I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate whether faculty meet the general criteria for promotion on the Teaching Track. Teaching Track appointments are annually renewable and are not in the tenure stream.

This document contains Criteria and Standards pertaining to:
A. Definitions of educational domains, a scholarly approach to educational work, and educational scholarship. These definitions are key to understanding the criteria and standards for the Teaching Track.
B. Appointment to the Teaching Track as an Assistant Professor.
C. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor.
D. The process for annual appraisal of Teaching Track faculty and post-promotion review.

The criteria, standards, and procedures are applied without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. Teaching Track Statements are reviewed and approved by the Dean of the Medical School.

II. MISSION STATEMENT

Committed to innovation and diversity, the Medical School educates physicians, scientists, and health professionals; generates knowledge and treatments; and cares for patients and communities with compassion and respect.

The Medical School strongly encourages and values interdisciplinary work, including scholarship, public engagement, and teaching, as well as interprofessional collaboration in clinical sciences. Concordant with the position of the National Institutes of Health, the Medical School also values Co-Principal Investigators and interdisciplinary collaboration on major funding proposals.

III. KEY DEFINITIONS: EDUCATIONAL DOMAINS, SCHOLARLY APPROACH, AND EDUCATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP

Educational Domains: Teaching Track faculty participate in educational activities that fall into five domains: (1) teaching, (2) curriculum, (3) mentoring/advising, (4) learner assessment, and/or (5) educational leadership/administration. Brief descriptions of these domains are provided in section V. While individual faculty members on the Teaching Track are not expected
to excel in all five domains, a well-rounded portfolio that would include growing accomplishment in multiple areas is expected.

**Scholarly Approach:** Teaching Track faculty must take a “scholarly approach” to their educational activities. Faculty take a scholarly approach when they systematically design, implement, assess, and redesign an educational activity in the field. A scholarly approach requires that the educational activity be informed by the literature and “best practices” with regard to content and educational practices. This approach ensures that educational activities are informed by the knowledge and resources of the academic educational community. Implementation of educational activities using a scholarly approach requires documentation of quantity and quality of the work product.

**Educational Scholarship:** For promotion on the Teaching Track, faculty must go beyond a scholarly approach and demonstrate engagement in educational scholarship in at least one of the five domains (teaching, curriculum, mentoring/advising, learner assessment, and educational leadership/administration). Educational scholarship requires not only drawing upon resources and best practices in the field (scholarly approach), but additionally contributing to the resources in the field by publicly disseminating educational products or approaches so that the educational products are peer-reviewed.

Educational scholarship can take a variety of forms, all of which have value in assessing the performance and accomplishments of faculty in the Teaching Track. Examples of educational scholarship for each of the five domains are provided in Section V. and in the departmental addendums. The quantity of scholarship may vary considerably for faculty in this track and should be evaluated commensurate with their time allocation for such endeavors.

**IV. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF FACULTY**

**A. Appointment of Faculty**

Teaching Track appointments may be made on all of the University of Minnesota Medical School campuses and affiliated sites, following the processes described in the *Medical School Policy on Faculty Appointments*. Each department may add specialty-specific criteria for appointment in Part 2. Departmental Addendum.

1. **To Assistant Professor**
   In the Medical School, the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. The minimal, general criteria for initial appointment at this rank include but are not limited to:
   a. Possession of a terminal degree (M.D. or equivalent and/or Ph.D.)
   b. Board eligibility or certification (in applicable clinical specialties)
   c. Demonstrated ability in teaching
   d. Demonstrated involvement in high quality educational scholarship or research
   e. Demonstrated competence in the skills of communication, including effective communication with students, colleagues, and patients (if applicable)

2. **To Associate Professor and Professor**
The criteria for appointment as an Associate Professor or Professor are the same as the criteria for promotion to the rank and can be found in sections VI.B. and VI.C.

