



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

College of Medicine

College of Medicine Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure And Post-Tenure Review

Administrative updates: “College” to “School”, Section C, APT External letters: September 2023

Administrative updates: “School” to “College”, language change in compliance with SB-17, reorganization and clarification of guidelines by faculty track: December 2024

Additional organization/clarity and approval by Faculty Advisory Committee: February 24, 2025

Approval by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee: February 28, 2025

Approved by the College of Medicine and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs: March 28, 2025

1. Table of Contents	
2. General Guidelines for Employed Faculty	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Relevant Texas A&M System (TAMUS) and Texas A&M University (TAMU) Policies and Procedures	5
2.3 Amendments to the Guidelines	6
3. Faculty Ranks and Tracks	7
3.1 General Faculty Ranks	7
3.1.1 Assistant	7
3.1.2 Associate	7
3.1.3 Professor	7
3.2 Faculty Tracks	8
3.2.1 Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty:	8
3.2.2 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty:	8
3.2.3 Adjunct and Adjunct Affiliate Faculty:	10
3.3 Indicators of Faculty Performance	11
4. Criteria and Processes for Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty	13
4.1 Areas of Faculty Responsibility	13
4.1.1 Teaching	13
4.1.2 Research/Scholarly Activity	14
4.1.3 Service	16
4.1.4 Other Faculty Responsibilities	17
4.2 Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness	17
4.2.1 Teaching	17
4.2.2 Research/Scholarly Activity	19
4.2.3 Service	22
4.2.4 Other Faculty Responsibilities	24
4.3 Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenured/ Tenure Track Faculty	25
4.3.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	25
4.4 Processes to Evaluate Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty	27
4.4.1 Annual Review	27
4.4.2 Mid-term Review	32
4.4.3 Processes for Promotion and Tenure of Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty	35
4.4.4 Post-tenure Review	38

4.4.5	Periodic Peer Review	39
4.4.6	Professional Development Review	41
5.	Criteria and Processes for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty	46
5.1	Areas of APT Faculty Responsibility.....	46
5.2	Indicators of APT Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness.....	46
5.2.1	Teaching	46
5.2.2	Research/Scholarly Activity	48
5.2.3	Service.....	51
5.2.4	Other APT Faculty Responsibilities	53
5.3	Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Categories and Ranks:.....	54
5.3.1	Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor	54
5.3.2	Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor	54
5.3.3	Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor	54
5.3.4	Joint Faculty	55
5.4	Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track (APT) Appointment and Promotion	55
5.4.1	Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of Instructional Track APT Faculty	56
5.4.2	Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of APT Clinical Track Faculty	58
5.4.3	Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of APT Research Faculty:	59
5.5	Processes to Evaluate Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty	61
5.5.1	Annual Review.....	61
5.5.2	Processes for Promotion of Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty	65
5.5.3	External Reviews for Promotion of Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty	68
6.	Criteria and Processes for Adjunct (Affiliate) Clinical Faculty.....	69
6.1	Introduction	69
6.2	Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty Appointment Terms and Conditions.....	69
6.3	Adjunct (Affiliate) Clinical Faculty Responsibilities	70
6.3.1	Clinical Education:	70
6.3.2	Clinical Research/Investigation and Education:	71
6.3.3	Service:.....	71
6.4	Appointment Process.....	71
6.5	College of Medicine Adjunct (Affiliate) Working Titles	72
6.5.1	Promotion Process for Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty.....	72

6.5.2	Promotion of Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty with More Than One Appointment and/or Secondary Appointments.....	73
6.6	Areas of Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty Responsibility	74
6.6.1	Teaching	74
6.6.2	Service.....	76
6.6.3	Research/Investigation (if applicable).....	78

2. General Guidelines for Employed Faculty

2.1 Introduction

The mission of the Texas A&M College of Medicine is to improve the health and well-being of the people of Texas through excellence in education, research, and health care delivery. Accomplishing this mission requires a diverse faculty with a broad range of talents and expertise. Appropriate evaluation guidelines and reward mechanisms for faculty members to support the mission are essential.

The expectations of the College of Medicine for its faculty are that they develop a scholarly and balanced approach of teaching, research, and service to achieve effectiveness and excellence in their disciplinary area. The nature of scholarly innovation requires both flexibility and freedom; thus, the expectation of applying a single formula for evaluating performance is unattainable. That is, it is neither desirable nor feasible to specify a rigid set of evaluation guidelines. This document provides a general set of guidelines and criteria congruent with the goals and objectives of the University and the College; such guidelines and criteria are used as indicators of effectiveness and excellence.

2.2 Relevant Texas A&M System (TAMUS) and Texas A&M University (TAMU) Policies and Procedures

This document articulates general College guidelines for appointment, annual review, midterm review, post-tenure review, and promotion and tenure of tenured/tenure track, academic professional track (non-tenure track; APT), and adjunct (affiliated) faculty. These guidelines are consistent with the requirements and guidelines found in the following University documents:

- 1) Texas A&M System (TAMUS) Regulation 01.01 (*System Policies and Regulations, and Member Rules and Procedures*)
<https://policies.tamus.edu/01-01.pdf>
- 2) TAMUS Regulation 12.01.01 (*Institutional Rules for Implementing Tenure*)
<http://policies.tamus.edu/12-01-01.pdf>
- 3) University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*)
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules>
- 4) University Rule 12.01.99.M2 (*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*) – Appendix I
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules>
- 5) Standard Administrative Procedure 12.06.99.M0.01 (*Post-Tenure Review*)
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules>
- 6) Texas A&M University Faculty Affairs: <https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu>

- a. Faculty Hiring Guidelines for Deans and Department Heads
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Hiring>
- b. Faculty Hiring Guidelines for Deans and Department Heads, Appendix C: Guidelines to Faculty Titles
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Hiring>
- c. Promotion and Tenure Package Submission Guidelines (published annually)
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Faculty-Resources/CURRENT-FACULTY/Promotion-and-Tenure>
- d. Guidelines for Annual and Mid-Term Review
<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/Rules/Faculty-Rules>

In the event of inadvertent discrepancies between this document and Texas A&M University policies, regulations, rules, and procedures, the University policies, regulations, rules, and procedures take precedence. In the event of discrepancies between Texas A&M University policies, regulations, rules, and procedures and Texas A&M University System policies, regulations, rules, and procedures, the Texas A&M System policies, regulations, rules, and procedures take precedence.

2.3 Amendments to the Guidelines

Proposed amendments must be reviewed and approved by the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs before being forwarded to the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC). Approved amendments will be forwarded to the FAC for review and discussion before being distributed to the General Faculty for comment at least two weeks before being voted on. Any amendments proposed by the FAC (made after those amendments already approved by Faculty Affairs) must be approved by the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs. After approval by a General Faculty vote, the FAC shall send the final amended version of the guidelines, with a succinct list of changes, to the College of Medicine Dean for approval. Following approval by the College of Medicine Dean, the amended guidelines will be sent to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for approval. Upon approval by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the amendments are considered active and published.

As noted above, the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs shall coordinate the amendment process and maintain copies of guidelines and amendments. The College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs shall provide updated versions of the Guidelines to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The most recent and approved version of the Guidelines will be posted on the Texas A&M Faculty Affairs website, ensuring that it is readily available to all College of Medicine faculty members.

3. Faculty Ranks and Tracks

3.1 General Faculty Ranks

All faculty members having positions with the word **Professor** in the title will have a doctoral or other appropriate terminal degree and will have their rank qualifier (the descriptor of their rank) determined as follows:

3.1.1 Assistant

Assistant as a qualifier in the title indicates an entry-level position in academia. Individuals should have credentials evidencing both an expertise in the field and a commitment to significantly contribute to the areas of performance required by their appointment of teaching, research/scholarly activity, and/or service.

3.1.2 Associate

Associate as a qualifier in the title indicates experience in academia or substantial contributions to the field. For non-tenure track faculty, only sections 3.1.2.1. and 3.1.2.2. apply. For tenure-track faculty, sections 3.1.2.1, 3.1.2.2., and 3.1.2.3 apply, in alignment with the areas required by the individual faculty member's appointment.

3.1.2.1 A level of accomplishment, as measured against the contributions of others in the field.

3.1.2.2 Professional performance conducive to a collaborative and constructive cooperation work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of the College of Medicine.

3.1.2.3 An area of specialization germane to the programs of the College, with documented evidence of independent research/scholarship and a sustained commitment to maintain the level of competence in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and/or service expected of a tenured faculty member.

3.1.3 Professor

The title **Professor** with no other rank qualifier (*i.e.*, Assistant or Associate) indicates continued accomplishments in academia and evidence of significant impact on the professions of College of Medicine faculty and on the field in which the faculty member will teach. In addition, such faculty members are expected to have exceeded all required attributes for faculty members with the **Associate** qualifier as part of their title and rank.

3.2 Faculty Tracks

Faculty tracks are divided into three categories:

- **Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty;**
- **Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty** – non-tenure accruing;
- **Adjunct Faculty** – non-tenure accruing, not employed by Texas A&M University, but contribute to the College of Medicine’s teaching mission.

3.2.1 Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty:

Tenured/tenure-track titles recognize University-employed faculty members who make significant and sustained contributions to the mission of the College in all three major areas of responsibility (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with exceptions made for termed appointments to focus on fewer of these areas (such as administrative appointments or faculty development leave). Only tenured/tenure-track faculty should be hired, evaluated, and promoted based on all three areas. All faculty members whose service accrues credit toward tenure and those who are already tenured must receive at least one-third of their salary from the University ([University Rule 12.01.99.M2](#)) (*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion*). **Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor** are appointment titles of either tenured or tenure-track faculty members.

3.2.2 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty:

The academic professional track (APT) faculty are those faculty not on the tenure-track who contribute to the mission of the College of Medicine in more focused ways. Normally, APT faculty are evaluated on a primary area of responsibility (e.g., teaching or research/scholarly activity) of the non-tenure track appointment but also may be expected to contribute in more than a single area of teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service. There is no prohibition for APT faculty to be involved in multiple duties related to teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service. However, decisions regarding hiring, continuation of employment, and evaluation of APT faculty performance should relate to the primary and secondary responsibilities of their appointment and not be based on all three areas.

3.2.2.1 **Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor.**

Clinical Assistant/Associate/Professor faculty appointments, without the adjunct or affiliate prefix, are University-employed. Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, primarily in the clinical setting, and can make contributions that are incident to either the area of research/scholarly activity, service, or patient care/clinical practice. Faculty also may make contributions to administration, in support the College’s mission, but administration is not required for promotion.

3.2.2.2 **Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor**

Instructional faculty appointments are for individuals who are University-employed. Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, primarily in the non-clinical setting, and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of research/scholarly activity or service.

3.2.2.3 **Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

Research faculty appointments are for individuals who are University-employed. Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in research/scholarly activities and can contribute to either service or teaching. These faculty members normally have no obligation to teach regular courses and normally do not have significant, reoccurring classroom teaching assignments.

Faculty in these appointments are subject to the guidelines posted by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Vice President for Research (<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/index.html>). These types of appointments require the pre-approval of the position by the Texas A&M University Vice President for Research (VPR) (<https://vpr.tamu.edu/>).

3.2.2.4 **Senior Associate Professor and Senior Professor**

Senior faculty appointments are for individuals who are University-employed. Faculty in these appointments have been hired into an APT position **following retirement and giving up tenure or moving to a non-tenure track position and giving up tenure**. Senior professors are hired in a very specific role and are expected to make significant contributions in one area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). Academic ranks are conferred at the rank commensurate with the candidate's position at the time of retirement.

3.2.2.5 **Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor**

Visiting faculty appointments are for individuals who are University-employed and temporarily appointed by the College but have continuing academic appointments in other institutions. Appointments may be renewed yearly for up to three (3) years at the discretion of the Department Head, although reappointment is possible after three (3) years. Academic ranks are normally conferred at the rank commensurate with the candidate's position at the academic institution at which he or she holds a continuing appointment. Visiting faculty with the professorial title (**Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor**) are expected to make significant contributions in one area of faculty performance (teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service). However, faculty with lecturer titles will only be required to contribute to the area of teaching.

University rules state that faculty members with the Visiting modifier are not

eligible to participate in promotion and tenure decisions of tenure-track faculty, selection and evaluation of department heads and deans, and faculty senate.

3.2.2.6 **Lecturer**

Lecturer appointments are for individuals who are University-employed and have an appropriate terminal degree. Faculty in these appointments teach and this is the only area they are evaluated in. Lecturers can make contributions in the areas of scholarly research or service but they are not evaluated in these areas.

3.2.2.7 **Assistant Lecturer**

These appointments are for individuals who are University-employed and appointed for fewer than five years for candidates for a Texas A&M University doctoral degree. These appointments are focused on teaching and they do not have eligibility for voting rights in shared governance processes on campus.

3.2.2.8 **Principal Lecturer**

Should have an appropriate terminal degree or significant experience in the field and demonstrate a continued pattern of excellence in teaching.

3.2.2.9 **Senior Lecturer**

Should have an appropriate terminal degree or significant experience in the field and demonstrate a continued pattern of excellence in teaching.

3.2.2.10 **Joint Faculty**

Joint appointments happen within the context of the University or University agencies. In a **true joint appointment** situation, the employee of one University department is appointed part of their time to work for another University department, thereby splitting the full-time effort between both departments. In a **courtesy joint appointment** situation, the request is based on a desire of the University department where the faculty member is housed to have the faculty member perform certain non-remunerated duties for another University department. A University faculty member appointed under a joint appointment is appointed with the same title held by the faculty member in their home University department.

3.2.3 **Adjunct and Adjunct Affiliate Faculty:**

Adjunct faculty are not formally employed by Texas A&M University but provide specialized training, education, and supervision of learners (e.g., medical students, residents, etc.). Typically, adjunct and/or adjunct affiliate faculty provide medical education in either classroom or clinical settings. Adjunct affiliates typically are physicians/clinicians who are employed by hospitals, health care systems, and/or clinics that are affiliated with or have formal agreements with Texas A&M University. Adjunct/affiliate faculty contribute to the mission of the College of Medicine in more focused ways and are not on the tenure track.

Typically, adjunct/affiliate faculty are evaluated primarily on their teaching responsibilities, but they also may be expected to contribute, and be evaluated, in other areas including research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or patient care. There is no prohibition for adjunct/affiliate faculty to be involved in multiple duties related to teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or patient care. Adjunct/affiliate faculty are eligible for promotion but, because they are not Texas A&M-employed faculty, the promotion review process is conducted independently of the College of Medicine Promotion & Tenure Committee and the University Promotion & Tenure processes. Decisions regarding adjunct/affiliate faculty initial appointments, annual reviews, appointment renewals, and promotions are conducted by the Campus Associate Deans and the faculty member's 'home' academic Department in the College of Medicine. Evaluations and promotions of adjunct/affiliate faculty should focus on the primary responsibility (*i.e.*, teaching), although other areas may be considered.

3.2.3.1 Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Assistant Professor, Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Associate Professor, and Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Professor

Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Assistant/Associate/Professors are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching. As noted at the beginning of this section (Section 3.1), faculty members with "Professor" in their title will have an appropriate terminal degree (*e.g.*, M.D., D.O., Ph.D.) and will have the appropriate rank qualifier based on expertise, experience, accomplishments, and impact. These Adjunct Affiliate faculty may use the courtesy titles of "Affiliate Clinical Assistant / Associate / Professor" for evaluations and/or promotions. Less formally (not for University business), these Adjunct Affiliate faculty may use "Clinical Assistant / Associate/ Professor".

3.2.3.2 Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Instructor

Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Instructors are expected to contribute substantially in the area of teaching. The title "Adjunct/Affiliate Adjunct Clinical Instructor" is to be used by faculty who do not have terminal degrees (*e.g.*, M.A., M.S., M.S.N., etc.). Adjunct Affiliate Clinical Instructors may use the courtesy titles of "Affiliate Clinical Instructor" for evaluations and, less formally (not for University business), may use "Clinical Instructor".

