 605.1.6). Faculty shall be informed in writing

and given adequate notice whenever there is a change made in those criteria and expectations. Contract provisions shall be reviewed and, when appropriate, expectations may be revised as a part of the faculty member's periodic evaluations. (adapted from Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3, b, ii).

Whenever the evaluation is used in deliberations on retention or tenure, *the report of the evaluation must include a written statement evaluating progress toward tenure as unsatisfactory, adequate, or excellent, as measured with reference to the individual's tenure plan(s) in effect during the period of evaluation*, and the statement must be placed in the faculty member's personnel file; if the statement reports unsatisfactory progress, the faculty member shall be provided specific written recommendations for improvement. (Adapted from Faculty Handbook I-5.5.3, B, 1.;and SBHE:605.1.6).

Timeline

Eligibility for tenure requires a probationary period of six years of continuous academic service to the institution, during which the faculty member is evaluated at least annually according to an evaluation process designed to foster continuous improvement. The term may be extended beyond six years or the continuous service requirement may be waived in exceptional circumstances. (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.1.1, 3, c) and SBHE 605.1, 3, c). Additional information on eligibility, exceptional circumstances, and procedures regarding the award of tenure may be found within SBHE policies and the Faculty Handbook.

"A tenure-eligible Assistant Professor ordinarily must put forth an application for both promotion to Associate Professor and tenure in his or her sixth year. If the Assistant Professor does not achieve promotion to Associate Professor, then the President will recommend that his or her tenure application also be denied.

In this case, with the Provost's approval, and consistent with fulfillment of the University's institutional obligations, appropriate rigor of promotion, and tenure standards, and fairness to faculty, the Assistant Professor's Dean may a. Do nothing, in which case the following year will be the Assistant Professor's terminal year; b. Hire the Assistant Professor in a non-tenure-eligible position, such as instructor." (Faculty Handbook I-8.8.2, P;

"An institution may, subject to procedural requirements stated in SBHE Policy 605.1, 3, d and Policy sections 605.2, 605.3, and 605.4, decline to renew the contract of a probationary faculty without cause at any time during the probationary period" (Faculty Handbook I-8.8.1.1.3,d.; SBHE: 605.1.3, d).

Documentation for Tenure Review

Materials to be submitted to the Office of Education and Faculty Affairs relative to a tenure decision must include:

- The documentation requested for promotion decisions (see [promotion and tenure checklist](#))
- All prior evaluations of the faculty conducted by the department
- A completed form that records votes for the components involved in the decision ([Form Appendix IX](#))

Routing for Approval

Requests and recommendations for promotion and tenure of faculty on probationary contracts are forwarded from the Vice President of Health Affairs to the President. In accordance with State Board Policy 305.1, 4, d, the President will approve or disapprove the recommendations (Faculty Handbook I-8.1.1. c.) Requests and recommendations for the award of tenure are forwarded from the President to the Chancellor. Tenure is not an entitlement, and the granting of tenure requires an affirmative act by the State Board of Higher Education, upon recommendation of the Chancellor.




Figure II: Routing Sequence for Documents Related to the Award of Tenure

Recommending Authorities and Advisory Groups

Recommending Authorities. Tenure is granted by the State Board of Higher Education upon recommendation by the President. Recommending authorities to the President are the Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean and the chair of the department in which tenure is to be granted. Because faculty are tenured in the academic unit, and because of the close and frequent professional association between the initiating committee or the chair and the faculty member, consideration should be given to the chair's recommendation at all stages of the review process. (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, A, 1).

All recommendations from the department chair, and the Vice President of Health Affairs and Dean, must be in writing, and each must include a statement supporting his or her recommendation. The statement must speak with reference to and take into account the tenure plan or plans under which the person being considered for tenure has served, as identified in, to, or with that individual's contract(s) as required by Board of Higher Education Policy Manual section 605.1 subpart 3 b (i) and (ii). If the recommendation is negative, the accompanying statement must indicate the basis for the recommendation. Both the recommendation and that statement must be made part of the faculty member's personnel file. After each recommendation is made, the candidate for tenure must be informed of said recommendation and must be given access to the file in order to review the recommendation and respond, if desired, in the form of a written statement, to any material in his or her file. (Adapted, Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 1).

Advisory Groups. The department chair must seek the advice of a department committee. The dean of the college or school involved must seek the advice of a college or school advisory committee. These advisory groups shall be formed according to department or college procedures. The committees must record roll call votes for and against tenure, and these votes must be made a part of the tenure file. Any negative vote must be accompanied by a written statement providing the basis for the vote. The candidate is to be informed of the committee's recommendation and must be given access to the file in order to review the recommendation and respond, if desired, in the form of a written statement. All written advice must be part of the file which is reviewed for tenure (Faculty Handbook I-5, 5.3, B, 2).

Appeal of a Decision on the Award of Tenure

If a decision is made by the President against recommending that tenure be granted, and if the faculty member alleges that the reasons for the decision were inadequate, the faculty member may appeal by following the procedures outlined in the Board of Higher Education Policies on Hearings and Appeals (SBHE 605.4).

Appointments with Tenure

In an exceptional case, the School may make an initial appointment with tenure, with the approval of the departmental chair, CPT, the Dean, the President, and the State Board of Higher Education.

Documentation submitted to CPT for tenured appointment shall include a curriculum vita, a letter of support from the departmental chair, a letter of support from the Associate Dean of either Medicine or Health Sciences (in the case of hiring a departmental chair), and the job description. In addition, criteria for appointment should consider the proposed title and rank of the faculty member; departmental criteria for rank and title; proposed percent of effort distributions; and the accomplishments of the individual that are consistent with the rank and evidenced within the curriculum vitae.

Promotions for tenured faculty follow the Guidelines relative to promotion within the faculty title and rank ([see section on faculty rank](#)). Requests and recommendations for promotion of tenured faculty are forwarded from the Vice President of Health Affairs to the President. In accordance with State Board Policy 305.1, 4, d, the President will approve or disapprove the recommendation(s) the request for promotion is complete at the presidential level.

iv. Administrative Appointments

Under normal circumstances, administrative officers initially appointed to the University in nonacademic administrative positions will not be given tenure eligible rank or recommended for tenure as a result of time spent in the administrative positions (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, F).

If a probationary faculty member at UND moves into a full-time nonacademic administrative position, he/she will not continue to accrue credit toward tenure while in that administrative position. A faculty member already tenured will retain tenure (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, F).

Any recommendation regarding academic rank for a non-academic administrator will be made by the dean, only upon recommendation of the faculty of the department (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, F).