B. Annual Appraisal of Faculty

1. Process
   The process for this review is described in the Medical School Faculty Review Policy: Annual Review. The head of each Department, or his/her designee, annually reviews the progress of each faculty member. The Department Head prepares a written summary of that review and discusses the faculty member’s progress with the faculty member, giving him/her a copy of the report. In considering proposals for promotion in rank, the Medical School and its Departments comply with the procedures described in this Statement (section VIII).

   The Academic Unit head and (if applicable) departmental faculty will meet annually to review and discuss the performance of Teaching Track Assistant Professor faculty, relative to the Teaching Statement. The annual review of Teaching Track Assistant Professor faculty will be recorded on the Medical School Form 12a and will reflect the faculty member’s performance relative to the Departmental Teaching Track Statement. A record of the vote will be included on the Form 12a, if a vote was taken (optional). The Academic Unit head and faculty member will sign the completed Form 12a. The Form 12a is forwarded to the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs for review, comment, and signature. The original will be sent back to the home department and will become a part of the faculty member’s dossier. A copy of the signed form will be kept in the Medical School’s Office of Faculty Affairs in the faculty member’s personnel file.

2. Criteria
   The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review are the same as those for the appropriate rank, as defined in this Teaching Track Statement.

   Criteria for scholarly activities and educational scholarship in teaching, curriculum, mentoring/advising, learner assessment, and educational leadership/administration are broadly defined below, and more specifically defined by the department in Part 2. Departmental Addendum. Additionally, each department defines specific examples of activities, quality measures, assessment, and scholarly output, which are discipline specific.

V. BROAD DESCRIPTIONS OF THE FIVE EDUCATIONAL DOMAINS, WITH ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF EDUCATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP

A. Teaching includes both direct teaching and the creation and use of instructional materials. Examples of direct teaching include lecturing, leading workshops, facilitating small groups, role modeling in any setting (e.g., as ward attending), precepting, leading faculty development workshops, and teaching procedure skills. Examples of developed instructional materials include teaching handouts, slides, computer-assisted instructional
materials, interactive distance-learning modules, and other audiovisual learning materials.

Educational scholarship in the teaching domain requires that the activities or products be publicly available for peer review so they can be evaluated and applied by the educational community. Peer review and dissemination methods for teaching activities are highly diverse. They may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Peer review by local experts, the institution’s curriculum committee, the department’s education committee, or internal (Graduate Medical Education Committee) or external (ACGME, LCME) accreditation reviewers
- Peer-reviewed or invited presentations – including workshops, abstracts, or posters – at local, regional, national, or international meetings (including but not limited to clinical and basic science professional organizations)
- List of other institutions where the lectures, workshops, or teaching methods have been adopted
- Invitations for teaching consultation from other departments or schools and results of the consultation
- Number of citations in other instructors’ curricula
- Publishing in a peer-reviewed print venue (journal article) or book, or acceptance of instructional materials in a peer-reviewed repository, for example:
  - MedEd Portal
  - Higher Education Assets Library
  - Family Medicine Digital Resource Library

B. **Curriculum** is defined as a longitudinal set of designed educational activities and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the materials. The activities may occur at any level of training (e.g., medical student, resident, graduate student, continuing medical education, inter-professional education, faculty development, community programs) and may be delivered face-to-face or through distance-learning media.

Educational scholarship in the curriculum domain requires that the activities or products be publicly available for peer review so they can be evaluated and applied by the educational community. Peer review and dissemination methods for curriculum activities are highly diverse. They may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Peer review by local experts, the institution’s curriculum committee, the department’s education committee, or internal (Graduate Medical Education Committee) or external (ACGME, LCME) accreditation reviewers
- Peer-reviewed or invited presentations – including workshops, abstracts, or posters – at local, regional, national, or international meetings (including but not limited to clinical and basic science professional organizations)
- List of other institutions where the curriculum has been adopted
- Invitations for curriculum consultation from other departments or schools and results of the consultation
- Number of citations in other instructors’ curricula
- Publishing in a peer-reviewed print venue (journal article) or book, or acceptance of curricular materials in a peer-reviewed repository, for example:
C. **Mentoring/Advising** are developmental relationships encompassing a spectrum of activities in which educators help learners or colleagues (i.e., other faculty) accomplish their goals. Mentoring implies a sustained relationship from which the mentor and mentee obtain reciprocal benefits. Advising occurs over a more limited period of time, with the advisor serving as a guide or source of expertise to help the advisee achieve her or his goals.