3.3 Indicators of Faculty Performance

Decisions on promotion, tenure, and merit compensation will be based upon the faculty member's performance in the assigned areas of responsibility (teaching; research, scholarly activity, and/or creative work; service; patient care/clinical practice; administration; other, as applicable to their unit). Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty responsibility are presented below. Alternate work assignments (*e.g.*, administration, etc.) may replace one or more responsibility areas in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work assignments will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

Although some quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence and potential for continued excellence in performance are of primary importance. That is, the quality, significance, and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than the quantity, per se. However, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. The College of Medicine defines and recognizes five (5) **indicators of performance**, as further described below:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in any or all of the assigned areas of faculty responsibility.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in one or more of the assigned areas of faculty responsibility.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in one or more of the assigned areas of faculty responsibility.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence. Faculty in this category will be outstanding in one or more of the assigned areas of faculty responsibility.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

4. Criteria and Processes for Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty

4.1 Areas of Faculty Responsibility

Briefly, decisions on annual reviews, mid-term reviews, promotion and tenure, post-tenure review, merit compensation, and other reviews will be based upon the three major areas of faculty responsibilities: (1) Teaching, (2) Research/Scholarly Activity, and (3) Service. For some faculty, a fourth responsibility area, when approved by the Department Head and Dean, (4) Other, will be considered and may include administration, patient care/clinical practice, or other responsibilities central to the mission of the College of Medicine. Evaluations and reviews of faculty performance, in each area of responsibility, must be based on the currently-assigned percent effort in each area of responsibility, which is outlined in each faculty annual reappointment letter.

4.1.1 Teaching

Teaching is central to the mission of the College of Medicine, and effectiveness in teaching is required of all faculty. All faculty members are expected to: (A) contribute to instruction and student development; (B) continuously strive to improve their teaching effectiveness; and (C) promote and diversify the development of the College's instructional programs. Effectiveness and excellence in teaching affect decisions on merit compensation, promotion, and tenure.

Evaluation of teaching does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement. Multiple sources of information and methods must be considered in the assessment of teaching. Measures/sources of information include: (A) self-evaluation; (B) peer-evaluation; (C) student feedback; and (D) student learning. The criteria for effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluating teaching performance are:

4.1.1.1 **Teaching Qualities:**

The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including a spectrum of foundational and current literature in one's discipline. Essential components of teaching are the use of appropriate methods of instruction; effective planning and organization; clarity of written, oral and visual presentation; rapport with students of all abilities; effective questioning and group facilitation skills; stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving; modeling professionalism; mentoring students; using appropriate methods of evaluation; and providing adequate feedback to students. Teaching should be carried out with enthusiasm and energy.

4.1.1.2 **Educational Innovation:**

Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort. Innovations in teaching must accomplish more than mere change. Rather, new methods should demonstrate measurable advantage over those previously used. Examples of innovations in teaching are: taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness; developing new learning experiences, courses, programs, or curricula; developing unique methods to evaluate student learning, skills or professionalism; and developing methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses, or curricula.

4.1.1.3 **Impact Upon Students:**

The positive impact of teaching on students should be the primary educational goal of each faculty member. Increased knowledge, skills, professional attitudes, and values result from effective teaching. The ultimate outcome of effective teaching is students achieving competency that leads to proficiency and, finally, mastery of their chosen profession.

4.1.1.4 **Degree of Teaching Responsibility:**

The degree of responsibility assigned to a faculty member and the extent to which these responsibilities contribute to the teaching programs of the College must be considered. More weight should be given to coordinating a course or having a primary responsibility managing a teaching program than solely presenting lectures in a course or serving as a laboratory or clinical instructor. It is expected that faculty members assume more responsibility for teaching as they gain academic experience. Preparation time and unscheduled contact time directly related to teaching/learning issues should be taken into consideration for the review of teaching responsibility.

4.1.2 **Research/Scholarly Activity**

Research and scholarly activity are essential to the mission of the College. Research/scholarly activity has two forms: (1) the generation of new knowledge through original research and publication of the findings; and (2) the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge. Typically, peer review is the most rigorous standard for publications. In addition, publications will be evaluated with regard to their impact and dissemination (e.g., local vs. regional vs. national/international). To be granted tenure, a faculty member must engage in the generation of knowledge through original research

and publication of the findings. The other forms of scholarly activity are of significant importance and lend to substantial support to a candidate's application for tenure. It should be understood that a record of peer-reviewed publications and dissemination of knowledge in refereed journals or books or other formats is necessary for career advancement. While publications prior to employment are important, the major emphasis will be on publications since employment or last promotion at the institution of record. In all instances, the quality and impact of the research/scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure of effectiveness and excellence.

4.1.2.1 **Scholarly Activity:**

The compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is one aspect of scholarly activity that contributes to and advances scholarship. Such scholarly work may take many forms, which may include: the publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, case reports, technical and clinical procedures, and instructional materials, videos, teaching manuals and syllabi; the development of new continuing education courses; the editorship of professional journals; integration and synthesis of translational and clinical approaches to particular medical problems; invention of new methods and techniques in education, instrumentation, and technology; and collaborative projects with other units within the University, and other institutions. Non-tenure track faculty members are encouraged to participate in scholarly activity that improves their teaching skills and contributes to the knowledge base in their specialized area.

4.1.2.2 **Generation of Knowledge:**

Research is the generation of new knowledge. Such research may be basic, behavioral, translational, educational, and/or clinical. A reasonable and consistent level of research productivity is required; however, it is the quality and impact of the investigative activity that is of primary importance in evaluation for promotion and/or tenure. The quality and impact of research can be measured most readily through two peer review mechanisms: 1) publication in refereed journals and books and 2) the acquisition of federal or external funding consistent with the discipline. Development and sustainability of an independent research program is an important criterion. Patents are of similar importance to peer-reviewed publications.

Interdisciplinary and interprofessional scholarship is important for faculty career development and is valued by the College. Increasingly, the complexity and breadth of biomedical and healthcare projects involving basic, translational, educational, and clinical research will require an interprofessional approach to research efforts. These efforts may require the creation of teams of scientists from multiple departments, institutions, governmental agencies, non-governmental foundations, and industry. The evaluation should consider the successful accomplishments of team-based research efforts in which candidates have participated as part of their evaluation regarding promotion and tenure. Furthermore, team science projects often create grant proposals with multiple co-Principal Investigators or co-Investigators, as well as publications with multiple authors. The contributions of the candidate to these efforts must not be discounted because of the number of participants on a research team. Therefore,

Promotion and Tenure Committees shall ask candidates to provide information on their specific roles on, and the importance of their contributions to, multi-investigator grant proposals and papers. Faculty members who contribute to technology commercialization may attribute the activity to either research or education.

4.1.3 Service

The College of Medicine must effectively serve many constituencies to achieve state, national, and international prominence; a variety of service roles can contribute to attainment of that goal. All faculty members, other than those with Adjunct in their title, are expected to participate in service activities as a responsibility of their institutional citizenship. Faculty effort in this area of evaluation may include institutional programs and services, professional activities, and clinical care/advocacy.

4.1.3.1 Institutional Programs and Services:

All faculty must share in the work necessary to maintain the operation of the department, College and University. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving programs and services.

Examples of activities that relate to institutional programs and services include: membership on committees or other assignments within the University and College; leadership roles in curriculum reform, development, and implementation; contribution to faculty governance; participation in institutional, departmental, or program strategic planning; participation in student recruiting activities; development of or participation in outreach programs; participation in faculty recruitment; conducting faculty development programs; providing in-service seminars, continuing education, and training; participation in quality control; participation in assessment programs; and setting up educational displays in, and outside of, the College of Medicine.

4.1.3.2 Professional Service Activities:

Faculty should contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. Continuing education is both an instructional and public service activity that the College is well-positioned to provide. Finally, faculty are encouraged to serve the community-at-large in a professional capacity that enhances the stature of the College of Medicine.

Examples of activities that relate to professional service activities include but are not limited to the following: membership in and contribution to professional organizations (includes offices held); organization of symposia; consultant to professional journals as a manuscript reviewer, etc.; consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards; membership on boards and committees in the community-at-large in a professional capacity; continuing education services to help professionals in the community-at-large; presentation of continuing education programs; and invited presentations at academic and professional groups.

4.1.4 Other Faculty Responsibilities

4.1.4.1 Administration:

Some faculty may be assigned, by the Department Head or Dean, administrative responsibilities that are central to the mission of the College of Medicine. It is important to note that some administrative duties may result in decreased efforts in other major areas, including teaching and research/scholarly activity. As such, reviews and evaluations should carefully weight the percent effort of each responsibility and conduct reviews accordingly.

Examples of administrative activities include Department Heads, Associate Department Heads, Assistant/Associate Deans, Directors, etc.

4.1.4.2 Patient Care/Clinical Practice:

Clinical faculty are expected to provide exemplary clinical care/advocacy that is respected by patients and peers both within the College of Medicine and in the professional community.

Examples of activities that relate to clinical care/advocacy include but are not limited to: certification by specialty board; engagement in either in-patient or out-patient care; consultation to patients and other healthcare providers; participation in professional organizations; improvement in clinical care through educating medical students, residents and fellows; innovation in clinical care technologies; involvement in continuing medical education (CME) either as presenters or trainees; establishment of professional relationships with nursing or other healthcare staff.

4.2 Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

The College recognizes that there are multiple indicators of various levels of performance. Over the course of any individual's career, performance indicators will vary, depending on career stage. This document does not provide a specific formula for evaluating faculty performance; but instead describes accomplishments that are likely to lead to career development and to favorable evaluations. The sections below provide representative indicators of excellence and effectiveness for each of the three areas of performance.

4.2.1 Teaching

Performance ratings to be used for all evaluations of Teaching are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be

supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. The department head should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence in order to evaluate fairly the faculty member.

4.2.1.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes.
- Demonstrated evidence of teaching excellence by selection for peer-reviewed University, College, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction awards.
- Participation in development of questions for specialty board examinations.
- Contribution to new instructional program development.
- Development of new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses.
- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals.
- Publication of the results of education research endeavors.
- Publication of scholarly review articles, textbooks, original clinical investigations, descriptions of clinical experience, or case reports/results that emphasize education endeavors.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, etc.).
- Development of innovative or acclaimed instructional materials including syllabi or software.
- Presentation at professional meetings or other institutions of higher education that serve the teaching mission of the College.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Evidence of successful career paths of former graduate students and post-doctoral students.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s).
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects or education research.
- Leading a major curriculum development, assessment, or redesign effort for the introduction of innovative technology or novel teaching methodologies in the instructional setting.

- High-quality of teaching to multiple College instructional programs.
- Leadership role in educational activities of national/international professional societies.
- Chair of doctoral student committees.
- Placement of doctoral students or postdoctoral students into significant academic, scholarly, and/or professional positions.
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to doctoral student development.

4.2.1.2 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Good teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes.
- Evidence of contributing to or coordinating courses or both.
- Coordination of team-taught or integrated courses.
- Rigorous, accurate, and equitable grading.
- Development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes.
- Service as a member of thesis/dissertation committees of graduate students.
- Mentoring and training medical students or post-graduate residents in experimental experiences and postgraduate residencies.
- Favorable evaluation by faculty mentored by the candidate.
- Direction of independent student research.
- Mentoring junior colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality.
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness.
- Introduction of current and emerging instructional methodologies and technologies in the curriculum.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College
- Development of pedagogical approaches to enhance student engagement and to optimize student learning.
- Introduction of practices to evaluate the engagement of students in a critical analysis of course material, or which evaluate their involvement in research or scholarly activity.
- Contribution to a College-wide culture of evidence-based approaches to evaluation and improvement of academic programs.
- Development of valuable evidence-based metrics for teaching effectiveness.
- Preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs.
- Selection for student or departmental awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Evidence of active teaching of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows in the laboratory setting.
- Consistent membership on doctoral student committees.

4.2.2 Research/Scholarly Activity

Performance ratings to be used for all evaluations of Research/ Scholarly Activity/ Creative Work are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.

- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, and book chapters.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by high-quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top-tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

4.2.2.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity** include, but are not limited to:

- Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings.
- A substantial record of peer-reviewed primary and/or corresponding senior authored publications that demonstrate evidence of originality as an investigator.
- Publications of original research in the leading peer-reviewed, discipline-related journals.
- Favorable citation index listing of research/educational publications within their respective discipline.
- Consistent, sustainable, and competitive external funding for research.
- Key participation in forming productive collaborative research arrangements with industry, community agencies, foundations, and other academic institutions.
- Significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements.
- Coordination of interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects.
- Publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s).
- Leadership of national meetings or workshops
- Authorship of a textbook, textbook chapter, review articles, contributions of published symposia.
- Editorship or associate editorship of scholarly, refereed journals, or of special issues of a journal.
- Recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars.
- Evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface with other academic disciplines.
- Originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication

- of new understanding of, perspective on, and uses of information.
- Peer-reviewed publication of instructional materials, e.g., case studies, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials.
- Extramural recognition for contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant, service on editorial boards of prestigious journals in the chosen area of teaching scholarship, and invitations to present keynote or plenary national or international meetings concerning education.
- Significant extramural funding for research on issues of importance in teaching.
- Publication of critically acclaimed chapters, books, or comparable electronic materials about education.
- Election to membership in major national research societies.
- Dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College.
- Editorship or associate editorship of a major journal in the chosen area of teaching scholarship.
- Serving on national grant organization study sections, review panels, or site visit teams.
- Serving on national professional society program committees.
- Election to major national professional societies.
- A senior leadership role demonstrating superior competence and outstanding productivity on research projects.
- Consistent and sustainable extramural support for an established research program.
- Service on National Advisory Councils or Boards, Editorship of journals, leadership of national/international study sections, consensus panels, etc.
- Frequent citation of publications.

4.2.2.2 Indicators of **Effectiveness** in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of articles in professional journals appropriate to the field of endeavor. Greater significance will be attributed to primary and corresponding authored papers in peer-reviewed journals, but all co-primary and co-corresponding publications will be evaluated.
- Publication of books, monographs, or manuals on paper or in electronic media that are widely disseminated, evaluated by peers, and advance the field of endeavor.
- Award of extramural support commensurate with the current primary field of research.
- Demonstration of a sustained leadership role in an independent research program (e.g., research program leader or laboratory/clinic director).
- Evidence for a principal role in management and/or support of a collaborative research program (e.g., letters from program leader or members of the research program).
- Development/award of patents for discoveries in the candidate's field.
- Leadership and/or organization of peer-reviewed clinical trials as documented by program reviews or letters.
- Participation in interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects.

- Invited presentations of original scientific data at regional/state/national meetings, or at major institutions or research organizations.
- Service on editorial boards of journals.
- A national and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of reference.
- Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines.
- Publication in non-refereed journals that are widely recognized.
- Publication of a respected professional book.
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
- Presentation of papers at regional/state/national conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s).
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national or international organizations.
- Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings.
- Well-documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.
- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals.
- Publication of technical reports, case reports, or monographs in peer-reviewed journals.
- Presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings.
- Contribution in area of expertise to the scholarship of others.
- Authorship of review articles.
- Serving as a research mentor for medical students or residents.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies adopted by other faculty members within the College of Medicine.

4.2.3 Service

Performance ratings to be used for all evaluations of **Service** are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of effectiveness in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national-level service in professional organizations would be typical.

- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

4.2.3.1 Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Officer, committee chair, or board/committee member in a national/international professional organization in one's discipline or national/international task force.
- Program chair or similar position for a national/international meeting.
- Administrative leadership role within the College or University.
- Officer in the Faculty Senate.
- Chair of a major University committee or task force.
- Demonstration of a significant time commitment to or role in committee work.
- Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, College, University, or system administrative or service roles.
- Service on study sections (or scientific peer review groups), consensus panels, etc.
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, committee, or board.
- Attainment of significant external development support.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Serving as editor or member of the editorial board of a major journal. This activity per se is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of an editorial board can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Service as a frequent ad hoc member or permanent member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies, or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).
- Organization of regional, national, international symposia and colloquia.
- Significant and effective mentorship of junior faculty members as evidenced by selection for College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards.
- Awards that recognize clinical expertise.
- Consultation as requested by other faculty members.
- Service as a consultant on clinical care (e.g., third-party payment groups, courts, health organizations).
- Holding leadership roles in hospital or healthcare organizations.
- Membership or fellowship in elected professional organization that denotes high level of clinical competency.

4.2.3.2 Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Committee chair of regional/state/national professional organization.
- Officer in regional or state professional organization.
- Program chair or similar position for regional or state professional organization meeting.
- Active member of the Faculty Senate.
- Service on University, College, department committees and task forces.
- Serving in administrative roles within the department.
- Contribution to external development efforts.

- Advisor to student organizations.
- Administrative roles within the department.
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups.
- Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. This activity per se is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Participation in: departmental, College, or University strategic planning, search committees, College seminar programs, faculty development programs, assessment programs, symposia and colloquia, and student recruitment activities.
- Presentation of continuing education programs.
- Invited presentations at academic and professional groups.
- Development and participation in health care service to community programs.
- Certification by specialty board.
- Referral of patients from practitioners both within and outside the University.
- Expression of confidence and respect from patients and clinical staff.
- Application of current methods in clinical care.
- Membership on a specialty examining board.
- Diligent efforts to make clinical and private clinical care efficient and effective.
- Occasional service as an ad hoc member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).

4.2.4 Other Faculty Responsibilities

As outlined above, other faculty responsibilities may include administration, patient care/clinical practice, or other duties central to the mission of the College of Medicine.

Performance ratings to be used for all evaluations of **Administration** or **Patient Care/Clinical Practice** responsibilities are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in assigned responsibilities, goals, deliverables, and/or clinical care activities.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in assigned responsibilities, goals, deliverables, and/or clinical care activities. Individuals receiving this rating typically have several areas needing improvement.
- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of effectiveness in assigned responsibilities, goals, deliverables, and/or clinical care activities. Those in this category have met, or are on-track to meet, outlined goals/deliverables or are meeting clinical care expectations. Effectiveness can be supported by evidence of completed projects, peer review, RVUs, patient satisfaction scores, etc.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in assigned responsibilities, goals, deliverables, and/or clinical care activities. Faculty in this category are recognized by their peers as academic or clinical leaders, regularly meet and typically exceed expectations for projects or clinical care, and have developed

and implemented new initiatives that have benefited their units and/or the College.

- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary leader and/or clinician. These faculty members, through their administrative and/or clinical activities, are nationally recognized for their leadership and/or clinical activities, have received university-wide and/or national/international awards, and have raised the national/international reputation of the College and University by solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations associated with either academic leadership or clinical care.

4.2.4.1 Indicators of **Excellence or Effectiveness in Administration** typically are outlined in the original administrative appointment and should be outlined and assessed by the Department Head, Dean, or other senior administrators.

4.2.4.2 Indicators of **Excellence or Effectiveness in Patient Care/Clinical Practice** typically are Department/specialty-specific and should be outlined and assessed by the Department Head.

4.3 Criteria for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenured/ Tenure Track Faculty

4.3.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for appointment, promotion, and tenure based upon accomplishments in each of the three major areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their research/scholarly activity and teaching. For those faculty with administrative or patient care/clinical practice responsibilities, demonstration of effectiveness or excellence in those areas should be evaluated by peer or supervisor evaluations, patient satisfaction scores, referrals, etc. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is provided by peer review. The criteria for the College are articulated below.

4.3.1.1 Assistant Professor:

The candidate to be appointed as **Assistant Professor on the tenure track** is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate Effectiveness in teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research/scholarly activity and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, should generally be focused on departmental and College academic needs. Further, it is expected that Assistant Professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

4.3.1.2 Associate Professor:

Faculty members appointed as Assistant Professor on the tenure track must achieve

promotion to Associate Professor, with tenure awarded simultaneously, within an agreed-upon probationary period.

In accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion):

Minimum requirements for appointment at, or promotion to, **Associate Professor with tenure**, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field.
- Professional and/or ethical conduct conducive to a work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of the University.
- An area of specialization germane to the programs of the University, which if currently represented on tenured faculty, the candidate will have made reasonable attempts to collaborate with those faculty members in an innovative manner, or an area of specialization that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority.
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.

Imperatives for appointment at, or promotion to, **Associate Professor with tenure** in the College of Medicine include:

- Excellence is expected in the primary area of responsibility of research/scholarly activity or teaching and at this stage, a regional-to-national recognition in the primary area of responsibility, as well as a sustained, consistent record of increasing excellence.
- At a minimum, demonstrated **Effectiveness** in the other two areas of responsibility.
- In addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required.
- Must demonstrate unequivocal promise of a continuing high level of sustained productivity and scholarly activity.
- Must demonstrate extramural funding sources for an independent and sustainable research program.

Guiding questions when considering an appointment at, or promotion to, **Associate Professor with tenure**:

- Has the candidate contributed successfully to the teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service missions of the department, College, and the University?
- Has the candidate achieved substantial regional-to-national recognition in research or another form of creative activity in their chosen field(s), or has shown significant evidence that they will do so in the near future?
- If applicable, during the probationary period, has the candidate developed a research program that is sustainable in terms of extramural funding in support of research projects?
- Does the person have the highest level of competence that can be obtained for the position at hand?
- Is this an individual whose personal qualities, professional knowledge and competence, and standards of professional integrity measure up to the level

- desired for the department, College, and University?
- Does the individual offer an area of specialization not currently represented on the tenured faculty or provide desired reinforcement in an area of significance? Is this field of specialization germane to the programs of the department, College, and the University?

4.3.1.3 **Professor:**

Minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for appointment at, or promotion to, **Professor with tenure**, in accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), and in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- Continuing accomplishments in teaching.
- Continuing accomplishments and some measure of national or international recognition in research or another form of creative activity.
- Evidence of valuable professional service.

Imperatives for appointment at, or promotion to, **Professor** in the College of Medicine include:

- Promotion to Professor connotes additional recognition for academic achievements.
- This appointment signifies that the individual is established as an authority and leader in the discipline, with a national-to-international reputation.
- Evidence of sustained Excellent performance at the expert level in the academic missions relevant to the faculty member's career.

Guiding questions when considering the appointment at, or promotion to, Professor:

- Has the candidate successfully developed a leadership role in research/scholarly activity, teaching, and service missions of the department, College, and the University, recognized at national or international levels?
- Is the candidate recognized, by peers, as a leading scholar in chosen field(s), or have they shown significant evidence to do so in the near future?
- Has the candidate developed, since last promotion, a research program that is sustainable in terms of extramural funding and shown evidence of high impact productivity?

4.4 Processes to Evaluate Tenured/Tenure-track Faculty

4.4.1 Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion](#).

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review. Their respective department heads are responsible for conducting this review.

In the event that an annual review is needed for a faculty member holding a budgeted joint appointment, all of the department heads must collaborate with each other to develop complete and accurate reviews. The department or College which holds the majority percentage of the faculty's FTE is responsible for crafting the letter and must seek input from the unit heads in which the faculty holds other FTE percentages. For more detailed information, see section 2.4.4 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and Tenure](#) which specifically addresses annual reviews for faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments.

Annual reviews for faculty whose primary area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., vice deans, associate deans, department heads, or directors) will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For faculty members with an administrative appointment, and also have faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head regarding the faculty member's performance in the latter areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head, with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one annual evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

4.4.1.1 Purpose of the Annual Review

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding how well the faculty member is currently performing relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty position.
- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure, as relevant.

4.4.1.2 Focus

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For tenured faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective performance. For tenure-track faculty, the annual review serves as an assessment of progress toward promotion and tenure.

4.4.1.3 Time Period of, and Timeline for, Review

Annual reviews are conducted in the spring semester of each academic year and focus on the immediately previous calendar year. The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases.

At the College of Medicine, the following shall be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the department head **no later than June 1st of each year**:

- Copies of the annual reviews, signed by both the Department Head and the

faculty member.

- Report to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, through the dean, from the department head, which certifies that all faculty (tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure track) have been reviewed, have received feedback, and have signed a copy of their written review. In this report, the department head must specifically indicate any tenure-track faculty member who is not progressing satisfactorily toward an affirmative tenure decision. Likewise, an unsatisfactory performance evaluation for a tenured faculty member must also be reported and the written plan for near-term improvement must accompany the report.

4.4.1.4 **Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance**

During an annual review, the Department Head will rate performance in each of the areas of faculty responsibility, using the *Indicators of Faculty Performance* (see Section 3.3):

- Unsatisfactory;
- Needs Improvement;
- Satisfactory;
- Exemplary;
- Most Meritorious

Ratings should be based on the *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* (see Section 4.2).

4.4.1.5 **Required Components:**

The annual review must contain the components listed below, in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and Tenure](#).

2. Faculty member's activity report:

The exact structure of the faculty member's activity report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College but must include the following:

- The activity report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year, while also allowing the faculty member to outline the status of long-term projects and provide context for which annual activities have occurred.
- The activity report should provide specific details of teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or clinical care activities from the previous calendar year, as appropriate.
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals. Examples of possible content for the report are listed in Section (2.4.3.3.) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 \(University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and tenure\)](#)

3. Department Head's Annual Review of the Faculty:

The department head will write a formal annual review, including:

- a. Individual evaluations for each of the faculty member's responsibilities/activities (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or clinical care) for the previous calendar year and ratings for each responsibility area;
- b. An overall rating of the previous calendar year's activities, which correlates with and/or is weighted to the FTE percentages in particular responsibility areas. For example, if a tenure-track faculty is 65% research/scholarly activity, then 65% of the overall rating must be based on research performance.
- c. A list of goals/expectations in each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, patient care/clinical practice) for the current calendar year.

The details of this evaluation and goals/expectations will be communicated with the faculty member in a memorandum or in the Annual Review document, which will be shared with the faculty member. The faculty member will acknowledge receipt of the Annual Review, including goals/expectations, by signing the document. Faculty should be allowed to provide written comments and/or discuss and mutually agree upon adjustments to goals/ expectations. A faculty member who refuses to sign the acknowledgment of the annual review will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file. The annual review and/or memorandum should include an informed judgment by the department head of the extent to which the faculty member is in compliance with applicable rules, policies, procedures, trainings, etc. If applicable (e.g., mid-term review), this memorandum and/or annual review must include information on whether the faculty member's progress towards promotion and/or tenure is on track or if additional professional development, mentoring, or other support is needed.

The annual review, memorandum, faculty activities report, and/or any related documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file and copies of all files will be transmitted to the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs for archiving.

4. Training and University Compliance:

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating or higher if they have not completed all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training) and/or compliance requirements (e.g., IT audits, equipment audits, conflict of interest, etc.). To satisfy these requirements, all faculty must complete the 'Certification of Trainings and Compliance' section of the Annual Review form.

4.4.1.6 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member.

The department head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the annual review and expectations/goals for the coming year. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

4.4.1.7 Outcomes of Annual Reviews with less than ‘Satisfactory’ ratings

4.4.1.7.1 Unsatisfactory Rating:

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as either:

- “Unsatisfactory” in any single area of faculty responsibility (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, patient care/clinical practice); or
- “Needs Improvement” in any two areas of faculty responsibility.

An annual review resulting in an overall “Unsatisfactory” performance rating shall state the basis for the rating, in accordance with both the *Indicators of Faculty Performance* (section 3.3) and *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* (see Section 4.2.). All overall “Unsatisfactory” ratings must be reported to the both the Dean and the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs. For tenured or tenure-track faculty members, the formal report for each “Unsatisfactory” performance evaluation must be accompanied by a written professional development plan, with detailed metrics and milestones, that are mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and department head. Professional development plans should not exceed three years in length. Regardless of the area(s) needing improvement or the length of the professional development plan, the faculty member’s progress must be assessed, discussed, and documented during regular reviews, at least quarterly or, ideally, monthly.

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide summaries of progress;
- It is the responsibility of the Department Head to schedule meetings and document regular reviews of progress;
- If the faculty member is making consistent progress on pre-determined metrics and milestones in the professional development plan, a rating of “Unsatisfactory” could be upgraded to “Needs Improvement” or higher in subsequent annual reviews;
- When the metrics and milestones of the performance improvement plan are achieved, the department head will formally document successful completion of the professional development plan in a memorandum to both the Dean and the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs;
- If the faculty member is not making consistent progress towards or fails to achieve the metrics and milestones of the professional development plan, the faculty member must undergo a Periodic Peer Review (see below);
- The faculty member may consult with the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and/or the faculty Ombudsperson whenever needed during the professional development process.

4.4.1.7.2 Needs Improvement Rating:

If a tenured or tenure-track faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty responsibility, they must work with their department head to immediately develop a written professional development plan. For improvements to teaching, this plan should take one year or less to

successfully complete. In other responsibility areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity), this professional development plan may take up to three years to successfully complete. Regardless of the area needing improvement or the length of the professional development plan, the faculty member's progress must be assessed and discussed during regular reviews, ideally at least twice per year.

As noted in the previous section, "Needs Improvement" ratings in any two areas of faculty responsibility will result in an overall "Unsatisfactory" rating, which must be reported to both the Dean and the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs and requires a more rigorous professional development plan with more frequent reviews (see above).

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide summaries of progress;
- It is the responsibility of the Department Head to schedule and document regular reviews of progress;
- If the faculty member is making consistent progress on pre-determined metrics and milestones in the professional development plan, a rating of "Needs Improvement" could be upgraded to "Satisfactory" or higher in subsequent annual reviews;
- If the metrics and milestones of the professional development plan are achieved, the department head will formally remove the professional development plan in a memorandum (maintained in the Department).
- If the metrics and milestones of the professional development plan are not achieved, the rating will be changed to "Unsatisfactory," prompting notification of the Dean and College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs (see previous section on "Unsatisfactory" ratings).

4.4.2 Mid-term Review

In accordance with both Section (4.3.5.2.) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion](#), and the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, published annually by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (VPFA), it is mandatory that a comprehensive mid-term review be conducted for tenure-track faculty subject to a probationary period (of five or more years) to determine their progress towards tenure. Mid-term reviews are normally conducted at the end of the third year.

4.4.2.1 Purpose

A mid-term review is intended to provide a formative review of tenure-track faculty members near the mid-point of their probationary period.

The mid-term review will familiarize the faculty member with the promotion and tenure process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion and tenure decision.

The mid-term review will ensure the faculty member has a clear understanding of their current status and progress.

The mid-term review should mimic the promotion and tenure review process as closely as possible, including submission of dossier items by the faculty member. However, only internal letters of recommendation will be solicited by the department, rather than external letters of recommendation. As with the promotion and tenure process, the mid-term review will include review by the department P&T committee, department head, College P&T committee, and dean.

The mid-term review should result in an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments and performance in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service, to date, as well as provide constructive guidance for the remainder of the probationary period. For some tenure-track faculty, additional responsibilities in administration and/or patient care/clinical practice also may be evaluated.

The mid-term review will be considered as the annual faculty performance review; it is not necessary for a department head to conduct an independent annual review for a tenure-track faculty member in the same year that their mid-term review is taking place.