If a probationary or tenured faculty member already employed at the University is appointed to an academic administrative position, rank or tenure status will not be affected by the appointment. Accrual of additional tenure credit during subsequent administrative service may be granted only when there is regular, formal involvement in the program and the discipline of the department, and the concurrence of the department/college concerned (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, H).

Administrators do not accrue credit toward tenure during the time they serve as administrators (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, I).

If any individual is appointed to an academic administrative position from outside the University, academic rank and/or tenure offered concurrently with or subsequent to such appointment will be determined only after recommendation of the department/college in which the rank is to be given. The criteria for rank and/or tenure for such individuals, especially those relating to scholarly activity and service to students, will be similar to those regularly used in the department/college (Faculty Handbook I-8, 8.2, J).

APPENDICES

EXPECTATIONS of the Faculty Member and the Department Relative to Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure Processes

Role of the Faculty Member

It is the role of the faculty member, in collaboration with the department chair, to **take an active part in his or her evaluation** by providing materials that give a complete picture of his/her performances by organizing those materials in an accessible manner, and by making herself/himself available for discussion of those materials with peers and administrators. In addition to materials required by the department, college, and university, the individual faculty member may submit any additional materials deemed appropriate to the evaluation process (Faculty Handbook I-4, 4.3.3).

Self-Evaluations, which are required:

The self-evaluations in scholarly and/or creative activity, in teaching, and in service should communicate (a) that the faculty member takes a deliberate, effective and scholarly approach to his or her work; (b) how the individual's achievements support the mission of his or her academic unit; and (c) evidence that his or her work has substantial impact. Composing a reflective self-evaluation leads the faculty member to assess his or her accomplishments relative to long-term goals and plot his or her course for ongoing professional development. It puts the individual's work in context for the evaluators – including those outside of the discipline. ([Adapted from: Hugo Schwyzer, The Joys of Faculty Self-Evaluations, Nov 2005](#)).

Examples of Activities Which Address Criteria for Advancement

A. Academic Title Series

In assessing the accomplishments of the radiology faculty members in the areas of research/scholarly activity, teaching, and service, the Department of Radiology CPT will assign rank scores of "Good", "High", or "Outstanding" to these areas based upon the preponderance of evidence supplied in the candidate's dossier that addresses the evaluation benchmarks used to assess promotion and tenure as outlined in Tables 1.1-3.2. It is possible to receive an evaluation of "Good", "High", or "Outstanding" in an area without achieving all goals in the guidelines. In the end, a preponderance of evidence must be provided by the faculty being evaluated to support a given evaluation.

Promotion to associate professor and awarding of tenure will occur only if the candidate has demonstrated, in their major area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity or Teaching), accomplishment that must be "Outstanding". In their second most area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "High". In their third area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "Good".

Promotion to Professor will occur only if the candidate has demonstrated, in their major area of effort (Research and Scholarly Activity or Teaching), accomplishment that is "Outstanding". In their second most area of effort (Research/Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "High" and in their third area of effort (Research and Scholarly Activity, Teaching or Service), the candidate's accomplishment must be at least "Good" in the rank being sought.

The benchmarks listed in Tables 1.1-3.2 are applicable to evaluations of faculty members at any rank in the Academic Title Series. Tenured faculty will be expected to meet the minimal expectations of their rank to remain in good standing within the department. Professional development plans will be instituted by the Department Chair when faculty members do not meet the minimum expectations within these areas. Recognizable performance may be achieved by other means, but these must be discussed in advance with the Department Chair to determine their potential impact on evaluation decisions.

Scientist, Educator, and Clinician Scholar

The characteristics for rank are listed in this document for the Scientist, Educator, Clinician Scholar series.

Examples of activities which address the criteria for promotion and for tenure are listed below. Suggestions for documentation of these achievements are also provided.

i. Scientist Scholar

Evidence of collaborative and inter-disciplinary teaching and research is encouraged as appropriate within the job description, contract, and faculty and departmental goals and objectives.

Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

Documentation of scholarly activity in the form of research and creative work is essential for promotion to the higher academic ranks of associate and full professor. These accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. The discipline of the candidate should be taken into account in assessing productivity since the number of publications and journals are discipline specific; variability is present in journal impact factors; and the size of the reading audience varies. There should be evidence that the candidate is continuously and effectively engaged in peer reviewed and accepted scholarly and/or creative activity of high quality and significance.

Following are examples of scholarly and creative activity:

- Laboratory research and publication
- Field research and publication
- Educational research and publication
- Clinical research and publication
- Invited or peer reviewed presentations at local, regional, national and international conferences
- Textbook writing and publication
- Reports (the Scholarships of Application or Integration)
- Grant writing and approval
- Intellectual Property: Development, Applications, and Assignments - (e.g., Patents, Trademarks, Copyrights, and/or other similar protections)
- Development of computer software/models
- Entrepreneurship benefitting the School

Effective and/or creative activity in this area should be documented. The impact of the activity should be described and explained; do not simply list the activity. It is the responsibility of each department to identify how accomplishment in this area is to be measured.

Teaching

Evidence for effective and/or creative teaching must be well documented and must be included in evaluations for promotion and tenure.

Evidence of effective and/or creative teaching must include student evaluations. Student evaluations should include all submissions from each cohort providing an evaluation. Evaluations from courses using differing teaching methodologies, differing audiences, and differing level (undergraduate, graduate, medical) are helpful in demonstrating strengths of the faculty member.

Evidence must also include written statements or evaluations by the immediate supervisor (the administrative evaluation) and colleagues (peer evaluations), and, as available, an indication that teaching contributions have been effective and incorporated into the curriculum or design of the curriculum.

The following are examples of a commitment to scholarly teaching:

- Curriculum development, delivery, assessment, and revisions
- Course development, delivery, assessment, and revisions

Teaching Roles/Activities to be considered for inclusion:

Providing:

- Lectures
- Laboratory Experiences
- Seminars
- Group Facilitations
- Demonstration(s) of skills, techniques, etc.
- Tutorials
- Discussion courses/experiences
- Mentorship of other faculty
- Development of Simulation Center Modules
- Instruction using online/electronic formats
- Directing or Teaching Clinical, Fieldwork, or Internship

Experiences Audiences

- Undergraduate, Graduate, Professional, Postdoctoral
- Lay Public
- Interdisciplinary

Service

Professional and community service and contributions to society must be in the area of one's professional discipline but not necessarily confined to University related activities.