*Educational scholarship in the mentoring/advising domain* is highly diverse and may be demonstrated by methods including, but not limited to, the following:

- Invitations to critically review a mentoring program and documentation of the results of the appraisal’s impact
- Acquisition of competitive program development funding (i.e., grants) through a peer-reviewed process for development of a mentoring/advising program
- Conducting mentoring and advising training sessions
- Invitations for consultation from other departments or schools and results of the consultation
- Peer-reviewed or invited presentations (e.g., on a mentoring program, evaluation methods, other innovation) – including workshops, abstracts, or posters – at a local, regional, national, or international meeting (including but not limited to clinical and basic science professional organizations)
- List of other institutions where the mentoring or advising program/evaluation methods/other innovation has been adopted
- Publishing (e.g., on a mentoring program, evaluation methods, other innovation) in a peer-reviewed print venue (journal article) or book, or acceptance of mentoring materials in a peer-reviewed repository such as:
  - MedEd Portal
  - Higher Education Assets Library
  - Family Medicine Digital Resource Library

D. **Learner Assessment** encompasses measuring the learner’s knowledge, skills and attitudes by using instructional objectives and/or standards. Scholarly activities include the development of assessment processes and tools, implementation of an evaluation, and the analysis and synthesis of data.

*Educational scholarship in the learner assessment domain* requires that the activities or products be publicly available for peer review so they can be evaluated and applied by the educational community. Peer review and dissemination methods for learner assessment activities are highly diverse. They may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Presentation of the assessment process or outcomes to local audiences such as departmental or Medical School curriculum committees, or internal review in preparation for an Residency Review Committee visit
• Peer-reviewed or invited presentations – including workshops, abstracts, and posters – at local, regional, national, or international meetings (including but not limited to clinical and basic science professional organizations)
• List of other institutions where the assessment process or tool has been adopted
• Publishing in a peer-reviewed print venue (journal article) or book, or acceptance of the assessment tool in a peer-reviewed repository, for example:
  - MedEd Portal
  - Higher Education Assets Library
  - Family Medicine Digital Resource Library

E. **Educational Leadership/Administration** is the achievement of desired educational outcomes through administrative and leadership efforts. Educational leadership also includes major course, clerkship, and program development for students, residents, faculty, interprofessional colleagues, and community members.

*Educational leadership excellence in this area* may be demonstrated by methods including, but not limited to, the following:
- Course, clerkship, or educational program leadership through a major curriculum change, as approved and peer reviewed by the curriculum committee of the medical school or department
- Evaluations by learners of course, clerkship, or program based on defined objectives or goals
- Replication or borrowing of course, clerkship, or program components or best practices by other faculty or learners

*Educational scholarship in this area* is highly diverse and may be demonstrated by methods including, but not limited to, the following:
- Documentation of the leader’s effectiveness using 360-degree evaluation with peer comparisons, benchmarking, or external peer-review
- Peer review of innovations/programs/curricula by local experts, the institution’s curriculum committee, the department’s education committee, or internal (Graduate Medical Education Committee) or external (ACGME, LCME) accreditation reviewers
- Peer-reviewed or invited presentations of innovations/programs/curricula – including workshops, abstracts, or posters – at regional, national, or international meetings (including but not limited to clinical and basic science professional organizations)
- List of institutions that have adopted innovations/programs/curricula created by the faculty leader
- Grants or internal awards to support innovations as evidence that others have judged the innovation to be worthy of investment
- Invitations or nominations to serve on education committees or taskforces, editorial boards, study sections, other relevant review committees, etc.