If a tenure-track faculty member is not progressing adequately toward the requirements for tenure, action to not renew the contract of the individual will be taken in accordance to Section 2.2 of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion](#).

4.4.2.2 Process

The mid-term review should occur at the end of the third year, should not begin before March of the academic year prior to the target academic year, and should be completed before December of the target year. For example, if the mid-term review is due during the 2025-2026 academic year, the mid-term review may occur anytime between March 2025 and December 2025. See below for examples of faculty members hired in different calendar years.

Faculty Hired	Probationary Period	Mid-Term Review will occur between
Calendar year 2022	7 years	Mar – Dec 2025
Calendar year 2025	7 years	Mar – Dec 2028

The Department head will inform the faculty member of their upcoming mid-term review and instruct them to assemble the required mid-term review dossier documents. This review should mimic the tenure review process as closely as possible, however, external review letters are not required. The mid-term review will include dossier items contributed by the candidate using the latest Texas A&M Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

The faculty member will upload all required mid-term review dossier documents

to Interfolio/Faculty180.

The department P&T committee will review each dossier/case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the department head. The department P&T committee will separately evaluate each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), providing specific ratings (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3) in each area, and will provide an overall assessment rating. The department P&T committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the faculty member but, rather, must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member is or is not on track for promotion and tenure. Finally, the department P&T committee must also discuss what the mid-term faculty member can do to improve performance during the remainder of the probationary period.

After department P&T review, the department head will review the faculty dossier/ case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation. The department head will separately evaluate each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), providing specific ratings (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3) in each area, and will provide an overall assessment rating. The department head must not merely list the accomplishments of the faculty member but, rather, must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member is or is not on track for promotion and tenure. Finally, the department head must also discuss what the mid-term faculty member can do to improve performance during the remainder of the probationary period.

After department head review, the dossier/case will be forwarded to the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (via Interfolio/Faculty180) for verification and review. Mid-term review dossiers/cases should contain the following items:

- Faculty member's mid-term review dossier;
- Department P&T committee's written evaluation and recommendation for each faculty member
- Department head's written evaluation and recommendation for each faculty member.

The College P&T committee will review each mid-term review case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the dean, through the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The College P&T committee will separately evaluate each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), providing specific ratings (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3) in each area, and will provide an overall assessment rating. The College P&T committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the faculty member but, rather, must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member is or is not on track for promotion and tenure. Finally, the College P&T committee must also discuss what the mid-term faculty member can do to improve performance during the remainder of the probationary period.

The dean will review the dossier/case and write a report outlining the conclusions of the mid-term review, which is added to the dossier/case and also held in the COM Office of Faculty Affairs.

The Office of Faculty Affairs will provide feedback to the college committee and provide a copy of the dean's report to the department head.

The Department head will prepare a final report/memo to the faculty member, considering input from all review levels. The Department head will meet with the faculty member to discuss their progress and present the faculty member with the formal written review. If the mid-term faculty member is not making adequate progress towards tenure and promotion, the department head must create a written performance improvement plan, with detailed metrics and milestones, that are mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and department head, for the mid-term faculty member to improve performance during the remainder of the probationary period. The faculty member's progress must be assessed, discussed, and documented during regular reviews, at least quarterly or, ideally, monthly.

4.4.3 Processes for Promotion and Tenure of Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

4.4.3.1 Evaluation Criteria for Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty members should be evaluated for appointment, promotion, and tenure on accomplishments in each of the three primary areas of faculty responsibility (teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with primary emphasis on the quality, significance, and impact of their research/scholarly activity and teaching. For some tenure-track faculty, additional responsibilities in patient care/clinical practice also may be evaluated. For promotion and/or tenure, in addition to meritorious accomplishments, a high potential for continued excellence is required. Documentation of excellence is best provided by peer review. The faculty rank criteria for the College are articulated below. Faculty also may make contributions to administration, in support of the College's mission, but administration is not required for promotion.

4.4.3.1.1 Assistant Professor:

A **tenure-track Assistant Professor** is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate Effectiveness in teaching and to establish an excellent pattern of research/scholarly activity and publication. Service contributions, while normally limited, generally should be focused on departmental and College academic needs. Further, it is expected that Assistant Professors will display evidence of progress toward meeting the established criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

4.4.3.1.2 Associate Professor:

Faculty members appointed as Assistant Professor on the tenure track must achieve promotion to Associate Professor with tenure simultaneously within a seven-year probationary period.

In accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), the minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to **Associate Professor with tenure**, in addition to the criteria developed by the College, include:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contributions of others in the field.
- Professional and/or ethical conduct conducive to a work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of the University.
- An area of specialization germane to the programs of the University, which if currently represented on tenured faculty, the candidate will have made reasonable attempts to collaborate with those faculty members in an innovative manner, or an area of specialization that provides desired reinforcement in an area of priority.
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in teaching and research expected of a tenured faculty member.
- The candidate must demonstrate extramural funding sources for an independent and sustainable research program.

4.4.3.1.3 Professor:

In accordance with [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion), the minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for appointment at, or promotion to, **Professor with tenure** in addition to the criteria developed by the College, include:

- Continuing accomplishments in teaching.
- Continuing accomplishments and some measure of national or international recognition in research or another form of creative activity.
- Evidence of valuable professional service.

4.4.3.2 Purpose

The purpose of the promotion and tenure review process is intended to support faculty as they move through a career path and to recognize their growing expertise and contributions in their areas of responsibility. Before beginning the process, faculty members preparing for review should become familiar with the university promotion and tenure guidelines, the College of Medicine guidelines, and their specific department guidelines.

Reviewing these guidelines will familiarize the faculty member with the promotion and tenure process and ensure that the faculty member understands the expectations of those entities that will ultimately be responsible for the promotion and tenure decision.

4.4.3.3 Process

Candidates on the tenure track have a mandatory review date set at the time of hire. To calculate the academic year of mandatory review, take the calendar year hired and add the 7-year probationary period, then subtract 2 years,

resulting in the fall semester of the tenure consideration year. For example, a faculty member hired in 2020 with a 7-year probationary period will undergo mandatory tenure review in 2025-2026 ($2020 + 7 - 2 = 2025$). Faculty should consult their tenure-track agreement form (signed at time of hire) for their mandatory review year. Candidates may choose to undergo tenure review earlier than their mandatory year but **must** consult their department head before doing so.

Candidates should be advised that their department head will need to include in their review a statement about any documented and currently pending sanctions, requirements, or personnel issues that are not resolved at the time of the review. This does not include any allegations under investigation, past allegations that were dismissed, or past allegations where the faculty member was found responsible, but requirements or sanctions have been completed. The department head review will be part of the dossier beyond the department level.

In the spring of the faculty member's mandatory year, the department head will inform the faculty member of their upcoming tenure and promotion review. The candidate will build a review dossier comprising the materials required by the latest [Texas A&M Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

The faculty member will submit the required dossier materials (e.g., CV, impact statement, supplemental/supporting documents) to the department head using Interfolio/Faculty180. The candidate and the department head will generate a list of potential reviewers from peer or aspirational peer universities. External letters should be from tenured scholars at or above the rank being sought by the candidate. External reviewers must be arm's length, meaning that they should not have a professional, personal, or financial interest in the outcome of the promotion and tenure decision. A "Candidate External/Internal Reviewers Checklist" form must be completed and signed by the candidate. The department head then will request a minimum of five (5) arm's length letters, with seven (7) letters being preferred.

Once the case/dossier is complete, the department P&T committee will review each faculty case/dossier. The department P&T committee will prepare a summary report, with separate sections focused on each of the candidate's assigned responsibility areas, which should include teaching, research and/or other scholarly or creative activities, and service. For some tenure track faculty, additional responsibilities in administration and/or patient care/clinical practice also may be evaluated. The report must include the committee's evaluation and recommendation to the department head. Separate evaluations of each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), with specific ratings (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3) in each area, as well as an overall assessment rating must be provided. The department P&T committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the faculty member but, rather, must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member has or has not met the requirements for tenure and promotion. The department P&T report will be submitted to the department head through Interfolio/Faculty180.

Next, the department head will review the candidate's dossier/case, external reviewers' letters, and department P&T committee report and make an independent recommendation for/against tenure and/or promotion. The department head's report should include a discussion of the department P&T committee evaluations/recommendations and external review letters, especially if the department head disagrees with either the department P&T committee or external reviewers and should provide any further evaluations based on the dossier and the faculty member's activities in the department. The department head will submit their report through Interfolio/Faculty180, where review at the college level begins.

After department head review, the dossier/case will be forwarded to the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (via Interfolio/Faculty180) for verification and review.

Next, the College P&T committee will review each dossier/case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the dean. The College P&T committee will separately evaluate each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service), providing specific ratings (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3) in each area, and will provide an overall assessment rating. The College P&T committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the faculty member but, rather, must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member has or has not met the requirements for tenure and promotion. The College P&T Committee report is submitted to the Dean through Interfolio/Faculty180.

Upon completion of the college P&T review, the dean will review the dossier/case and write a report which is a summary analysis of the case, providing a general basis for strengths or weaknesses, addressing any mixed or negative votes, and explaining if the dean supports or does not support promotion and tenure. If the dean's vote is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations, it will be clearly and specifically addressed in the dean's report.

Upon completion of the dean's report, the entire dossier is submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. It will undergo further review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Regents. Ultimately, the Board of Regents holds the power to award tenure. The decision is generally made at the spring Board meeting and announced to the college at a later date.

Upon receiving notification from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the college notifies the candidate of the board's final decision.

4.4.4 Post-tenure Review

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review](#), post-tenure review applies to tenured faculty members and is intended to promote continued academic professional development and enable a faculty member who has fallen below performance norms to pursue a peer-coordinated professional development plan and return to expected levels of productivity. Post-tenure reviews should occur at least once

every six years.

A post-tenure review is composed of:

- 1) Annual performance reviews (see Section 4.4.1) conducted by the department head (or individual/supervisor responsible for conducting the annual review);
- 2) Review of the last five years of annual evaluations by a committee of peers (i.e., Periodic Peer Review, see next section);
- 3) Faculty submission of an updated CV and summary of accomplishments (similar to the promotion and tenure Impact Statement) over the last five years

4.4.4.1 Expectations

In accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review](#):

The College of Medicine expects tenured faculty to perform satisfactorily in academic endeavors of teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care/clinical practice, etc.) throughout their career.

- Percent effort on these responsibilities may be modified but should not be reduced to zero in any area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, service). A decrease in expectation in one should be matched by a concomitant increase in load expectations in another area. However, volume of work does not equate to quality.
- Alternate work assignments (such as administration) may replace one or more areas in certain situations but only with the written approval of department head and dean. Faculty are to be reviewed based upon the assigned duties (this would include administrative assignments) of their position.

4.4.5 Periodic Peer Review

Texas Education Code section 51.942 requires that tenured faculty at State of Texas institutions of higher education be subject to a comprehensive performance evaluation process conducted no more often than once every year, but no less often than once every six years, after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion at the institution. The College of Medicine will conduct periodic peer reviews, including post-tenure reviews, of tenured faculty in accordance with [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review](#), no less frequently than once every six years after the date the faculty member was granted tenure or received an academic promotion in rank. The evaluation should be based on the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, and other assigned responsibilities. Periodic peer reviews, including post-tenure reviews, take the place of the faculty member's annual performance review.

Periodic peer reviews, including post-tenure reviews, only should be conducted by tenured faculty at the same rank or higher than the candidate.

4.4.5.1 Purpose of Periodic Peer Review

- Assess whether the individual is making contributions consistent with those expected of a tenured faculty member;
- Provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development;
- Recognize faculty who continue to exceed expectations;
- Assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals;
- Refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate.

4.4.5.2 Process for Periodic Peer Review

A. Materials to be reviewed by tenured faculty member's **departmental peer group**:

- Faculty member's updated CV;
- Statement, similar to the promotion and tenure Impact Statement, by the faculty member that summarizes the major accomplishments/achievements in teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, and other responsibilities they have been assigned over the last six years. The faculty member also should include a list of goals for the next six years. The statement page limit is three (3) pages, single-spaced, 12-point font.
- Faculty member's annual reviews from the previous past five years (see Section 4.4.1).
- Any other pertinent materials that the faculty member may want to submit.

The departmental peer group will review all submitted materials and will generate an advisory report that includes an evaluation rating (see Section 3.3, *Indicators of Faculty Performance*) for each area of responsibility (e.g., teaching, service, administration, patient care/clinical practice), as well as an overall evaluation rating, to be included with the post-tenure review package for review by the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

B. Materials to be reviewed by the **College Promotion and Tenure Committee**:

- All previously submitted materials (see above)
- Advisory (nonbinding) report from the tenured faculty member's departmental peer group about the impact of the faculty member's responsibilities, including teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, and other responsibilities.

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the submitted materials and prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's activities, providing

evaluation ratings (see Section 3.3, *Indicators of Faculty Performance*) for each of the categories/responsibilities of teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, and other assigned responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care/clinical practice), as well as an overall evaluation rating.

- If all of the relevant review categories are “**Satisfactory**”, “**Exemplary**”, or “**Most Meritorious**”, the faculty member will be undergo a post-tenure again in six years, or following an “**Unsatisfactory**” annual evaluation by the department head, whichever is earlier.
- A rating of “**Unsatisfactory**” performance in any individual category/responsibility shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* (Section 4.2), described above. An unsatisfactory Periodic Peer Review will trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (see section 4.4.6, below).
-
- A finding of “**Needs Improvement**” in any two categories shall state the basis for that finding in accordance with the *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* (Section 4.2), described above. Such an outcome will also trigger the initiation of a Professional Development Review (see section 4.4.6, below).
- A rating of “**Needs Improvement**” in a single category must specifically elaborate the deficiencies, in writing, to better inform the immediate development of a near-term improvement plan, developed in collaboration between the department head and the faculty member.

For tenured faculty with budgeted joint appointments, Periodic Peer Review will be conducted as per the post-tenure review guidelines of the department or program where the faculty holds the majority of the appointment (*ad loc*). If a faculty member holds tenured appointments in two departments, **both units** should conduct a review.

The College Tenure and Faculty Promotion Committee will provide to the dean and the Office of Faculty Affairs the list of those faculty who underwent Periodic Peer Review, the outcome of the review, and the year when each tenured faculty last underwent a review. **This Periodic Peer Review report must be provided no later than May 31 of each year.** The College Tenure and Faculty Promotion Committee’s written evaluation and the faculty member’s post-tenure review documents must be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file in compliance with Texas A&M records retention policies.

4.4.6 Professional Development Review

A professional development review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive overall “Unsatisfactory” annual reviews (see Section 4.4.1), an “Unsatisfactory” Periodic Peer Review (including post-tenure review; see Sections 4.4.4 or 4.4.5), or upon request of either the department head or the faculty member (see below). The department head will inform the faculty member that they are subject to a Professional Development Review and will provide details about the nature and

procedures of the review. A faculty member can be exempted from review upon recommendation of the department head and approval of the dean when substantive mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness) exist. The faculty member may be aided by private legal counsel or another representative at any stage during the Professional Development Review process.

4.4.6.1 Purpose

The purposes of the Professional Development Review are to:

- Identify and officially acknowledge substantial or chronic deficits in performance;
- Develop a specific professional development plan by which to remedy deficiencies;
- Monitor progress toward achievement of the professional development plan.

4.4.6.2 Process

The Professional Development Review will be conducted by an *ad hoc* review committee (hereafter referred to as the review committee), unless the faculty member requests that it be conducted by the department head. The three-member *ad hoc* faculty review committee will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with the department head and faculty member undergoing review. When appropriate, the committee membership may include faculty from other departments, colleges, or universities.