Following are examples of activities considered under this category:

- Professional Services
- Membership in professional societies or organizations
- Membership on committees and/or task forces in professional societies or organizations
- Service as an officer in professional organizations, societies, or boards
- Memberships in study sections or ad hoc grant reviews
- Membership on editorial boards
- Service as a reviewer of professional journal manuscripts or book chapters
- Service on accreditation committees
- Service as a consultant to industry, education, or government

Student Services

- Advisor as to academic courses or career development
- Advisor or Membership Responsibilities on Graduate Committees
- Advisor to student organizations
- Screening of applicants

Faculty Service

- Advising and mentoring of faculty
- Leadership in faculty development activities

Administrative Service

- Departmental committees
- School committees
- Campus-wide or university-wide committees
- State, national, and international committees
- Administrative offices
- Hospital committees

Community Service

- Speaking to lay groups from the perspective of professional area of expertise
- Giving professional assistance to committees, agencies or institutions

Table 1.1. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Scientist Scholars** for promotion from **Assistant Professor** to **Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to establish active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging <0.5 per year • Presenting at local/regional meetings • Actively applying for intramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication rates in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscript per year • Presenting at national meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students • Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field • Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program • Active seeking of extramural funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication rates, in general averaging over 1 manuscript per year • Patent(s) submission • Significant extramural funding (e.g.; >= \$50 K direct cost) • Presentation at international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post- doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field

Teaching	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to Department's teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluation ratings and student performance on examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High contributions to the Department's teaching mission (participation as a mentor in training programs, CME learners) • Evidence of effective student performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through student evaluations as well as other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's teaching mission (development of teaching materials, syllabi, media) • Leadership in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Excellent student evaluation ratings and/or teaching awards • Involvement in curriculum development/implementation and design of program assessment • Effective teaching of undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers through evaluation ratings and performance on examinations • Demonstrated success in the placement of students into career paths related to the profession • Evidence of scholarship of teaching including publication of case studies and other teaching materials
-----------------	--	---	---	---

Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others
----------------	--	---	--	--

Table 1.2. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Scientist Scholars** for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscripts per year • Presenting at regional/national meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students • Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field • Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program • Active seeking of extramural funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 1 or more manuscript per year • Pending regular patent application(s) • Significant extramural funding • Presenting at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vigorous, productive, research/scholarly activity program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 2 or more manuscripts per year • Regular patent(s) granted • Sustained, significant extramural funding • Speaker at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post- doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • Invited reviews/book chapters • International recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field

Teaching	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through student evaluations and student performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through student evaluations as well as other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Excellent student evaluations • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Effective teaching of undergraduate students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • regularly Counsel students into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Outstanding student evaluations • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Success in obtaining extramural training grants • Leadership in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Demonstrated skill in course administration • Formal recognition of teaching excellence through local/national awards and student performance on examinations • Successful placement of students into career paths related to the profession
-----------------	--	---	--	---

Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels • Regular reviewing of grants for funding organizations and manuscripts for publication • Leadership in professional organizations • Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring
----------------	--	--	--	---

ii. Educator Scholar:

Evidence of collaborative and inter-disciplinary teaching and research is encouraged as appropriate within the job description, contract, and faculty and departmental goals and objectives.

Scholarly Activity

While not all educator scholars are engaged in pedagogical or other types of educational research, all are expected to demonstrate evidence of scholarship. Scholarship may be focused within the discipline of the Educator Scholar. Scholarship may take various forms, including the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of application or engagement, or the scholarship of integration.

Regardless of how scholarship is demonstrated, it is essential that there is evidence the scholarly works are thoughtful, analytical, publicly available, peer-reviewed, and potentially applicable elsewhere. The work should provide a foundation for future works.

Following are examples of scholarly and creative activity appropriate for the Educator Scholar:

- Educational innovation and curriculum development

Documentation should provide *evidence of significant improvements* in course, block, clerkship, or program related to the Educational innovations and or curriculum development.

The following are examples of some of the acceptable forms of scholarly activity in educational innovation and curriculum development:

- Leadership in program design and development
- Leadership in curriculum design and development
- Leadership in course, block, or clerkship design and development
- Case authorship - Authorship or major contribution to development of case(s) in a course, clerkship, or residency, e.g., PCL case author or substantial contribution to PCL case(s), Computer case(s), and/or Clinical exercises
- Authorship of computer-assisted instructional programs
- Authorship of freestanding audiovisual materials for instruction

Educational evaluation and research

Documentation should provide evidence of substantial contributions in educational research or educational evaluation. A variety of different activities must be documented in order to establish sufficient breadth and depth of contributions in this area.

The following are examples of some of the acceptable forms of scholarly activities in educational evaluation and research:

- Peer-reviewed poster or oral presentations at national or international levels
- Publication of manuscripts in educational research and evaluation
- Publication of books or book chapters
- Substantial contributions to education research and evaluation through grant and/or contract activity

- Course, block, or /clerkship assessment activities
- Curriculum Assessment
- Program Assessment

Professional development/faculty advancement in education

Documentation should provide evidence of growth of one's own educational knowledge/skills and a contribution to the educational development of other faculty.

Evidence of significant participation in self-improvement seminars, meetings related to medical and health science education and conducting faculty development workshops on educational topics.

The following are examples of some acceptable forms of scholarly activity in professional development/ faculty advancement in education:

- Participation in education conference sessions (e.g., presentations/attendance at regional, national, or international medical and health science education meetings, as appropriate for the discipline.
- Participation in education workshops (e.g., presentations/attendance at a PCL facilitation workshop, attendance at a test item writing workshop).
- Participation in education grand rounds (e.g., presentations/attendance at grand rounds specifically devoted to the enhancement of teaching, educational evaluation, educational research, et cetera.).

Creative and/or Scholarly Activity within the discipline

Documentation should provide evidence of substantial contributions to discipline. A variety of different activities may be documented in order to establish sufficient breadth and depth of contributions in this area.

The following are examples of some of the acceptable forms of scholarly activities **within the discipline**:

- Peer-reviewed poster or oral presentations at national or international levels
- Publication of manuscripts in research/scholarly activity of the discipline (e.g., clinical research)
- Publications relative to policy and/or legislation
- Publication of books or book chapters
- Substantial contributions to specific needs within the discipline through grant and/or contract activity

Scholarly Teaching

High to outstanding teaching is an essential criterion for promotion and must be well documented.

Documentation should provide evidence of sustained quality, quantity, creativity and diversity of direct instruction and/or mentoring throughout the educational program. Teaching need not be restricted to formal classroom activity but should indicate that the teaching effort produced a definite or desired result. Such evidence may include student evaluations, written statements by immediate supervisor or colleagues or some indication that teaching contributions have been incorporated into the curriculum or design of the curriculum.