VI. **CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION**

A. **To Assistant Professor**
Not applicable in the Medical School (entry level rank is Assistant Professor).

B. **To Associate Professor**
A recommendation for promotion to associate professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the specific standards for promotion to Associate Professor as stated by this Teaching Track Statement. Promotion is based on performance and service, independent of time in previous rank.

1. *Continuing engagement in high-quality educational work (including the application of a scholarly approach) across any combination of the five educational domains.*
   Quality can be assessed in a variety of ways, depending upon the domain and the specific activity or product. Candidates should continue to participate in relevant educator development workshops, meetings, and conferences in order to acquire skills/knowledge for application in their educational practice.

2. *Outstanding educational scholarship in at least one of the five educational domains.*
   Educational scholarship can take a variety of forms, all of which have value in assessing the performance and accomplishments of faculty in the Teaching Track. Examples of scholarship for each of the five educational domains are provided in section V. and in the departmental addendums.

3. *Service, particularly on education-related committees, task forces, or boards.*
   Although not a primary criterion for advancement, service will be taken into consideration in making decisions on promotion. Performance of service, however exemplary, cannot substitute for the primary criteria of teaching and/or work in the other domains (curricula, mentoring/advising, learner assessment, educational leadership/administration) and educational scholarship. Examples of service contributions include:
   a. Service to the department, school, or university on governance-related or policy making committees
   b. Roles in discipline-specific regional and national organizations
   c. Service to the community, state, and public engagement

4. *An excellent local and regional reputation in any combination of the five educational domains* (teaching, curriculum, mentoring/advising, learner assessment, and/or educational leadership/administration) as demonstrated by invited presentations, program development, receipt of awards, and nomination by faculty peers.

Concordant with the Medical School’s mission, value should be given to educational activities and scholarship that involve collaboration, interdisciplinary or interprofessional teams, and public engagement.

C. **To Professor**
A recommendation for promotion to professor is made when an eligible faculty member is recognized as a national leader for excellence in at least one of the five educational domains. The eligible faculty member must also have demonstrated high quality work in
other domains such as education and educational development with evidence of effective mentoring and has made additional academic, scientific, scholarly, and/or professional achievements outlined, but not limited to, the list below. Promotion is based on performance and service, independent of time in previous rank.

1. **Nationally recognized for engagement in high-quality educational work (including the application of a scholarly approach) across any combination of the five educational domains.** Quality can be assessed in a variety of ways, depending upon the domain and the specific activity or product. Candidates should continue to participate in relevant educator development workshops, meetings, and conferences in order to acquire skills/knowledge for application in their educational practice.

2. **Nationally recognized for educational scholarship in at least one of the five educational domains.** Educational scholarship can take a variety of forms, all of which have value in assessing the performance and accomplishments of faculty in the Teaching Track. Examples of scholarship for each of the five educational domains are provided in section V. and in the departmental addendums.

3. **Service, particularly on education-related committees, task forces, or boards.** Although not a primary criterion for advancement, service will be taken into consideration in making decisions on promotion. Performance of service, however exemplary, cannot substitute for the primary criteria of teaching and/or work in the other domains (curricula, mentoring/advising, learner assessment, educational leadership/administration) and educational scholarship. Examples of service contributions include:
   a. Service to the department, school, or university on governance-related or policy making committees.
   b. Roles in discipline-specific regional and national organizations,
   c. Service to the community, state, and public engagement

4. **Holds educational leadership positions** either locally within the Medical School or in national societies.

5. **Contributions to the development of other faculty educators or medical residents.**

6. **An excellent national reputation in any combination of the five educational domains** (teaching, curriculum, mentoring/advising, learner assessment, and/or educational leadership/administration) as demonstrated by invited presentations, program development, receipt of nationally recognized awards, and nomination by faculty peers.

**VII. ANNUAL REVIEW**

Each Medical School department will conduct an annual review of all Teaching Track faculty members during the first six years on the track. The process and review criteria are described in the departmental Teaching Track Statement.
Further, all Teaching Track faculty will be eligible for a periodic career review (a minimum of every four years), providing an in-depth assessment of their career at that particular stage.