The faculty member undergoing professional development review will prepare a dossier by providing all documents, materials, and statements they deem relevant and necessary for the review within one month of notification of Professional Development Review. All materials submitted by the faculty member will be included in the dossier. Although review dossiers will differ, the dossier will include, at minimum:

- Current/updated CV;
- Statement and supporting information on current teaching;
- Statement and supporting information on current research/ scholarship; or creative work;
- Statement and supporting information on current service;
- Statement and supporting information on other responsibilities (e.g., administration, patient care/clinical practice)

The department head will add to the dossier any further materials they deem necessary or relevant to the review of the faculty member's academic performance. The department should provide copies of the prior six years of annual reviews for the review committee. The faculty member has the right to review and respond in writing to any materials added by the department head with the written response included in the dossier. In addition, the faculty member has the right to add any materials at any time prior to the date of the review committee meeting.

The Professional Development Review will be made in a timely fashion (normally within three months after submission of the dossier). The Professional Development Review will result in one of three possible outcomes:

1. **No deficiencies are identified.** The faculty member, department head, and dean are informed, in writing, of the review committee's decision, and the outcome of the prior annual review is superseded by the *ad hoc* committee report;
2. **Some deficiencies are identified but are not substantial or chronic.** The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies, in writing, and a copy is provided to the faculty member, the department head, and the dean to better inform the near-term improvement plan, which must be put in place no later than forty-five (45) days after the review committee's final report;
3. **Substantial or chronic deficiencies are identified.** The review committee specifically elaborates the deficiencies in writing and a copy is provided to the faculty member, department head, and dean. The faculty member, review committee, and department head shall then work together to draw up a "Professional Development Plan" (see next section) that is acceptable to the dean. A copy of the Professional Development Plan should be sent to the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs.

4.4.6.3 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan shall indicate how specific deficiencies in a faculty member's performance (as measured against *Indicators of Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* [Section 4.2]) will be remedied. The professional development plan will be developed with collaboration among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean and should reflect the mutual aspirations of the faculty member, the department, and the College of Medicine, in a time frame not to exceed three years. The review committee's evaluation will inform the creation of the plan. A copy of this plan will be submitted to the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs. It is the faculty member's obligation to assist in the development of a meaningful and effective plan and to make a good faith effort to implement the final plan.

Although each professional development plan is tailored to individual circumstances, the plan will:

- Identify specific deficiencies to be addressed.
- Define specific goals or outcomes necessary to remedy the deficiencies.
- Outline the activities to be undertaken to achieve the necessary outcomes.
- Establish timelines for accomplishing the activities and achieving intermediate and ultimate outcomes. The overall timeline may not exceed

three years.

- Indicate the criteria for assessment in annual or semi-annual reviews of progress in the plan.
- Identify institutional resources to be committed in support of the plan.

4.4.6.4 **Assessment of the Professional Development Plan**

The faculty member and department head will meet regularly (at least twice per year; ideally more often) to review the faculty member's progress toward remedying deficiencies. Progress towards the completion of a professional development plan will be reported to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (through the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs) on an annual basis. Evaluation of the faculty member's performance within the regular faculty performance evaluation process (e.g. annual reviews) must draw upon the faculty member's progress in achieving the goals outlined in the Professional Development Plan. As specified in [University SAP 12.06.99.M0.01 Post-Tenure Review](#), if the faculty member fails to make sufficient and continuous progress, based on the goals and timelines in their Professional Development Plan, this may constitute grounds for dismissal with cause.

4.4.6.5 **Completion of the Professional Development Plan**

When the objectives of the Professional Development Plan have been met, the agreed timeline expires, or in any case, no later than three years after the start of the Professional Development Plan, the department head shall prepare a final report to the faculty member and dean that outlines a summary of outcomes, progress during the plan timeline, meeting summaries during the plan timeline, etc. This final report will be sent from the department head through the Dean to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

If, at the conclusion of the stated time period for the development plan, the department head and dean agree that the faculty member has failed to meet the goals of the Professional Development Plan and that the deficiencies at the time of the plan expiration constitute grounds for dismissal under applicable tenure policies, dismissal proceedings may be initiated under applicable policies governing tenure, academic freedom, and academic responsibility.

4.4.6.6 **Appeal**

If, at any point during the Professional Development Review or Professional Development Plan, the faculty member believes the provisions of this procedure are being unfairly applied, a grievance can be filed under the provisions of [University Standard Administrative Procedure 12.99.99.M0.01 \(Faculty Grievances Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights\)](#).

If the faculty member wishes to contest the composition of the Professional Development Review committee due to specific conflict of interests with one or more of the proposed committee members, an appeal may be made to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. After consultation with the faculty member,

department head, and the dean, the decision of the Office of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on the committee composition is final.

If the faculty member wishes to contest the Professional Development Review committee's finding of substantial or chronic deficiencies, the faculty member may appeal the finding to the dean, whose decision on such an appeal is final.

If the faculty member and department head fail to agree on a Professional Development Plan acceptable to the dean, the Plan will be determined through mediation directed by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

4.4.6.7 Department Head-Initiated Professional Development Review

Department Heads may initiate, with approval from the Dean, Professional Development Reviews for tenured faculty who receive one "Unsatisfactory" annual review (see Section 4.4.1) or whose annual review contains "Needs Improvement" in at least two areas of responsibility.

4.4.6.8 Voluntary Professional Development Review

A tenured faculty member desirous of a voluntary Professional Development Review may seek a review by peers, through a Periodic Peer Review or a Professional Development Review, by making a request to their department head.

5. Criteria and Processes for Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

5.1 Areas of APT Faculty Responsibility

Decisions on annual reviews, promotion, merit compensation, and other reviews will be based upon the faculty member's performance in each assigned APT faculty responsibility, which may include: (1) Teaching; (2) Research/Scholarly Activity; (3) Service; (4) Administration; or (5) Patient Care/Clinical Practice. Descriptions of faculty expectations in their assigned areas of faculty responsibility are presented below. Alternate work responsibilities (e.g. administration, etc.) may replace one or more responsibilities in certain situations, but only with the written approval of the Department Head and Dean. Faculty with alternate work responsibilities will be reviewed based on assigned duties (including administrative assignments).

Although some quantitative measures of evaluation may be employed, excellence and potential for continued excellence in performance are of primary importance. That is, the quality, significance and impact of accomplishments are of much greater importance than the quantity, per se. However, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance.

5.2 Indicators of APT Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness

5.2.1 Teaching

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluations of Teaching are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited

involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of a faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. The supervisor should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence to evaluate the faculty member fairly.

Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer-evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes.
- Demonstrated evidence of teaching excellence by selection for peer reviewed University, college, healthcare system, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction awards.
- Participation in development of questions for specialty board examinations.
- Contribution to new instructional program development.
- Development of new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses.
- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals.
- Publication of the results of education research endeavors.
- Publication of scholarly review articles, textbooks, original clinical investigations, descriptions of clinical experience, or case reports/results that emphasize education endeavors.
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like).
- Development of innovative or acclaimed instructional materials including syllabi or software.
- Presentation at professional meetings or other institutions of higher education that serve the teaching mission of the college.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence.
- Evidence of successful career paths of former medical students, graduate students and postdoctoral students.
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s).
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects or education research.
- Leading a major curriculum development, assessment, or redesign effort for the introduction of innovative technology or novel teaching methodologies in the instructional setting.
- High quality of teaching to multiple instructional programs.
- Leadership role in educational activities of national/international professional societies.
- Chair of doctoral student committees.
- Placement of doctoral students or medical students into significant academic, scholarly, and/or professional positions.
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to doctoral student development.

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Good teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes.
- Evidence of contributing to or coordinating courses or both.
- Coordination of team-taught or integrated courses.
- Rigorous, accurate, and equitable grading.
- Development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes.
- Service as a member of thesis/dissertation committees of graduate students.
- Mentoring and training medical students or post-graduate residents in experimental experiences and postgraduate residencies.
- Favorable evaluation by faculty mentored by the candidate.
- Direction of independent student research.
- Mentoring of junior colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality.
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness.
- Introduction of current and emerging instructional methodologies and technologies in the curriculum.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College
- Development of pedagogical approaches to enhance student engagement and to optimize student learning.
- Introduction of practices to evaluate the engagement of students in a critical analysis of course material, or which evaluate their involvement in research or scholarly activity.
- Contribution to a college-wide culture of evidence-based approaches to evaluation and improvement of academic programs.
- Development of valuable evidence-based metrics for teaching effectiveness.
- Preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs.
- Selection for student or departmental awards for outstanding teaching/instruction.
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects.
- Evidence of active teaching of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows in the laboratory setting.
- Consistent membership on graduate student committees.

5.2.2 Research/Scholarly Activity

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have

limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, and book chapters.

- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by high-quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top-tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity** include, but are not limited to:

- Recognition from peers in the field, e.g., fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings.
- A substantial record of peer-reviewed primary and/or corresponding senior authored publications that demonstrate evidence of originality as an investigator.
- Publications of original research in the leading peer-reviewed, discipline-related journals.
- Favorable citation index listing of research/educational publications within their respective discipline.
- Consistent, sustainable, and competitive external funding for research.
- Key participation in forming productive collaborative research arrangements with industry, community agencies, foundations, and other academic institutions.
- Significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements.
- Coordination of interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects.
- Publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s).
- Leadership of national meetings or workshops
- Authorship of a textbook, textbook chapter, review articles, contributions of published symposia.
- Editorship or associate editorship of scholarly, refereed journals, or of special issues of a journal.
- Recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars.
- Evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the

- interface with other academic disciplines.
- Originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspective on, and uses of information.
 - Peer-reviewed publication of instructional materials, e.g., case studies, textbooks, or electronic instructional materials.
 - Extramural recognition for contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant, service on editorial boards of prestigious journals in the chosen area of teaching scholarship, and invitations to present keynote or plenary national or international meetings concerning education.
 - Significant extramural funding for research on issues of importance in teaching.
 - Publication of critically acclaimed chapters, books, or comparable electronic materials about education.
 - Election to membership in major national research societies.
 - Dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs.
 - Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the college.
 - Editorship or associate editorship of a major journal in the chosen area of teaching scholarship.
 - Serving on national grant organization study sections, review panels, or site visit teams.
 - Serving on national professional society program committees.
 - Election to major national professional societies.
 - A senior leadership role demonstrating superior competence and outstanding productivity on research projects.
 - Consistent and sustainable extramural support for an established research program.
 - Service on National Advisory Councils or Boards, Editorship of journals, leadership of national/international study sections, consensus panels, etc.
 - Frequent citation of publications.

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Research/Scholarly Activity** include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of articles in professional journals appropriate to the field of endeavor. Greater significance will be attributed to primary and corresponding authored papers in peer reviewed journals, but all co-primary and co-corresponding publications will be evaluated.
- Publication of books, monographs, or manuals on paper or in electronic media that are widely disseminated, evaluated by peers, and advance the field of endeavor.
- Award of extramural support commensurate with the current primary field of research.
- Demonstration of a sustained leadership role in an independent research program (e.g., research program leader or laboratory/clinic director).
- Evidence for a principal role in management and/or support of a collaborative research program (e.g., letters from program leader or members of the research program).
- Development/award of patents for discoveries in the candidate's field.

- Leadership and/or organization of peer-reviewed clinical trials as documented by program reviews or letters.
- Participation in interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects.
- Invited presentations of original scientific data at regional/state/national meetings, or at major institutions or research organizations.
- Service on editorial boards of journals.
- A national and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of reference.
- Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines.
- Publication in non-refereed journals that are widely recognized.
- Publication of a respected professional book.
- Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs.
- Presentation of papers at regional/state/national conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines.
- Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s).
- Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national or international organizations.
- Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings.
- Well-documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others.
- Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness.
- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals.
- Publication of technical reports, case reports, or monographs in peer-reviewed journals.
- Presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings.
- Contribution in area of expertise to the scholarship of others.
- Authorship of review articles.
- Serving as a research mentor for medical students or residents.
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies adopted by other faculty members within the college

5.2.3 Service

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Service are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in service. Effectiveness must be supported by high quality manuscripts, grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national-level service in professional organizations would be typical.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations.

Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Officer, committee chair, or board/committee member in a national/international professional organization in one's discipline or national/international task force.
- Program chair or similar position for a national/international meeting.
- Administrative leadership role within the College or University.
- Chair of a major University committee or task force.
- Demonstration of a significant time commitment to or role in committee work.
- Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, College, University, or system administrative or service roles.
- Service on study sections (or scientific peer review groups), consensus panels, etc.
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, committee, or board.
- Attainment of significant external development support.
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal. This activity per se is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of an editorial board can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Service as a frequent ad hoc member or permanent member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies, or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).
- Organization of regional, national, and international symposia and colloquia.
- Significant and effective mentorship of junior faculty members as evidenced by selection for College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards.
- Awards that recognize clinical expertise.
- Consultation as requested by other faculty members.
- Service as a consultant on clinical care (e.g., third-party payment groups, courts, health organizations).
- Holding leadership roles in hospital or healthcare organizations.
- Membership or fellowship in elected professional organization that denotes high level of clinical competency.

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Committee chair of regional/state/national professional organization.
- Service on University, College, department committees, and task forces.
- Serving in administrative roles within the department.
- Contribution to external development efforts.
- Advisor to student organizations.
- Administrative roles within the department.
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups.
- Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies.
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large.
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness.
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. This activity per se is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities.
- Participation in: Departmental, College, or University strategic planning, search committees, College seminar programs, faculty development programs, assessment programs, symposia and colloquia, and student recruitment activities.
- Presentation of continuing education programs.
- Invited presentations at academic and professional groups.
- Development and participation in health care service to community programs.
- Certification by specialty board.
- Referral of patients from practitioners both within and outside the University.
- Expression of confidence and respect from patients and clinical staff.
- Application of current methods in clinical care.
- Membership on a specialty examining board.
- Diligent efforts to make clinical and private clinical care efficient and effective.
- Occasional service as an ad hoc member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).

5.2.4 Other APT Faculty Responsibilities

5.2.4.1 Administration:

Some APT faculty may be assigned, by the Department Head or Dean, administrative responsibilities that are central to the mission of the College of Medicine. It is important to note that some administrative duties may result in decreased efforts in other major areas, including teaching and/or research/scholarly activity. While faculty may make contributions to administration, administration is not required for promotion..

Examples of administrative activities include Department Heads, Associate Department Heads, Assistant/Associate Deans, Directors, etc.

5.2.4.2 **Patient Care/Clinical Practice:**

Clinical APT faculty are expected to provide exemplary clinical care/advocacy that is respected by patients and peers both within the College of Medicine and in the professional community.

Examples of activities that relate to clinical care/advocacy include but are not limited to: certification by specialty board; engagement in either in-patient or out-patient care; consultation to patients and other healthcare providers; participation in professional organizations; improvement in clinical care through educating medical students, residents and fellows; innovation in clinical care technologies; involvement in continuing medical education (CME) either as presenters or trainees; establishment of professional relationships with nursing or other healthcare staff.

5.3 Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty Categories and Ranks:

The academic professional track (APT) faculty are those faculty not on the tenure-track who contribute to the mission of the College of Medicine in more focused ways. Normally APT faculty are evaluated on a primary area of responsibility (teaching or research/scholarly activity) of the non-tenure track appointment but also may be expected to contribute in more than a single area of teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service, as applicable to their faculty title. There is no prohibition for APT faculty to be involved in multiple duties related to teaching, research/scholarly activity, or service. However, decisions regarding hiring, continuation of employment, and evaluation of APT faculty performance should relate to the primary and secondary responsibilities of their appointment and not be based on all three areas.

5.3.1 **Instructional Assistant Professor, Instructional Associate Professor, and Instructional Professor**

Instructional faculty appointments are for individuals who are University-employed. Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, primarily in the non-clinical settings, and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of research/scholarly activity, service, or administration.