The following are examples of acceptable forms of a commitment to teaching:

- Teaching by multiple methods (lecture, seminar, facilitation, tutoring, and workshop)
- Teaching in multiple courses/clerkships/programs

- Teaching at multiple levels (undergraduate, graduate, medical, resident, or peer)
- Mentoring of fellows, graduate students, residents, undergraduate students, advisees, and/or research assistants
- Directing graduate student research and/or scholarly activity through completion of a master's or doctoral degrees
- Conducting faculty development presentations, workshops, or grand rounds regarding education (e.g., conduct workshops for colleagues on patient-centered learning, clinical teaching, test item writing, etc.)

Service

Professional and community service and contributions to society must be in the area of one's professional discipline but not necessarily confined to University related activities.

The following are examples of acceptable forms of service for the Educator Scholar:

- Professional Services
- Membership in professional societies and/or offices held
- Membership in study sections or ad hoc grant reviews
- Membership on editorial boards
- Review of professional journal manuscripts or book chapters
- Service on accreditation committees
- Consultation (industry, education, or government)

Student services

- Academic advising
- Special counseling
- Advising student organizations
- Screening of applicants

Faculty service

- Advising and counseling
- Assisting in career development
- Faculty development

Administrative service

- Departmental committees
- School of Medicine & Health Sciences committees
- Campus-wide or university-wide committees
- State, national, and international committees
- Administrative offices
- Hospital committees
- Course/block/clerkship/residency/graduate program coordinator/director

Community service

- Speaking to lay groups from the perspective of professional area of expertise

- Giving professional assistance to committees, agencies, or institutions

Table 2.1. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Educator Scholars** for promotion from **Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to establish active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging < 0.5 per year • Presenting at local meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication rates in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscript per year • Presenting at regional meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students • Actively applying for intramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication rates, in general averaging over 1 manuscript per year • Successful Intramural grants funding • Presenting at national meetings • Successful mentoring of graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, technicians, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field • Creates new courses/clerkships/programs

<p>Teaching</p>	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through students/residents evaluations and students/residents performance on examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective students/residents performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through students/residents evaluations as well as other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students/residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Leadership in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Excellent students/residents evaluations • Involvement in curriculum development/implementation and design of program assessment • Demonstrated success in the placement of students/residents into career paths related to the profession • Evidence of scholarship of teaching including publication of case studies and other teaching materials
------------------------	--	---	--	--

Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others • Lead professional societies • Leads health related community education committees
----------------	--	---	--	--

Table 2.2. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Educator Scholars** for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscripts per year • Presenting at regional meetings • Mentoring of students/residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 1 or more manuscript per year • Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program • Presentations at national meetings • Successful mentoring of students/residents, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • Local or regional recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vigorous, productive, research/scholarly activity program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 2 or more manuscripts per year • Patent(s) seeking • Actively seeking extramural funding • Invited presentations at national/international meetings • Mentorship of prize winners students/residents, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • Invited reviews/book chapters • National or international recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field

<p>Teaching</p>	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through students/residents evaluations and students/residents performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through students/residents evaluations and other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students/residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Excellent students/residents evaluations • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Effective teaching through CME credits seminars • Regularly Counsel students/residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Success in obtaining training grants • Leadership in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Demonstrated skill in course administration • Formal recognition of teaching excellence through local/national awards and students/residents performance on examinations • Successful placement of students/residents into career paths related to the profession
------------------------	--	---	--	---

Service	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Service on grants and/or program review panels • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Leadership in professional organizations • Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring
----------------	---	--	--	--

iii. Clinician Scholar

Evidence of collaborative and inter-disciplinary teaching and research is encouraged as appropriate within the job description, contract, and faculty and departmental goals and objectives.

The Clinician Scholar track recognizes faculty with an important commitment to active participation in the development, deliverance and oversight of the health sciences curricula, patient care, as well as sharing his or her clinical practice for the purpose of pre- and postdoctoral training. The types of scholarly activity may include clinical research, basic science research, or educational research. The level of scholarly activity expected for faculty in the Clinician Scholar track will be determined according to departmental guidelines.

Teaching

Effective teaching in formal classroom and clinical settings is an essential criterion for promotion. Evidence for effective and/or creative teaching must be well documented. Such evidence must include student or resident evaluations and written statements by immediate supervisors or colleagues.

The following lists some acceptable forms of teaching effectiveness:

- Curriculum development and design
- Course development and design
- Curriculum delivery
- Lectures, Grand Rounds
- Laboratory experiences
- Seminars
- Group Facilitation
- Clinical or Fieldwork experiences
- Demonstration of skills, techniques, etc.
- Tutorials

- Discussion leadership
- Participation in Residency Programs
- Outpatient and/or inpatient bedside teaching

Scholarly and Creative Activity

A measurable level of scholarly activity is expected for promotion for individuals in the Clinician Scholar series. The level and type of scholarly activity expected from faculty will be determined by the department.

Examples of suitable scholarly activity include the following:

- Publication of clinical observations, reviews, and/or case reports in peer reviewed journals
- Publication of clinical and/or basic science research in peer reviewed journals
- Development of teaching materials including curriculum materials, educational programs, textbooks, manuals, computer programs, or audiovisual resources
- Teaching or providing leadership in continuing education
- Submission of grants and receiving funding

Service

It is expected that all faculty members holding rank in the Clinician Scholar series demonstrate service contributions of two types: direct patient care and professional and community service not directly related to the provision of health care.

Effective patient care is essential for promotion in this series. Examples of appropriate evidence are listed below:

- Clinical practice adhering to regional “standard of care”
- Recognition by peers and patients as an outstanding clinician, i.e., regional referrals, patient surveys

The following are examples of professional and community service activities considered under this category:
Professional Services

- Membership in professional societies and/or offices held
- Membership in study sections or ad hoc grant review panels
- Case reviews
- Membership on editorial boards
- Review of professional journal manuscripts or book chapters
- Service on accreditation committees

Student services

- Academic advising
- Special counseling
- Advising student organizations
- Screening of applicants

Faculty service

- Advising and counseling

- Assisting in career development
- Faculty development

Administrative service

- Departmental committees
- School of Medicine & Health Sciences committees
- Campus-wide or university-wide committees
- State, national, and international committees associated with his or her profession
- Administrative offices
- Hospital committees
- Course/block/clerkship/residency/graduate program coordinator/director

Community service

- Speaking to lay groups from the perspective of professional area of expertise
- Giving professional assistance to committees, agencies, or institutions