The specific criteria for performance evaluation on the Teaching Track are outlined in the individual Departmental Teaching Track Statements. In general, a faculty member should continue as an active participant in the intellectual life and mission of the Department. Specific goals and expectations should be established with the Division or Department to allow flexibility for changes in a faculty member’s career patterns.

VIII. PROCEDURES

Promotion in the Medical School requires a positive vote by two-thirds of all faculty members at the department level who are eligible to vote on the question to affirmatively recommend for promotion. All full time faculty holding appropriate appointment and rank, including those at affiliated sites, are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion of candidates in the Teaching Track. The process for promotion will be the same for all tracks in the Medical School.

The promotion dossier will follow the standardized format required by the University.

IX. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS STATEMENT

The Medical School will review its Teaching Track Statement at least every five years, or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The revisions will be presented to the Faculty Advisory Council. All Medical School Teaching Track faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote of the Teaching Track faculty, in conjunction with approval of their departmental criteria, with the approval date noted on the document.

History of Revisions:

Original Document: April 30, 2008
Revision Approved by Teaching Track Faculty: December 18, 2012
PART 2: DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT
This document describes the procedures and criteria to be used by the Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology (IBP) for evaluation and promotion of faculty appointed to the Teaching Track. The contents include:
1. Departmental mission statement
2. Criteria for appointment to assistant, and promotion to associate and full professor
3. Procedure for annual review of faculty members
4. Competencies for scholarly teaching

II. IBP MISSION STATEMENT
The Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology is:
Dedicated to an integrative systems biology approach to bio-medical discovery.
We partner with colleagues across disciplines to investigate questions ranging from the gene/molecule to the intact animal, while striving for excellence in research and dissemination of new knowledge with local, national, and global impact.
Committed to mentoring and training graduate students.
We empower students to develop a deep understanding of the complexity of physiological systems to enable them to pursue unique career pathways spanning from academia to bio-industry.
Devoted to excellence, innovation and scholarship in education.
We educate students in the integration of structure and function of cells, organ-systems, and living animals, providing a strong foundation for knowledge discovery in basic science and human health fields.

III. APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY
A. Introduction
The primary effort of faculty members appointed to the Teaching Track will be to further the educational mission of the department. However, there is also an expectation for scholarly accomplishments and participation in service activities. The specific distribution of effort among these three areas will be decided on an annual basis by the Department Head and the faculty member. In the educational area, success will be based upon data from a teaching portfolio, which will include information such as reports from peer observation and review, learner evaluations and regular documented participation in educational faculty development.
B. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion of Faculty

1. Assistant Professor

Candidates for an initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor will be judged on the following standards:

- An earned doctoral degree (Ph.D., M.D. or equivalent) with a biological science major.
- Documentation of competence in teaching and communication skills.
- Experience in the preparation and delivery of lectures, as well as teaching in small groups, in a laboratory setting and in journal clubs.
- Evidence of the potential for independence in developing and directing courses, including coordinating faculty efforts and evaluating learners.
- Evidence of having done scholarly work in the laboratory and/or an area involving transmission of knowledge. Examples are presentations at local or national meetings, submitted manuscripts, or publications in a peer reviewed journal appropriate to the field.
- Evidence of the potential for independent scholarly productivity.

2. Associate Professor

Candidates for appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor must be experienced educators with competencies similar to those expected for assistant professors but at a higher level. In particular, evidence such as the following will be sought:

- Continued educational activities with an increased quantity of teaching and strong peer and learner evaluations.
- An assessment of effectiveness in teaching and advising students based upon:
  - A review of courses taught, directed and/or developed
  - A list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic advisor.
  - Evidence of teaching excellence at undergraduate, graduate and/or professional levels, provided by written statements and combined ratings of students.
  - Written statements by the Department Head, academic peers and others familiar with the faculty member’s teaching performance.
  - Evidence of sustained teaching excellence.
- Collaborative and faculty-initiated scholarly productivity, evidenced, for example, by publications in peer-reviewed journals, development and dissemination of educational materials, or the writing of books or chapters. This work can be in the area of transmission of knowledge and/or laboratory based.
- Service on departmental, Medical School, University and/or national organization committees; leadership in University/national professional organizations.