5.3.2 **Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor**

Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the area of teaching, primarily in the clinical setting and are required only to make significant contributions to either the area of research/scholarly activity, service, administration, or patient care/clinical practice.

5.3.3 **Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor**

Research faculty appointments are for individuals who are University-employed.

Faculty in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in research/scholarly activities and may contribute to either service or teaching. These faculty members normally have no obligation to teach regular courses and normally do not have significant, reoccurring classroom teaching assignments.

Faculty in these appointments are subject to the guidelines posted by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Vice President for Research (<https://facultyaffairs.tamu.edu/index.html>). These types of appointments require the pre-approval of the position by the Texas A&M University Vice President for Research (VPR) (<https://vpr.tamu.edu/>).

5.3.4 Joint Faculty

Joint appointments occur within the context of the University or University agencies. In a **true joint appointment** situation, the employee of one University department is appointed part of their time to work for another University department, thereby splitting the full-time effort between both departments.

In a **courtesy joint appointment** situation, the request is based on a desire of the University department where the faculty member is housed to have the faculty member perform certain non-remunerated duties for another University department. A University faculty member appointed under a joint appointment is appointed with the same title held by the faculty member in their home University department.

5.4 Evaluation Criteria for Academic Professional Track (APT) Appointment and Promotion

For appointment and promotion in the academic professional track (APT; non-tenure track), faculty members with Clinical, Instructional, or Research titles should be evaluated in the primary area of faculty responsibility.

For APT Faculty promotion, in addition to meritorious accomplishments in the primary responsibility area, a high potential for continued excellence in the same primary responsibility area is expected. For APT Faculty promotion, evidence of additional faculty performance in a secondary area is expected (e.g., Clinical and Instructional faculty are expected to provide evidence of either research/scholarly activity, service, and/or patient care/clinical practice; Research faculty are expected to provide evidence of either teaching activities, service, and/or patient care/clinical practice).

- Teaching/education: For faculty with Clinical or Instructional titles, the primary emphasis will be on the quality and impact of their teaching activities.
- Research: For faculty with Research titles, the primary emphasis will be on the quality and impact of their research activities.

- Service: All faculty members are expected to provide service to the College of Medicine, Texas A&M University, and/or their profession.
- Patient care/clinical practice: For clinical faculty, in addition to teaching in the clinical setting, additional responsibilities in patient care and clinical service duties will be evaluated. For promotion, patient care/clinical practice only applies to clinical employed faculty at Texas A&M University since it has a direct impact to the College and University.
- Administration: For faculty with administrative appointments, different levels of effort will be devoted to administration, in support of the College's mission. However, administration is not required for promotion.

5.4.1 Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of Instructional Track APT Faculty

5.4.1.1 Instructional Assistant Professor:

In accordance with the Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles, the minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for appointment at or promotion to Instructional Assistant Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- A Ph.D. or terminal degree in a discipline relevant to the research programs of Texas A&M University;
- Evidence of strong teaching abilities and potential for scholarship.

5.4.1.1.1 Imperatives for appointment at, or promotion to, Instructional Assistant Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- An Instructional Assistant Professor is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Effectiveness** in teaching and to establish a productive pattern of research, service, or administration contributions to the department, College and/or University.

5.4.1.2 Instructional Associate Professor:

In accordance with the [Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles](#), the **minimum requirements** to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Instructional Associate Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- The candidate is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Excellence** in the area of teaching;
- At a minimum, the candidate is expected to demonstrate **Effectiveness** in one other secondary area of responsibility;

- In addition, a high potential for continued excellence in teaching is required;
- The granting of promotion to Instructional Associate Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three areas of faculty responsibility, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of teaching activities. As noted, this should include a pattern over time of **Excellence** and impact in teaching as well as a pattern over time of **Effectiveness** in either the area of service to the University and/or national professional organizations, the area of research/scholarly activities, or administration.

5.4.1.2.1 **Imperatives** for appointment at, or promotion to, Instructional Associate Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- An Instructional Associate Professor is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Excellence** in teaching, and to establish a productive pattern of research, service contributions to the department, College and/or University, or administrative contributions to the College.

5.4.1.3 **Instructional Professor:**

In accordance with the [Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles](#), the **minimum requirements** to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Instructional Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- The granting of promotion to Instructional Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three areas of faculty responsibility, with a primary emphasis on the high quality and impact of teaching activities. This would include a pattern over time of **Excellence** and impact in teaching as well as a pattern over time of **Effectiveness** in either the area of service to the University and/or national professional organizations, the area of research/scholarly activities, or administration.

5.4.1.4 **Imperatives** for appointment at, or promotion to, Instructional Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- Accomplishments and evidence of recognition in teaching;
- Evidence of valuable professional service to the department and/or University;
- These faculty are expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Excellence** in teaching, and **Effectiveness** in research, service contributions to the department, College and/or University, as well as clinical care and/or clinical service.

5.4.2 Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of APT Clinical Track Faculty

5.4.2.1 Clinical Assistant Professor:

In accordance with the Texas A&M University [Guidelines for Faculty Titles](#), the **minimum requirements** to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- A M.D., D.O., or other terminal medical degree in a discipline relevant to the clinical instruction programs of the College of Medicine and Texas A&M University;
- Evidence of strength in patient care and/or clinical practice, as well as potential for strong performance in their assigned performance areas, as determined by their FTE.

5.4.2.1.1 Imperatives for appointment at, or promotion to, Clinical Assistant Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- A Clinical Assistant Professor is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Effectiveness** in clinical care or clinical practice duties and to establish a productive pattern of teaching or service, incident to their primary responsibilities in their Department.

5.4.2.2 Clinical Associate Professor:

In accordance with the [Guidelines to Faculty Titles](#), the **minimum requirements** to be met by individuals being considered for appointment at or promotion to Clinical Associate Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- An exemplary level of clinical accomplishment as measured against the contribution of others in their field;
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that advance the interests of the University;
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in clinical care and/or clinical duties expected of a faculty member;
- The granting of promotion to Clinical Associate Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the areas of faculty performance, with a primary emphasis on the quality and impact of patient care or clinical practice duties. This would include a pattern over time of **Excellence** and impact in patient care and clinical practice duties as well as a pattern over time of **Effectiveness** in either the area of teaching, service to the University and/or national professional organizations, administration, or the area of research/scholarly activities.

5.4.2.2.1 **Imperatives** for appointment at, or promotion to, Clinical Associate Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- A Clinical Associate Professor is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Excellence** in patient care and clinical practice duties and to establish an **Effective** pattern of education, administration, or service contributions to the department, College, and/or University.

5.4.2.3 **Clinical Professor:**

In accordance with the [Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles](#), the **minimum requirements** to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Clinical Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- Accomplishments and evidence of state, regional, or national recognition in patient care and clinical practice duties;
- Evidence of accomplishment in other faculty responsibility areas, determined by the faculty member's FTE;
- In addition to meeting the requirements for Clinical Associate Professor, the promotion to Clinical Professor will be based on an assessment of two of the three areas of faculty responsibility, with a primary focus on the high quality and impact of clinical teaching/education and service contributions to the department, College and/or University.

5.4.2.4 **Imperatives** for appointment at, or promotion to, Clinical Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- A Clinical Professor is expected to demonstrate a pattern of excellence and impact in patient care and clinical practice, service to the University, national professional organizations, administration, or research/scholarly activities. This includes a pattern of **Excellence** and impact in patient care/clinical practice over time, as well as **Excellence** in either service to the University and/or national professional organizations, research/scholarly activities, or clinical practice duties.

5.4.3 Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of APT Research Faculty:

5.4.3.1 **Research Assistant Professor:**

In accordance with the [Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles](#), the minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Research Assistant Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- A Ph.D. or terminal degree in a discipline relevant to the research programs of Texas A&M University;
- Evidence of strong research abilities and potential for scholarship.

5.4.3.1.1 Imperatives for appointment at, or promotion to Research Assistant Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- A Research Assistant Professor is expected, at a minimum, to demonstrate **Effectiveness** in research/scholarly activity. The candidate must demonstrate evidence of **Effectiveness** in mentoring graduate students or postdoctoral fellows in the laboratory or **Effectiveness** in service contributions to the department, College, and/or University;
- The candidate must demonstrate potential in obtaining extramural funding and be working toward becoming an independent researcher.

5.4.3.2 Research Associate Professor:

In accordance with the [Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles](#), the **minimum requirements** to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Research Associate Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- An exemplary level of accomplishment as measured against the contribution of others in their field;
- Professional conduct conducive to a collegial work environment and standards of professional integrity that will advance the interests of the University;
- An area of specialization germane to the research programs of the department, College and University;
- Evidence indicating a commitment to maintaining the level of competence in research expected of a faculty member.

5.4.3.2.1 Imperatives for appointment at, or promotion to Research Associate Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- A Research Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate **Excellence** in research/scholarly activity. The candidate must demonstrate evidence of **Effectiveness** in mentoring graduate students or postdoctoral fellows in the laboratory or **Effectiveness** in service contributions to the department, College, and/or University;
- The candidate must demonstrate the unequivocal promise of a continuing high level of sustained productivity and scholarly activity.

5.4.3.3 Research Professor:

In accordance with the [Guidelines for Texas A&M University Faculty Titles](#), the minimum requirements to be met by individuals being considered for appointment or promotion to Research Professor, in addition to the criteria developed by the College of Medicine, include:

- Accomplishments and evidence of national and international recognition in research;
- Evidence of valuable professional service;

5.4.3.3.1 **Imperatives** for appointment at, or promotion to Research Professor in the College of Medicine include:

- The Research Professor must demonstrate established authority or leadership in the respective research discipline, with a national or international reputation;
- The candidate must demonstrate evidence of sustained **Excellence** in productivity at the expert level in the candidate's respective research disciplines;
- The candidate must demonstrate a sustainable research program and continued extramural funding sources.

5.5 Processes to Evaluate Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

5.5.1 Annual Review

Annual reviews of performance are to be conducted in accordance with Section (2.4) of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Tenure, and Promotion.

All University-employed faculty members, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must have an annual written review. Their respective department heads are responsible for conducting this review.

In the event that an annual review is needed for a faculty holding a budgeted joint appointment, department heads must collaborate with the heads of the appropriate units to develop accurate reviews. The department or College that holds the majority percentage of the faculty's FTE is responsible for crafting the letter and must seek input from the unit heads in which the faculty holds other FTE percentages. For more detailed information, see section 2.4.4 of University Rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and tenure, which specifically addresses annual reviews for faculty who hold budgeted joint appointments.

Annual reviews for faculty whose primary area of responsibility is administrative (e.g., vice deans, associate deans, department heads, or directors) will be conducted by their immediate supervisor. For faculty members with an administrative appointment and also have faculty responsibilities such as teaching and/or research, the immediate supervisor is required to solicit feedback from the department head regarding the faculty member's performance in the latter areas. Faculty with administrative appointments equal to or less than 25% effort are to be evaluated annually by their department head with input from the supervisor of the administrative appointment. A faculty member should receive only one annual evaluation that covers all areas of responsibility.

5.5.1.1 Purpose of the Annual Review:

- Provide evaluative feedback regarding how well the faculty member is currently performing relative to the expectations and norms for the individual's faculty

position.

- Provide developmental feedback regarding areas where the faculty member's contributions may be enhanced and/or improved.
- Provide feedback regarding progress toward promotion, as relevant.

5.5.1.2 Focus of the Annual Review:

The focus of the annual review process will vary by title and rank and the stage of the individual's career at the time of the review. For APT faculty, the annual review evaluates continued effective performance. It may also serve as a method to assess progress toward promotion.

5.5.1.3 Time Period of, and Timeline for, Annual Review:

Annual reviews are conducted in the spring semester of each academic year and focus on the immediately previous calendar year. The annual review process is set to conclude prior to the beginning of the budgetary process, thereby enabling department heads to assess faculty performance when determining salary merit increases.

At the College of Medicine, the following shall be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs by the department head **no later than June 1st of each year:**

- Copies of the annual reviews, signed by both the Department Head and the faculty member.
- Report to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, through the Dean, from the department head, which certifies that all faculty have been reviewed, have received feedback, and have signed a copy of their written review. In this report, the department head must specifically indicate any faculty member who is not performing satisfactorily. Likewise, an unsatisfactory performance evaluation for a faculty member must also be reported and the written plan for near-term improvement must accompany the report.

5.5.1.4 Criteria for Rating Faculty Performance:

During an annual review, the Department Head will rate performance in each of the areas of faculty responsibility using the *Indicators of Faculty Performance* (see Section 3.3):

- Unsatisfactory;
- Needs Improvement;
- Satisfactory;
- Exemplary;
- Most Meritorious

Ratings should be based on the *Indicators of APT Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* (see Section 5.2).

5.5.1.5 Required Annual Review Components:

The annual review must contain the components listed below, in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of [University rule 12.01.99.M1 University Statement on](#)

Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and Tenure.

1. Faculty member's activity report:

The exact structure of the faculty member's activity report of previous activities may vary from department to department within the College but must include the following:

- The activity report should be focused on the immediately previous calendar year while also allowing the faculty member to outline the status of long-term projects and provide context for which annual activities have occurred;
- The activity report should provide specific details of teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or patient care/clinical practice activities from the previous calendar year, as appropriate;
- Faculty members should state their short-term and long-term goals. Examples of possible content for the report are listed in Section (2.4.3.3.) of [University Rule 12.01.99.M1](#) (*University Statement on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, Promotion and Tenure*).

2. Department Head's Annual Review of the Faculty:

The department head will write a formal annual review, including:

- Individual evaluations for each of the faculty member's responsibilities/activities (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or clinical care) for the previous calendar year and ratings for each responsibility area;
- An overall rating of the previous calendar year's activities, which correlates with and/or is weighted to the FTE percentages in particular responsibility areas. For example, if an APT faculty is 80% teaching, then 80% of the overall rating must be based on teaching performance.
- A list of goals/expectations in each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, patient care/clinical practice) for the current calendar year.

The details of this evaluation and goals/expectations will be communicated with the faculty member in a memorandum or in the Annual Review document, which will be shared with the faculty member. The faculty member will acknowledge receipt of the Annual Review, including goals/expectations, by signing the document. Faculty should be allowed to provide written comments and/or discuss and mutually agree upon adjustments to goals/ expectations. A faculty member who refuses to sign the acknowledgment of the annual review will be noted in the faculty member's personnel file. The annual review and/or memorandum should include an informed judgment by the department head of the extent to which the faculty member is in compliance with applicable rules, policies, procedures, trainings, etc. If applicable, this memorandum and/or annual review may include information on whether the faculty member's progress towards promotion is on track or if additional professional development, mentoring, or other support is needed.

The annual review, memorandum, faculty activities report, and/or any related documents will be placed in the faculty member's departmental personnel file, and copies of all files will be transmitted to the College of Medicine Office of Faculty Affairs for archiving.

3. Training and University Compliance:

No faculty member may receive an overall satisfactory rating or higher if they have not completed all required System and University training programs (System Regulation 33.05.02 Required Employee Training) and/or compliance requirements (e.g., IT audits, equipment audits, conflict of interest, etc.). To satisfy these requirements, all faculty must complete the 'Certification of Trainings and Compliance' section of the Annual Review form.

5.5.1.6 Meeting between the department head and the faculty member:

The department head will meet with the faculty member to discuss the annual review and expectations/goals for the coming year. In some cases, there may be the need for more frequent meetings at the request of the department head or faculty member.

5.5.1.7 Outcomes of APT Annual Reviews with less than 'Satisfactory' ratings:

5.5.1.7.1 Unsatisfactory Rating:

An overall unsatisfactory rating is defined as either:

- "Unsatisfactory" in any single area of faculty responsibility (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, patient care/clinical practice); or
- "Needs Improvement" in any two areas of faculty responsibility.