Table 3.1. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Clinician Scholars** for promotion from **Assistant Professor** to **Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to establish active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging < 0.5 per year • Presenting at local meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication rates in general averaging 0.5-1 manuscript per year • Presenting at regional meetings • Successful mentoring of students/residents • Actively applying for intramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication rates, in general averaging over 1 manuscript per year • Patent(s) submission • Intramural grants funding • Presenting at national meetings • Successful mentoring of students/residents, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field • Creates new courses/clerkships/program

<p>Teaching</p>	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good students/residents evaluations • At least 3 years of teaching experience • At least 100 hours/year of teaching experience • Contributes to Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching students/Residents performance on examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent students/residents evaluations • > 3-6 years of teaching experience • 100-200 hours/year of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective students/ residents performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through students/ residents evaluations and other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students/residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Teaching awards • > 6 years of teaching experience • > 200 hours/year of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Leadership in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum development/implement ation and design of program assessment • Demonstrated success in the placement of students/residents into career paths related to the profession • Evidence of scholarship of teaching including publication of case studies and other teaching materials
------------------------	--	--	---	---

Service	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department • Membership in professional organizations • Good overall evaluation on patient care from administration of health organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership with an active role in professional organizations • High overall evaluation on patient care from administration of health organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Leadership role in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others • Lead professional societies • Leads health related community education committees • High overall evaluation on patient care from administration of health organization
----------------	---	---	--	---

Letter from administration of health organization employer addressing good, high, and outstanding benchmarks.
(See Appendix III)

Table 3.2. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Clinician Scholars** for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working to establish active research/scholarly activity • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging < 0.5 per year • Presentations at regional meetings • Successful mentoring of students/residents • Recognition of research/scholarly activity by leaders in field • Evidence of intramural support for research/scholarly program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active research/scholarly program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 1 or more manuscript per year • Patent application(s) submission • Significant intramural funding • Presentations at national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of students/residents • Citation of publications by others in the field • Regional/National recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vigorous, productive, research/scholarly activity program demonstrating independence or independent contributions to collaborative work • Peer-reviewed publication, in general averaging 2 or more manuscripts per year • Patent(s) granted • Actively seeking extramural funding • Invited as a speaker to national/international meetings • Successful mentoring of students/residents, and/or peers • Citation of publications by others in the field • Invited reviews/book chapters • National/International recognition of the significance of research/scholarly activity by leaders in the field

Teaching	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good students/residents evaluations • At least 6 years of teaching experience • At least 100 hours/year of teaching experience • Evidence of contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through students/residents evaluations and students/residents performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through student evaluations and other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students /residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent students/residents evaluations • 6-9 years of teaching experience • 100-200 hours/year of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Regularly Counsel students/Residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Teaching awards • > 9 years of teaching experience • > 200 hours/year of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Leadership in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Demonstrated skill in course administration • Formal recognition of teaching excellence through local/national awards and students/residents performance on examinations • Successful placement of students/residents into career paths related to the profession
-----------------	--	---	--	---

Service	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations • Good overall evaluation on patient care from administration of health organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others • High overall evaluation on patient care from administration of health organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Leadership in professional organizations • Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring • Outstanding overall evaluation on patient care from administration of health organization
----------------	---	--	--	---

Letter from administration of health organization employer addressing good, high, and outstanding benchmarks.
(See Appendix III)

B. Non-Academic Title Series

i. Research Faculty

The major criterion for promotion of Research Scientist faculty is demonstrated research productivity and excellence in professional service. Teaching, if negotiated between the faculty member, Department Chair, and Principle Research advisor when applicable, will be considered towards promotion but is not required. If the faculty member is involved in the Departmental teaching mission then the criteria outlined for promotion in the Scientist Scholar track will be applied.

Faculty with Research appointments will be evaluated in a manner that is consistent with their faculty title and reflective of their percent of effort in the areas of Research & Scholarly Activity and Service. The Internal Medicine CPT will assign rank scores of "Good", "High", and "Outstanding" to these areas based upon the preponderance of evidence supplied by the candidate in their evaluation dossier that addresses those promotion criteria outlined in Table VI of this document.

Table 4.1. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Research Faculty** for promotion from **Assistant Professor** to **Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Scholarly & Creative Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research resulting in an average of 1 paper submitted for publication per year • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative research • Demonstrated potential to establish collaborative intramural funding • Demonstrated ability to mentor students/residents • Contributes to research mission of the department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research resulting in an average of 1 publication per year in peer-reviewed journal • Patent application(s) submission • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative multi-disciplinary research • Demonstrated ability to establish independent intramural funding and potential for extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor students/residents • Demonstrated national research reputation • Contributes significantly to research mission of the department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research resulting in an average of 2 or more publications per year • A patent granted • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent and sustainable research • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative and sustainable multi-disciplinary research • Demonstrated ability to secure extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor students/residents • Demonstrated international research reputation • Contributes extensively to research mission of the department

Professional Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in professional societies • Demonstrated participation in publication review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in professional societies • Demonstrated participation in publication review • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant review process • Invited to give national seminars on research expertise • Chair research symposium at national meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in professional societies • Demonstrated participation in publication review • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant reviews • Invited to give national and international seminars on research expertise • Chair research symposium at national and international meetings
-----------------------------	--	--	---	--

Table 4.2. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Research Faculty** for promotion from **Associate Professor** to **Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Scholarly & Creative Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research resulting in an average of 1 publication per year • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent research • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative multi-disciplinary research • Demonstrated ability to establish independent extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor students/residents • Demonstrated regional research reputation • Contributes significantly to research mission of the department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research resulting in an average of 2 or more publications per year • Pending regular patent application(s) • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent and sustainable research • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative and sustainable multi-disciplinary research • Demonstrated ability to establish independent and sustainable extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor students/residents • Demonstrated national research reputation • Contributes extensively to research mission of the department 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research resulting in an average of 3 or more publications per year • Invited reviews/book chapters • Patents granted • Demonstrated ability to conduct independent and sustainable research • Demonstrated ability to conduct collaborative and sustainable multi-disciplinary research • Sustained, significant extramural funding • Demonstrated ability to independently mentor students/residents • Demonstrated international research reputation • Leadership in the research mission of the department

Professional Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in professional societies • Demonstrated participation in publication review • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant review process • Invited to give national seminars on research expertise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively engaged in professional societies • Demonstrated participation in publication review • Demonstrated participation in local and national grant reviews • Invited to give national and international seminars on research expertise • Chair research symposium at national meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership roles in professional societies • Membership on editorial or review board for journals in area of research expertise • Chair of local and national grant review panels • Invited to give national and international seminars on research expertise • Chair research symposium at national and international meetings
-----------------------------	--	--	--	---

ii. Teaching Faculty

The major criterion for promotion of Teaching Faculty is teaching excellence and teaching productivity. Service activities, which are to be negotiated between the faculty member and department chair, will be considered towards promotion but are not required.