An annual review resulting in an overall "Unsatisfactory" performance rating shall state the basis for the rating, in accordance with both the *Indicators of Faculty Performance* (Section 3.3) and *Indicators of APT Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness* (see Section 5.2.). The department head will determine whether to retain or dismiss the APT faculty member (dependent on the terms of the faculty member's appointment). Depending on the circumstances, a performance improvement plan may be developed by the department head in conjunction with the faculty member. For improvements in teaching, this plan should take one year or less to successfully complete. For improvements in other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity), this plan may take up to two years to successfully complete.

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide regular summaries of progress;
- It is the responsibility of the Department Head to schedule meetings and document regular reviews of progress;
- If the faculty member is making consistent progress on pre-determined metrics and milestones in the professional development plan, a rating of "Unsatisfactory" could be upgraded to "Needs Improvement" or higher in subsequent annual reviews;

- The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” or higher when pre-determined goals and milestones are completed.
- The rating of “Needs Improvement” should remain as “Needs Improvement” if the faculty is making progress towards pre-determined goals and milestones, but those goals are not yet achieved.
- The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Unsatisfactory” if the faculty member is not making consistent progress towards or fails to achieve the metrics and milestones of the performance improvement plan, which may result in dismissal.

5.5.1.7.2 Needs Improvement Rating:

If an APT faculty member receives a “Needs Improvement” rating in any single area of faculty performance, they must work with their department head immediately to develop an improvement plan. For teaching, this plan should take one year or fewer to complete successfully. In other areas (e.g., research/scholarly activity), this plan may take up to three years to successfully complete.

- It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide regular summaries of progress;
- It is the responsibility of the Department Head to schedule meetings and document regular reviews of progress;
- The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Satisfactory” or higher when pre-determined goals and milestones are completed.
- The rating of “Needs Improvement” should remain as “Needs Improvement” if the faculty is making progress towards pre-determined goals and milestones, but those goals are not yet achieved.
- The rating of “Needs Improvement” should be changed to “Unsatisfactory” if the faculty member is not making consistent progress towards or fails to achieve the metrics and milestones of the performance improvement plan, which may result in dismissal.

5.5.2 Processes for Promotion of Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

For promotion purposes, all candidates employed must prepare a dossier, in accordance with the annual published guidelines by Texas A&M University Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Among other requirements that need to be submitted in the dossier, the candidate must prepare:

- Updated and complete CV, using the currently-approved University template;
- An impact statement (not to exceed three pages) on goals, philosophies, accomplishments, strategies, and the specific impact that their work has had in the field in the areas and FTE percentages of assigned responsibility (e.g., teaching/education, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or patient care/clinical practice). The purpose of this impact statement is to provide a context for review of the dossier at each level and for the candidate to demonstrate the impact or potential impact of their work, in addition to the quality and productivity over time.

A departmental APT promotion review committee will consist of five (5) faculty members at the rank of APT Associate Professor or APT Professor. For review of promotion to APT Professor, the committee will consist of members at the rank of APT Professors or Professors only.

For review of promotion to Clinical Professor, the committee will consist of Clinical Professors and Professors only. Best practices for the composition of this promotion review committee include considerations that the committee should comprise both clinical faculty and tenured faculty members. For departments with insufficient clinical faculty at the ranks of Clinical Professor or Professor, the committee will be composed of clinical faculty members of appropriate rank (Professor) from other departments in the College with knowledge of the clinical faculty role. The Department Head, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Medicine, selects these additional members to meet the minimum of five (5).

Candidates should be advised that their department head will need to include in the department head review a statement about any documented and currently pending sanctions, requirements, or personnel issues that are not resolved at the time of the review. This does not include any allegations under investigation, past allegations that were dismissed, or past allegations where the faculty member was found responsible, but requirements or sanctions have been completed. The department head review will be part of the dossier beyond the department level.

In the spring of the faculty member's desired promotion year, the department head will discuss with the faculty member their upcoming promotion review. The candidate will build a review dossier comprising the materials required by the latest [Texas A&M Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

The faculty member will submit the required dossier materials (e.g., CV, impact statement, supplemental/supporting documents) to the department head using Interfolio/Faculty180. For research APT faculty, the department head will then request external review letters from faculty at peer or aspirational peer universities. This is only required for Research APT Faculty, but each department's requirements vary.

For research track AP faculty, the department head will request a minimum of five (5) arm's length letters, with seven (7) letters being preferred.

Once the dossier is complete, the department APT promotion review committee will review each case/dossier. The department APT promotion review committee will prepare a summary report, with separate sections focused on each of the candidate's assigned responsibility areas, which can include teaching, research and/or other scholarly or creative activities, service, administration, or patient care/clinical practice. The report must include the committee's evaluation and recommendation to the department head. Separate evaluation of each responsibility area (teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or clinical care or clinical duties), with specific ratings in each area (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3), as well as an overall assessment, must be provided. The department APT promotion review committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the faculty member but,

rather, they must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member has or has not met the requirements for promotion. The department APT promotion review report will be submitted to the department head through Interfolio/Faculty180.

Next, the department head will review the candidate's dossier/case, reports and recommendations generated by the department APT promotion review committee, and external reviewers' letters (if included), to make an independent recommendation for/against promotion. This report should include a discussion of the department APT promotion committee evaluations/recommendations, especially if the department head disagrees with the departmental committee, or external reviewers (if required) and should provide any further evaluations based on the dossier and the faculty member's activities in the department. The department head will submit their report through Interfolio/Faculty180, where review at the college level begins.

After department head review, the dossier/case will be forwarded to the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (via Interfolio/Faculty180) for verification and review.

Next, the College P&T committee will review each dossier/case and provide a written evaluation and recommendation to the Dean. The College P&T committee will separately evaluate each responsibility area (e.g., teaching, research/scholarly activity, service, administration, and/or patient care/clinical practice), providing specific ratings in each area (see *Indicators of Faculty Performance*; Section 3.3), as well as an overall assessment rating. The College P&T committee must not merely list the accomplishments of the APT faculty member but, rather, they must provide a detailed summary of the quality, significance, and impact of the candidate's accomplishments and must specifically indicate whether the faculty member has or has not met the requirements for promotion. The report is submitted to the Dean through Interfolio/Faculty180.

Upon completion of the college P&T review, the dean will review the dossier and create a report that is a summary analysis of the case, providing a general basis for strengths or weaknesses, addressing any mixed or negative votes, and explaining if the dean supports or does not support promotion. If the dean's vote is contrary to any departmental or college recommendations, it will be clearly and specifically addressed in the dean's report.

Upon completion of the dean's report, the entire dossier is submitted to the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. It will undergo further review by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost, and the President. Promotion decisions generally are made at the spring Board meeting and announced to the college at a later date.

Upon receiving notification from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the college notifies the candidate of the Texas A& President's final decision.

5.5.3 External Reviews for Promotion of Academic Professional Track (APT) Faculty

With the exception of research-track faculty, the university does not require outside letters for academic professional track (APT) appointments. Members of the P&T committee should not provide or be asked to provide external evaluation letters when reviewing. In units where faculty members choose to upload letters, they should be included in the “other materials” section; and a reviewer chart should also be included.

6. Criteria and Processes for Adjunct (Affiliate) Clinical Faculty

6.1 Introduction

An important part of the mission of the clinical faculty at the TAMU College of Medicine is to serve the needs of society by furthering the training of students, postdoctoral fellows, residents, and fellows who will both practice clinical medicine and who will advance healthcare delivery and the science that underpins it.

The practice of medicine is concerned with the diagnosis and treatment of disorders, maintenance of health, and management of chronic conditions with all of these directed at improving the well-being of the individual and the population. Research and training the next generation of researchers is a critical part of this mission. The College of Medicine performs cutting-edge research with our affiliates and trains investigators to extend the boundaries of medicine and health.

The role of the adjunct (affiliate) clinical track faculty is primarily in the areas of clinical education (didactic and experiential) and service. Adjunct (affiliate) clinical faculty will typically work in healthcare settings. In order to train world-class physicians to serve the needs of the community and the State, the College of Medicine strives for excellence through exceptional teaching and training faculty with expertise in clinical practice. Clinical teaching and training require individuals who bring to the learners evidence-based practical skills and knowledge, as well as insights based on clinical experience.

The College of Medicine is continuously recruiting world-class individuals who are dedicated to state-of-the-art clinical practice and educating the next generation of clinicians and researchers.

Any changes to adjunct (affiliate) review criteria will be subject to consultation with the campus associate deans prior to implementation.

6.2 Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty Appointment Terms and Conditions

“Adjunct” is used within the Texas A&M University internal systems to specifically refer to faculty paid by affiliated institutions, versus those paid by Texas A&M University. Official Texas A&M University titles for faculty employed by affiliated institutions include the word “adjunct”. College of Medicine working titles for adjunct (affiliate) faculty may include “Affiliate Clinical” or, more simply, “Clinical” in the title and may be used on letterhead, emails, etc.

Adjunct (affiliate) faculty, referred to hereafter as “affiliate,” in these appointments are expected to make significant contributions in the areas of teaching, primarily in the clinical setting (clinical education) and service to the College of Medicine.

The appointment and reappointment of affiliate faculty are subject to the following terms and conditions:

- The appointment to an affiliate faculty title is a courtesy appointment and is not

- remunerated;
- Affiliate faculty appointments are non-tenure track;
- The affiliate appointment does not create or intend to create an employer-employee relationship;
- Texas A&M University College of Medicine is not responsible for the salary and/or benefits of the affiliate faculty member;
- The appointment as an affiliate faculty member does not provide any faculty rights at Texas A&M University;
- The affiliate faculty member must be evaluated yearly and be “in good standing,” which refers to both the licensing and clinical privileges, if seeing patients, while also having completed all required trainings required for their teaching role;
- The faculty track and rank must be portrayed by the affiliate faculty member as specifically noted in the appointment letter. Improper portrayal of the affiliate faculty title may be grounds for termination of the affiliate appointment and removal of the affiliate faculty title;
- Public statements made by the affiliate faculty member must be in their own personal capacity and not on behalf of or representing Texas A&M University or the College of Medicine;
- Affiliate faculty appointments expire at the end of three (3) years, unless otherwise reappointed prior to expiration of the existing appointment;
- Upon expiration, termination, or non-renewal of the affiliate appointment, the physician has no right to continue using the affiliate faculty title previously held;
- Notice of appointment termination for affiliate faculty will be provided as a courtesy notice by College of Medicine staff with no further obligations on the part of Texas A&M University;
- Affiliate faculty appointments may be removed at any time by the Dean of the College of Medicine, in consultation with the campus Associate Deans;
- Appointments of affiliate faculty are subject to Texas A&M University rules, standard administrative procedures, and guidelines regarding matters of prohibited conduct;
- Inactive status affiliate faculty can be reappointed based upon the needs of the College of Medicine and campuses.

6.3 Adjunct (Affiliate) Clinical Faculty Responsibilities

The appointment of adjunct (affiliate) faculty to the College of Medicine working titles of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor, is reserved for those faculty with a defined and approved TAMU College of Medicine academic role, with substantial commitment to the academic enterprise. In general, these appointments will be for promising clinician educators that directly impact medical education and/or who, in the view of the college, work in close collaboration with the college on key academic or clinical initiatives, including those who serve in important key leadership roles in the educational and service missions of the College. Examples of these adjunct (affiliate) clinical responsibilities may include but are not limited to:

6.3.1 Clinical Education:

- Clinical supervision/teaching of medical students/residents/fellows;
- Preceptorship in clinical venues;
- Didactic teaching (including planning and delivery), small group facilitation, etc.;
- Formal faculty mentor for medical students/residents/fellows/pipeline program

- participants;
- Faculty mentor to medical students/graduate students/residents/fellows for scholarly activity (abstracts, poster, presentation, published research);
- Teaching, evaluating, assessing learners in an educational session/lab;
- Creation of medical education content/curriculum for use in educational course;
- Creation/refinement of evaluation/assessment material;
- Dissemination of research or scholarly activity (abstract, poster presentation, published research)

6.3.2 Clinical Research/Investigation and Education:

- Supervision/teaching of students/residents/fellows/postdoctoral fellows;
- Didactic teaching (including planning and delivery), small group facilitation, etc.;
- Formal faculty mentor for students/residents/fellows/pipeline program participants;
- Faculty mentor to students/residents/fellows for scholarly activity (abstracts, poster, presentation, published research);
- Creation of education content/curriculum for use in educational course;
- Creation/refinement of evaluation/assessment material;
- Dissemination of research or scholarly activity (abstract, poster presentation, published research)

6.3.3 Service:

- Administrative leadership role in the academic and/or healthcare system mission of the College of Medicine;
- Serving and leading educational-academic organizations, committees, and task forces in which they represent the College of Medicine;
- Serving as a leader in UME/GME and other programs for the College of Medicine;
- Course director for an educational course of the College of Medicine;
- Core faculty training program for the College of Medicine;
- Leadership role in local, regional, state, and national academic or medical organization/society representing the College of Medicine;
- Formal career advising to students/residents/fellows on behalf of the College of Medicine;
- Invited speaker/presenter at local/regional/state/national grand rounds, academic meetings, medical societies, or professional organizations representing the College of Medicine;
- Dissemination of scholarly activity (abstract, poster presentation)

At the time of each annual evaluation or reappointment, adjunct (affiliate) faculty will be expected to, at a minimum, demonstrate teaching and/or medical education activities to maintain the appointment, with considerations made for faculty that exclusively teach in elective and/or clerkship rotations.

For adjunct (affiliate) promotion, the affiliate faculty will need to meet the indicators of faculty excellence and effectiveness for the specified rank, as indicated in these guidelines.

6.4 Appointment Process

Initial appointments are made based upon the judgment of the campus and/or site Associate

Deans. Below are guidelines for clinical experiences at the four (4) different ranks. Scholarly achievements, service on local/state/national committees or other indicators of faculty excellence or effectiveness in teaching and/or service can be considered for determining the appropriate rank.

6.5 College of Medicine Adjunct (Affiliate) Working Titles

Please refer to Section 3, *Faculty Ranks and Categories*, for more detailed descriptions of faculty titles and ranks.

- **Clinical Instructor:** for faculty without terminal degrees (e.g., M.A., M.S., M.S.N., etc.). In some cases and at some campuses, the Clinical Instructor title may be used for initial appointments of those with a doctorate or related terminal degree.
- **Clinical Assistant Professor:** the “Assistant” qualifier indicates an entry-level position for those with a doctorate or related terminal degree.
- **Clinical Associate Professor:** the “Associate” qualifier indicates experience in academia or substantial contributions to the field for those with a doctorate or related terminal degree.
- **Clinical or Investigational Professor:** the title “Professor,” with no other rank qualifier, indicates continued accomplishments in academia and evidence of outstanding teaching or significant impact on the professions of the College of Medicine and field for those with a doctorate or related terminal degree.

Appointment terms for affiliate faculty are three (3) years.

Supervisors of affiliated clinical faculty will complete evaluations every 3 years, or more frequently if desired by the campus Associate Dean.

In the case of a dispute on assigned rank, the final decision on rank will be made by the Dean of the College of Medicine. The Dean may consult with campus Associate Deans, department heads, and/or department promotion committees as needed.