Productive teaching, as demonstrated by high quality and scholarly teaching and its significance to the department or program, is essential for promotion to associate and full professor. These accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. The discipline of the candidate should be taken into account in assessing productivity since course requirements, teaching methodologies, class sizes, course level (undergraduate, graduate, or postdoctoral), and discipline specific requirements (accreditation) may vary amongst disciplines.

Following are examples of the acceptable teaching activity:

- Teaching by multiple methods (lecture, seminar, facilitation, tutoring, and workshop).
- Teaching in multiple courses/clerkships/programs.
- Teaching at multiple levels (undergraduate, graduate, medical, resident, or peer).
- Mentoring of fellows, graduate students, residents, undergraduate students, advisees, and/or research assistants.
- Conducting faculty development presentations, workshops, or grand rounds regarding education (e.g., conduct workshops for colleagues on patient-centered learning, clinical teaching, test item writing, etc.)

Table 5.1 Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Teaching Faculty** for promotion from **Teaching Assistant Professor** to **Teaching Associate Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Teaching	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good students/residents evaluations • At least 3 years of teaching experience • Contributes to Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching students/Residents performance on examinations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent students/residents evaluations • > 3-6 years of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective students/ residents performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through students/residents evaluations and other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students/ residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Teaching awards • > 6 years of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Leadership in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than student evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum development/implementation and design of program assessment • Demonstrated success in the placement of students into career paths related to the profession • Evidence of scholarship of teaching including publication of case studies and other teaching materials

Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership with an active role in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • Ad hoc reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Leadership role in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others • Lead professional societies • Leads health related community educations committees
----------------	--	---	--	---

Table 5.2 Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of **Teaching Faculty** for promotion from **Teaching Associate Professor** to **Teaching Professor**. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Teaching	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good students/residents evaluations • At least 6 years of teaching experience • Evidence of contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of effective teaching through students/residents evaluations and students/residents performance on examinations • Involvement in course design, development, and implementation • Evidence of improvement in teaching effectiveness through student evaluations as well as other mechanisms including well defined direct assessment procedures • Counseling of students /residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent students/residents evaluations • > 6-9 years of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Involvement in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Regularly Counsel students/Residents into career paths related to the profession 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Teaching awards • > 9 years of teaching experience • Significant contributions to the Department's formal teaching mission • Evidence of excellent quality of teaching through various mechanisms other than students/residents evaluations, including well defined direct assessment procedures • Leadership in curriculum design, development, implementation, and program assessment • Demonstrated skill in course administration • Formal recognition of teaching excellence through local/national awards and students/residents performance on examinations • Successful placement of students/residents into career paths related to the profession

Service	<p>The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Membership in professional organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active participation in the service missions of the Department, School, and University • <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewing of submitted grants • Reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Active involvement in professional organizations • Contributions to the professional development of others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in the service missions of the Department, School and University • Service on extramural grant and/or program review panels • Regular reviewing of manuscripts for publication • Leadership in professional organizations • Significant advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring
----------------	--	--	--	--

iii. Clinical Faculty

It is recognized that Clinical Faculty may be under contract, or they may serve the School on a voluntary basis educating students in clinical practice. Evaluations and promotions of volunteer faculty are within the purview of the School of Medicine and Health Sciences.

Patient Care

Effective patient care is essential for promotion in this series. Examples of appropriate evidence are listed below:

- Evidence of a high level of clinical competence of regional referral
- Board eligibility or certification or equivalent
- Clinical practice adhering to regional “standard of care”
- Recognition or potential for recognition by peers and patients as an outstanding clinician

Teaching

Effective teaching in formal classroom and clinical settings is an essential criterion for promotion. Evidence for effective and/or creative teaching must be well documented. Such evidence must include student or resident evaluations and written statements by immediate supervisors or colleagues.

The following lists examples of teaching activities. Evidence of effectiveness must be provided in the dossier.

- Curriculum development and/or course design
- Curriculum delivery
- Lectures, Grand Rounds
- Laboratory experiences
- Seminars
- Group Facilitating
- Clinical or Fieldwork experiences
- Demonstration of skills, techniques, etc.
- Tutorials
- Discussion leadership
- Participation in Residency Programs
- Outpatient and/or inpatient bedside teaching

Service

Professional and community service and contributions to society must be in the area of one’s professional discipline but not necessarily confined to University related activities.

The following are examples of activities under this category:

Professional Services

- Membership in professional societies and/or offices held
- Membership in study sections or ad hoc grant reviews
- Case reviews
- Membership on editorial boards
- Review of professional journal manuscripts or book chapters

- Service on accreditation committees

Student services

- Academic advising
- Special counseling
- Advising student organizations
- Screening of applicants

Faculty service

- Advising and counseling
- Assisting in career development
- Faculty development

Administrative service

- Departmental committees
- School of Medicine & Health Sciences committees
- Campus-wide or university-wide committees
- State, national, and international committees
- Administrative offices
- Hospital committees
- Course/block/clerkship/residency/graduate program coordinator/director

Community service

- Speaking to lay groups from the perspective of professional area of expertise
- Giving professional assistance to committees, agencies, or institutions

Scholarly and Creative Activity

A measurable level of scholarly activity is expected for promotion for individuals in the Clinical Faculty series. The level and type of scholarly activity expected from faculty will be determined by the department.

Examples of suitable scholarly activity include the following:

- Publication of clinical observations, reviews, case reports in peer reviewed journals
- Development of teaching materials including curriculum materials, educational programs, textbooks, manuals, computer programs, or audiovisual resources
- Teach or provide leadership in continuing education
- Clinical and/or basic research published in peer reviewed journals
- Grant writing and approval

Table 6.1. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of Clinical Faculty for promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of participation as a primary investigator on a scholarly project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary investigator on scholarly projects that resulted in presentation at a local or regional conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary investigator on scholarly projects that resulted in presentation at a national conference or publication
Teaching	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good students/residents evaluations • Up to 3 years of teaching experience • Up to 100 hours/year of teaching experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent students/residents evaluations • 3-6 years of teaching experience • 100-200 hours/year of teaching experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Teaching awards • > 6 years of teaching experience • > 200 hours/year of teaching experience
Service	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves on RAD departmental committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves on RAD departmental and a school committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves on RAD department, school and community committees

Letter from administration of health organization employer addressing good, high, and outstanding benchmarks. (See Appendix III)

Table 6.2. Examples of benchmarks and ratings for evaluation of Clinical Faculty for promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor. An individual need not achieve every benchmark in order to achieve a given rating, but the preponderance of evidence should support the rating assignment.

	DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS	GOOD	HIGH	OUTSTANDING
Research/ Scholarly Activity	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring students/residents on scholarly projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring students/residents on scholarly projects that resulted in presentation at a local or regional conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring students/residents on scholarly projects that resulted in presentation at a national conference or a publication
Teaching	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good students/residents evaluations • Up to 3 years of teaching experience as assistant professor • Up to 100 hours/year of teaching experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent students/residents evaluations • 3-6 years of teaching experience as assistant professor • 100-200 hours/year of teaching experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding students/residents evaluations • Teaching awards • > 6 years of teaching experience assistant professor • > 200 hours/year of teaching experience
Service	The individual does not meet the minimal expectations associated with a 'Good' rating when considering his or her professional development plan and percent of effort distributions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves as a leader on RAD departmental committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves as a leader on RAD departmental and a member of a school committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serves as a leader of school and /or community committee

Letter from administration of health organization employer addressing good, high, and outstanding benchmarks.
(See Appendix III)

Appendix III

Employer Evaluation Form of Clinical Competence of Medical School Faculty

(Circle most applicable response)

	Good	High	Outstanding
Quality	Participates in QA measures	Meets QA standards	Exceeds QA standards
Patient Satisfaction	No significant complaints	Growing practice	Busy practice with many positive patient compliments
Peer Evaluation	Cooperates as health team participant	Sought out for advice by colleagues	Many referrals from colleagues
Patient Surveys (if applicable)	+	++	+++
Educational Presentations	Meets requirements for CME	Applies new knowledge to practice	Shares clinical knowledge and skills
Educational Presentations	To allied health workers or parent groups	Grand Rounds and Journal Club participant	Invited speaker at state, regional or national meetings
Professionalism Dress, Respectfulness, Timeliness, Reliability	Generally	Consistently	Without fail
Clinic Department Service	Serves when asked usually	Valuable committee participant	Department/section or committee leader
Overall Rating	Good	High	Outstanding
Review Comments:			

Evaluator: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix IV

PROBATIONARY (TENURE TRACK) COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION & TENURE CHECKLIST

Name _____

Department _____

Chair's Letter Department _____

CPT Letter Department CPT _____

Membership Curriculum Vitae _____

Position Description (actual description of job duties, NOT pg. 2 of contract) _____

Percent Effort Forms (Pg. 2 of contract) _____

Tenure Plan _____

SMHS Annual Performance Evaluations _____

Statement of Teaching _____

 Student Evaluations _____

 Peer Evaluations _____

 Administrative Evaluation _____

Statement of Scholarly Activity | _____

Statement of Service _____

Self-Evaluation _____

Optional Materials

 Appendix _____

Additional documents can be added as an appendix limited to five. Include only most important documents that demonstrate accomplishments.

Please place this page in the front pocket of your dossier.

Appendix V

SPECIAL CONTRACT (NON-TENURE) COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION & TENURE CHECKLIST

Name _____

Department _____

Chair's Letter Department _____

CPT Letter Department CPT _____

Membership Curriculum Vitae _____

Position Description (actual description of job duties, NOT pg. 2 of contract) _____

Percent Effort Forms (Pg. 2 of contract) _____

SMHS Annual Performance Evaluations _____

Statement of Teaching _____

 Student Evaluations _____

 Peer Evaluations _____

 Administrative Evaluation _____

Statement of Scholarly Activity _____

Statement of Service _____

Self-Evaluation _____

Optional Materials

 Appendix _____

Additional documents can be added as an appendix limited to five. Include only most important documents that demonstrate accomplishments.

Please place this page in the front pocket of your dossier.

Appendix VI

POST TENURE COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION & TENURE CHECKLIST

Name _____

Department _____

Chair's Letter Department _____

CPT Letter Department CPT _____

Membership Curriculum Vitae _____

Position Description (actual description of job duties, NOT pg. 2 of contract) _____

Percent Effort Forms (Pg. 2 of contract) _____

SMHS Annual Performance Evaluations _____

Statement of Teaching _____

 Student Evaluations _____

 Peer Evaluations _____

 Administrative Evaluation _____

Statement of Scholarly Activity _____

Statement of Service _____

Self-Evaluation _____

Optional Materials

 Appendix _____

Additional documents can be added as an appendix limited to five. Include only most important documents that demonstrate accomplishments

Please place this page in the front pocket of your dossier.

CLINICAL FACULTY PROMOTION REQUEST



Name: _____

Department: _____

Campus: _____

Promotion requested: _____

Board Certified: ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ NOT APPLICABLE

Must Attach:

- ☐ Current CV
- ☐ Letter from Department Chair
- ☐ Position Description
- ☐ Board Verification (if applicable)
- ☐ Proof faculty meets criteria for requested rank
- ☐ Personal statement from faculty member

Recommendation of Department Chair

☐ Remain at current rank ☐ Promote to _____

Department Chair

Date

Recommendation of Senior Associate Dean for Medicine and Research

☐ Remain at current rank ☐ Promote to _____

Marc Basson, M.D., Ph.D., M.B.A.
Senior Associate Dean for Medicine and Research

Date

Recommendation of Senior Associate Dean for Education

☐ Remain at current rank ☐ Promote to _____

Kenneth Ruit, Ph.D.
Associate Dean, Education & Faculty Affairs

Date

Approval of Dean

☐ Remain at current rank ☐ Promote to _____

Joshua Wynne, M.D., M.B.A., M.P.H.
Vice President of Health Affairs and Dean

Date

A letter of promotion should be sent to the above named person outlining the responsibilities and parameters of the position and requesting that he or she sign that letter indicating acceptance. Please return the signed letter to Education and Faculty Affairs, Stop 9037.

Office of Education and Faculty Affairs use only:

- Return copy of completed form to Department
- Acceptance letter of promotion received
- Update database and Versatile
- Create ID Card/certificate, send to department and notify campuses

Appendix VIII

PROMOTION COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION & TENURE CHECKLIST

Name _____

Department _____

Promotion from _____ to _____

[Appendix I \(Form\)](#)

Chair's Letter _____

Department CPT Letter _____

Department CPT Membership _____

Curriculum Vitae _____

Position Description (actual description of job duties, NOT pg. 2 of contract) _____

Percent Effort Forms (Pg. 2 of contract) _____

SMHS Annual Performance Evaluations _____

Statement of Teaching _____

 Student Evaluations _____

 Peer Evaluations _____

 Administrative Evaluation _____

Statement of Scholarly Activity _____

Statement of Service _____

External Evaluation (3 letters) _____

Self-Evaluation _____

Optional Materials

 Appendix _____

Additional documents can be added as an appendix limited to five. Include only most important documents that demonstrate accomplishments.

Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor *does not need* 3 external letters and the statement of teaching, scholarly activity and service can be a combined statement no longer than two pages.

Please place this page in the front pocket of your dossier.

Appendix IX

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION & TENURE CHECKLIST

Name _____

Department _____

Promotion from _____ to _____

[Appendix I \(Form\)](#) _____

[Appendix II \(Form\)](#) _____

Chair's Letter _____

Department CPT Letter _____

Department CPT Membership _____

Curriculum Vitae _____

Position Description (actual description of job duties, NOT pg. 2 of contract) _____

Percent Effort Forms (Pg. 2 of contract) _____

Tenure Plan _____

SMHS Annual Performance Evaluations _____

Statement of Teaching _____

 Student Evaluations _____

 Peer Evaluations _____

 Administrative Evaluation _____

Statement of Scholarly Activity _____

Statement of Service _____

External Evaluation (3 letters) _____

Self-Evaluation _____

Optional Materials

 Appendix _____

Additional documents can be added as an appendix limited to five. Include only most important documents that demonstrate accomplishments

Please place this page in the front pocket of your dossier.



Appendix X

RECOMMENDATION FOR PROMOTION IN ACADEMIC RANK

Name of Faculty Member: _____ Date of Submission: _____
Current Academic _____ Years in Current _____ Years at
Rank: _____ Rank: _____ UND: _____
Academic Department: _____ Highest Degree: _____

As to the recommendation for promotion to the rank of: _____

Action of the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure

_____ Recommend promotion Votes for _____
_____ Does not recommend promotion Votes against _____

Signature, Dept. CPT Chair

Action of the Department Chair

_____ Recommend promotion
_____ Does not recommend promotion

Signature of Departmental Chair

Action of the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure


_____ Recommend promotion Votes for _____
_____ Does not recommend promotion Votes against _____

Signature, School CPT Chair

Action of the Dean

_____ Recommend promotion
_____ Does not recommend promotion

Signature, Dean SMHS



Appendix XI
RECOMMENDATION FOR TENURE IN ACADEMIC RANK

Name of Faculty Member: _____ Date of Submission: _____
Current Academic _____ Years in Current Rank: _____ Years at
Rank: _____ UND: _____
Academic Department: _____ Highest Degree: _____

As to the recommendation for tenure:

Action of the Departmental Committee on Promotion and Tenure

_____ Recommend
_____ tenure Votes for _____
_____ Does not recommend tenure Votes against _____

Signature, Dept. CPT Chair

Action of the Department Chair

_____ Recommend tenure
_____ Does not recommend tenure

Signature of Departmental Chair

Action of the School Committee on Promotion and Tenure

_____ Recommend tenure Votes for _____
_____ Does not recommend tenure Votes against _____

Signature, School CPT Chair

Action of the Dean

_____ Recommend tenure
_____ Does not recommend tenure

Signature, Dean SMHS

Appendix XII

DEPARTMENT OF RADIOLOGY FACULTY PROMOTION SAMPLE SCHEDULE <i>*Exact dates will be communicated annually.</i>		
STEP 1	Letter requesting promotion sent to Department Chair or Department Chair informing a candidate to prepare an application for promotion	April 15
	Candidate may contact the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair, for questions on the process	June
	The following information due to Department of Radiology CV (http://med.und.edu/administration/education-faculty-affairs/files/docs/cpt/smhs-cv-format.pdf) Time commitment worksheet Suggested External Reviewer List (at least 3) (Send via e-mail to renee.sluke@med.und.edu Contact Renee Sluke at 701-293-4156 with questions)	July 1
	Department Chair solicit external letters to be received no later than mid- September	mid-August
	Deadline for submission of complete dossier to Department of Radiology (only external letters may be added to the dossier until the CPT's meeting)	October 1
STEP 2	Complete dossiers submitted to IM CPT members for review	October 3
	Department P&T Committee votes on the candidates for promotion	October 15
	Complete dossiers sent to UNDSMHS Faculty Affairs, GF	November 6
STEP 3	Deadline for submission of completed dossiers to UNDSMHS Office of Faculty Affairs. Contact Linda Anderson at 701-777-4271 if you have questions	November 15 (This date is fixed by the Medical School and cannot vary)
	Dossiers reviewed by Medical School Promotion and Tenure Committee and additional supporting material obtained if necessary	December
	Recommended promotions from the Medical School are forwarded to Provost's Office (for tenure-track only appointments)	January 31 (This date is fixed by the Medical School and cannot vary)
	Board of higher education recommendation for promotion of University faculty members to be effective July 1	April

Appendix XIII

External Reviewers

The objective of obtaining letters from external reviewers “**at arms’ length**” is to request an unbiased evaluation of the candidate’s academic accomplishments and progress. Therefore, external reviewers “at arms’ length” must have no conflicts of commitment or interest with respect to assessment of the candidate. The following examples should be helpful but are not exhaustive. The P&T Committee reserves the right to characterize the relationship between the external reviewer and the candidate.

External reviewers “at arms’ length” may have:

- Been colleagues on a review board
- Been the editor of a journal the candidate submitted an article to
- Met at a professional meeting
- Served with the candidate in positions in professional societies
- Served together on grants reviews
- Never met the candidate before (someone the department Chair identified)

External reviewers “at arms’ length” may not have:

- A significant scientific role in the candidate’s career
- Contributing to the scientific development or execution of a project(s) in a substantive, measurable way (Senior, Project/Site/Core Director, or collaborator)
- Co-authored manuscripts
- Been a scientific or career mentor for the candidate
- Personal or business relationships with candidate
- Shared patients with the candidate resulting in a close working relationship
- Wrote a chapter in candidate’s book/candidate wrote chapter in reviewer’s book

Please look over the Department of Radiology Guidelines on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure. Please sign for approval:

Signatures:

DocuSigned by:

Derek Kane, MD (Committee Member)

7/26/2021

Date

DocuSigned by:

Jean Connell, MD (Committee Member)

7/29/2021

Date

DocuSigned by:

A. Michael Booth, MD (Committee Member)

7/22/2021

Date

DocuSigned by:

Luke Roller, MD (Chair)

7/22/2021

Date