6.5.1 Promotion Process for Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty

- The promotion timeline can be as early as three (3) years within the current rank (for truly exceptional faculty) but typically occurs after at least five (5) years of continuous academic service to Texas A&M College of Medicine within current rank;
- Promotion decisions are made by the Dean of the College of Medicine;
- No external reviewer/reference letters are required;
- Promotion decisions are not based on the number of teaching hours, alone. Rather, sustained and consistent levels of teaching, over a period of time, paired with excellent student evaluations, and service to the College are some of the factors that are considered during promotion evaluations;
- Promotion candidates must provide an updated CV, in any format, specifically

- highlighting education and service to Texas A&M College of Medicine learners;
- Promotion candidates must provide an Impact Statement (no more than 3 pages, single-spaced, 12-point font, 1-inch margins) that should include:
 - A well-reasoned, narrative translation of details in the CV;
 - Descriptions of activities that are accessible to a broad audience (avoid technical or discipline-specific details);
 - A perspective on past (at rank), present, and future performance and accomplishments and their impact/significance to the College of Medicine and Texas A&M University;
 - Innovative or cutting-edge aspects of education/teaching and/or service;
 - Highlights of hidden strengths (not necessarily captured in a CV);
 - Explanations of perceived weaknesses;
 - Explanations of gaps in the record (e.g., leave of absence);
 - Explanations of contributions within the larger academic unit;
 - Descriptions of how candidates distinguish themselves from their peers;
 - Explanations of how candidates advance the academic needs of their academic unit;
 - Explanations of the candidate's philosophy, methods, and/or approach to teaching learners;
 - Explanations of how the candidate fosters learner achievement by balancing high standards with appropriate levels of learner support;
 - Explanations of curriculum development, new electives, and/or efforts to advance the academic needs of the College;
 - Explanations of how candidates mentor and advise learners to develop professional identities and to develop their clinical practice skills;
 - Descriptions of how candidate's service contributions support the needs of the College.
- A support letter from the campus Associate Dean is required, which must include descriptions of education and service to the Texas A&M College of Medicine;
- Affiliate clinical faculty are reviewed based on indicators of performance of excellence and effectiveness in teaching, research and/or service (see below);
- Promotion to rank of Affiliate Clinical Associate Professor requires documented excellence and impact in effectiveness in teaching, with documented service to Texas A&M College of Medicine and its learners;
- Promotion to rank of Affiliate Clinical Professor requires a sustained pattern of excellence and impact in both teaching and service to Texas A&M College of Medicine and its learners.
- There are two (2) promotion timelines per year for affiliate clinical faculty:
 - The first affiliate promotion timeline generally begins in January, with promotions announced in August;
 - The second affiliate promotion timeline generally begins in July, with promotions announced in January

6.5.2 Promotion of Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty with More Than One Appointment and/or Secondary Appointments

- Affiliate promotions may be reciprocated (when requested), based on promotion at the affiliate faculty member's primary appointment;
- Promotion by another medical college (no primary appointment is designated) will be

- considered on a case-by-case basis;
- Requests for reciprocal promotions must be accompanied by a letter from the Campus Associate Dean, confirming promotion at the affiliate faculty member's primary medical college, and clearly outlining educational and service contributions to Texas A&M University College of Medicine learners;
- Requests for reciprocal promotions must include the promotion dossier from the primary appointment, a letter from the Campus Associate Dean, and letter of promotion from the affiliate faculty member's primary appointment. All submitted materials will be reviewed by the appropriate Texas A&M College of Medicine department head and forwarded to the Texas A&M Dean of the College of Medicine for approval;
- As noted above, affiliate faculty promotions, including reciprocal promotions, are considered twice per year.

6.6 Areas of Adjunct (Affiliate) Faculty Responsibility

6.6.1 Teaching

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluations of **Teaching** are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness or excellence in teaching.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Individuals receiving this rating may have areas needing improvement in mentorship, success of trainees, or didactic/laboratory and clinical teaching.
- **Satisfactory** – appropriate evidence of effectiveness in teaching. Effectiveness can be supported by peer review, student evaluations, and accomplishments of trainees.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in teaching. Faculty in this category will be outstanding classroom and/or clinical educators as evidenced by peer review, evaluations, awards for education, and trainee accomplishments. Many will contribute to novel educational methodologies and curricular development.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as educators through their leadership, receipt of awards, and solicited involvement in educational organizations.

Regardless of the weighting of an affiliate faculty member's teaching assignment, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is the minimum requirement for satisfactory performance. The supervisor should have a conversation about what would constitute sufficient (appropriate) evidence, and by implication, minimal and strong evidence to evaluate the affiliate faculty member fairly.

Indicators of **Excellence in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Outstanding teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes;
- Demonstrated evidence of teaching excellence by selection for peer-reviewed University, college, healthcare system, or professional society outstanding teacher/instruction awards;
- Participation in development of questions for specialty board examinations;
- Contribution to new instructional program development;
- Development of new course(s) or major revisions of existing courses.
- Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals;
- Publication of the results of education research endeavors;
- Publication of scholarly review articles, textbooks, original clinical investigations, descriptions of clinical experience, or case reports/results that emphasize education endeavors;
- Publication of widely adopted or acclaimed instructional materials (e.g., textbooks, instructional software programs, cases, readings, simulations, and the like);
- Development of innovative or acclaimed instructional materials including syllabi or software;
- Presentation at professional meetings or other institutions of higher education that serve the teaching mission of the college.
- Invitation to teach at a domestic or international institution of recognized excellence;
- Evidence of successful career paths of former medical students, graduate students and postdoctoral students;
- Receipt of awards for research or academic performance by the faculty member's student(s);
- Receiving external grant support for teaching/learning projects or education research;
- Leading a major curriculum development, assessment, or redesign effort for the introduction of innovative technology or novel teaching methodologies in the instructional setting;
- High-quality of teaching to multiple instructional programs;
- Leadership role in educational activities of national/international professional societies;
- Chair of doctoral student committees;
- Placement of doctoral students or medical students into significant academic, scholarly, and/or professional positions;
- Other clear and demonstrable contributions to doctoral student development.

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Teaching** include, but are not limited to:

- Good teaching performance as evidenced by such measures as peer evaluation, student feedback, and student learning outcomes;
- Evidence of contributing to or coordinating courses or both;
- Coordination of team-taught or integrated courses;
- Rigorous, accurate, and equitable grading;
- Development of assessment tools to measure student learning outcomes;
- Service as a member of thesis/dissertation committees of graduate students;

- Mentoring and training medical students or post-graduate residents in experimental experiences and postgraduate residencies;
- Favorable evaluation by faculty mentored by the candidate;
- Direction of independent student research;
- Mentoring of junior colleagues in teaching methodologies and teaching quality;
- Significant self-development activities leading to enhanced instructional effectiveness;
- Introduction of current and emerging instructional methodologies and technologies in the curriculum;
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the College;
- Development of pedagogical approaches to enhance student engagement and to optimize student learning;
- Introduction of practices to evaluate the engagement of students in a critical analysis of course material or which evaluate their involvement in research or scholarly activity;
- Contribution to a college-wide culture of evidence-based approaches to evaluation and improvement of academic programs;
- Development of valuable evidence-based metrics for teaching effectiveness;
- Preparation and presentation of professional continuing education programs;
- Selection for student or departmental awards for outstanding teaching/instruction;
- Receiving competitive internal grant support for teaching/learning projects;
- Evidence of active teaching of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows in the laboratory setting;
- Consistent membership on doctoral student committees.

6.6.2 Service

Performance ratings to be used for all evaluations of **Service** are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in service.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in service. Individuals receiving this rating typically have limited involvement with the respective unit and an absence of extra unit service. Criteria may depend on the rank and stage of the faculty member.
- **Satisfactory** – adequate evidence of effectiveness in service. Those in this category will have involvement in local service appropriate for their career stage and time assignment and often will have evidence of national service, again, taking into account the career stage and time assignment.
- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in service. Faculty in this category will successfully engage in impactful local service activities such as chairing committees, partaking in significant

administrative duties, and/or leading mentorship and outreach efforts. Prominent national-level service in professional organizations would be typical.

- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. These faculty members would be nationally recognized for service through their leadership, receipt of service awards, and solicited involvement in prominent professional organizations

Indicators of **Excellence in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Officer, committee chair, or board/committee member in a national/international professional organization in one's discipline or national/international task force;
- Program chair or similar position for a national/international meeting
- Administrative leadership role within the College or University;
- Chair of a major University committee or task force;
- Demonstration of a significant time commitment to or role in committee work;
- Other demonstrated leadership in departmental, College, University, or system administrative or service roles;
- Service on study sections (or scientific peer review groups), consensus panels, etc.;
- Service on a major governmental commission, task force, committee, or board;
- Attainment of significant external development support;
- Evidence of excellence in professional service to the local community and public at large;
- Serving as editor or member of editorial board of a major journal. This activity per se is considered service; however, being selected as editor or member of an editorial board can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities;
- Service as a frequent ad hoc member or permanent member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies, or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA);
- Organization of regional, national, and international symposia and colloquia;
- Significant and effective mentorship of junior faculty members as evidenced by selection for College, University, or professional association outstanding mentoring awards;
- Awards that recognize clinical expertise;
- Consultation as requested by other faculty members;
- Service as a consultant on clinical care (e.g., third-party payment groups, courts, health organizations);
- Holding leadership roles in hospital or healthcare organizations;
- Membership or fellowship in elected professional organization that denotes high level of clinical competency.

Indicators of **Effectiveness in Service** include, but are not limited to:

- Committee chair of regional/state/national professional organization;
- Service on University, College, department committees and task forces;

- Serving in administrative roles within the department;
- Contribution to external development efforts;
- Advisor to student organizations;
- Administrative roles within the department;
- Speeches and/or consulting for major practitioner groups;
- Service as consultant to business organization(s) and/or governmental agencies;
- Evidence of professional service to the local community and public at large;
- Significant self-development activities that lead to enhanced service effectiveness;
- Service as a reviewer for major refereed journals or as an ad hoc reviewer for national research organizations. This activity per se is considered service; however, being asked to serve as reviewer can also be used as an indicator of the recognition of impact and quality of the scholarly activities;
- Participation in Departmental, College, or University strategic planning, search committees, College seminar programs, faculty development programs, assessment programs, symposia and colloquia, and student recruitment activities;
- Presentation of continuing education program;
- Invited presentations at academic and professional groups;
- Development and participation in health care service to community programs;
- Certification by specialty board;
- Referral of patients from practitioners both within and outside the University;
- Expression of confidence and respect from patients and clinical staff;
- Application of current methods in clinical care;
- Membership on a specialty examining board;
- Diligent efforts to make clinical and private clinical care efficient and effective;
- Occasional service as an ad hoc member of a study section or scientific review panel for research organizations, institutions, professional societies or foundations (e.g., NIH, NSF, USDA).

6.6.3 Research/Investigation (if applicable)

Performance ratings to be used for annual evaluation of Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work are:

- **Unsatisfactory** – the absence of significant evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity.
- **Needs Improvement** – minimal evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Individuals receiving this rating will have limited evidence of research/scholarly impact as supported by funding, manuscripts, citations, prominent presentations, and book chapters.
- **Satisfactory** – strong evidence of effectiveness in research/scholarly activity. Effectiveness must be supported by high quality manuscripts,

grants, presentations, citations, and other factors.

- **Exemplary** – strong evidence of both effectiveness and excellence in research/scholarly activity. Faculty in this category will be nationally recognized for their research/scholarly activity. Examples of this evidence might include: quality publications, funding, citations, performances, and invited presentations. Each unit might include a suggested list of other examples relevant to the respective discipline.
- **Most Meritorious** – those receiving the most meritorious rating would have all the attributes of an exemplary faculty member. In addition, these faculty members would be nationally or internationally recognized as scholarly leaders through consistent publication in top-tier journals, field-changing awards for excellence in scholarship, and election to scientific societies or academies.

Indicators of **Excellence in Research/Scholarly Activity** include, but are not limited to:

- Recognition from peers in the field, including fellowships, research awards, publication awards, invitations to present keynote or plenary addresses at national or international meetings;
- A substantial record of peer-reviewed primary and/or corresponding senior authored publications that demonstrate evidence of originality as an investigator;
- Publications of original research in the leading peer-reviewed, discipline-related journals;
- Favorable citation index listing of research/educational publications within their respective discipline;
- Consistent, sustainable, and competitive external funding for research.
- Key participation in forming productive collaborative research arrangements with industry, community agencies, foundations, and other academic institutions;
- Significant intellectual publication in patents and royalty/licensing agreements;
- Coordination of interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and projects;
- Publication of critically acclaimed monographs or book(s);
- Leadership of national meetings or workshops;
- Authorship of a textbook, textbook chapter, review articles, contributions of published symposia;
- Editorship or associate editorship of scholarly, refereed journals, or of special issues of a journal;
- Recognition, acceptance, adoption, and application of the scholar's integrative contributions by others, e.g., use or review of electronic media by other institutions or scholars;
- Evidence of leadership of or contributions to successful team efforts at the interface with other academic disciplines;
- Originality and significance of accomplishments in synthesis and communication of new understanding of, perspective on, and uses of information;
- Peer-reviewed publication of instructional materials, e.g., case studies,

- textbooks, or electronic instructional materials;
- Extramural recognition for contributions to the advancement of teaching, such as presentations at national or international conferences, invitations to serve as a consultant, service on editorial boards of prestigious journals in the chosen area of teaching scholarship, and invitations to present keynote or plenary national or international meetings concerning education;
- Significant extramural funding for research on issues of importance in teaching;
- Publication of critically acclaimed chapters, books, or comparable electronic materials about education;
- Election to membership in major national research societies;
- Dissemination of teaching materials at national workshops, with the materials cited by other programs;
- Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies that are adopted outside the college;
- Editorship or associate editorship of a major journal in the chosen area of teaching scholarship;
- Serving on national grant organization study sections, review panels, or site visit teams;
- Serving on national professional society program committees;
- Election to major national professional societies;
- A senior leadership role demonstrating superior competence and outstanding productivity on research projects;
- Consistent and sustainable extramural support for an established research program;
- Service on National Advisory Councils or Boards, Editorship of journals, leadership of national/international study sections, consensus panels, etc.;
- Frequent citation of publications.

Indicators of **Effectiveness** in Research/Scholarly Activity include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of articles in professional journals appropriate to the field of endeavor. Greater significance will be attributed to primary and corresponding authored papers in peer-reviewed journals, but all co-primary and co-corresponding publications will be evaluated;
- Publication of books, monographs, or manuals on paper or in electronic media that are widely disseminated, evaluated by peers, and advance the field of endeavor;
- Award of extramural support commensurate with the current primary field of research;
- Demonstration of a sustained leadership role in an independent research program (e.g., research program leader or laboratory/clinic director);
- Evidence for a principal role in management and/or support of a collaborative research program (e.g., letters from program leader or members of the research program);
- Development/award of patents for discoveries in the candidate's field;
- Leadership and/or organization of peer-reviewed clinical trials as documented by program reviews or letters;
- Participation in interdisciplinary or interprofessional investigations and

- projects;
- Invited presentations of original scientific data at regional/state/national meetings, or at major institutions or research organizations;
 - Service on editorial boards of journals;
 - A national and/or international reputation as evidenced by external letters of reference;
 - Publication in respected refereed journals in appropriate disciplines;
 - Publication in non-refereed journals that are widely recognized;
 - Publication of a respected professional book;
 - Publication by research sponsor of technical reports or monographs;
 - Presentation of papers at regional/state/national conferences and professional meetings of appropriate disciplines;
 - Publication of chapter(s) in scholarly book(s);
 - Ad hoc reviewer for major refereed journals and/or national or international organizations;
 - Refereed publications in proceedings of conferences and professional meetings;
 - Well-documented contribution (i.e., mentorship) to the research of others;
 - Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave, that lead to increased research and publication effectiveness;
 - Publication with emphasis on medical education/curriculum development in refereed journals;
 - Publication of technical reports, case reports, or monographs in peer-reviewed journals;
 - Presentation of papers of original research or case reports at professional meetings;
 - Contribution in area of expertise to the scholarship of others;
 - Authorship of review articles;
 - Serving as a research mentor for medical students or residents;
 - Introduction of innovative pedagogical methodologies adopted by other faculty members within the college.