3. Professor

It is expected that faculty will strive to achieve the rank of full professor. In general, for promotion to this rank a faculty member’s performance should exceed that achieved
for promotion to associate professor. In particular, evidence such as the following will be sought:

- A national or international reputation, as shown, for instance, by letters from outside experts in the educational field, invitations to symposia, or evidence of leadership in national or international societies.
- Continued educational activities with increased teaching and excellent peer and learner evaluations.
- Excellence in student mentoring and advising.
- Productive scholarship in the area of transmission of knowledge and/or laboratory based.
- Participation in service activities, including recognized leadership roles at local or national levels.
- Successful mentoring of junior faculty.

C. Annual Evaluation of Faculty

1. Process for Annual Review

The Department Head will carry out an annual review of all IBP faculty members in the teaching track. Prior to the review, the faculty member will provide a written summary of their performance and accomplishments during the past year. The Department Head and faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty member’s performance in the light of promotion criteria and personal goals agreed upon at the previous annual review. They will also discuss any concerns the faculty member may have and how to deal with them. Finally, the faculty member’s goals for the coming year will be discussed, and an agreement about his/her distribution of effort among teaching, scholarly activity and service will be made. It is recognized that faculty interests may change with time, and that the specific weighting of emphasis on teaching, scholarly activity and service should be adjusted accordingly. The Department Head will prepare a written report of the meeting and the agreements made. This report will be given to the faculty member and a copy put in his/her file.

2. Determination and Consequences of Below-Standard Performance

If, in the opinion of the Department Head, the performance of the faculty member is substantially below the goals and expectations of the department, the following procedure will be followed:

- The Department Head will appoint a review committee composed of three faculty members from the department, to include at least one who is tenured and one in the teaching track.
- That committee will review the performance of the faculty member in question and determine if his/her performance is indeed below goals and expectations.
- If so, the committee and Department Head will prepare a plan for improving the faculty member’s performance during the coming year.
The particular deficiencies, the plan for removing them, and the criteria upon which the person will be judged will be presented to the faculty member in writing and at a meeting with the Department Head.

At the next annual review the Department Head will determine how diligent and successful the faculty member has been in improving his/her performance. If the progress has been unsatisfactory, the Department Head will meet again with the same faculty committee for advice on a course of action. This may include terminating the employment of the faculty member.

3. Mentoring and Evaluation of Junior Faculty
The Department Head will assign a senior faculty mentor (associate or full professor, preferably Teaching Track) for each junior faculty member. The mentor will meet with the mentee regularly to promote career development, monitor their progress and help new faculty members with tasks such as teaching preparation, student assessment, and program evaluation. Each year, prior to the mentee’s annual review, the mentor will submit a written evaluation of the mentee’s progress to the Department Head.

4. Periodic Career Review
All senior IBP faculty (Associate Professor and Professor) will be eligible for an optional Periodic Career Review, providing an in depth assessment over five years of their career at that particular stage. The process for this review is described in the Medical School Policy: Periodic Career Review.

The criteria for the Periodic Career Review are the same as defined elsewhere in Section III of this statement.

The department head may initiate this review process following the annual faculty review at any time of the year if it is deemed that it may help to enhance a faculty member’s role in the department.

IV. COMPETENCIES, EVIDENCE OF QUALITY AND ASSESSMENT
A. Introduction
Teaching can be defined as any activity undertaken by a faculty member within the academic setting that contributes to the efforts of learners to acquire intellectual skills, to extend knowledge and understanding, or to develop attitudes and habits that foster continuous lifelong learning. This could include, but is not limited to, direct teaching, course and program development, mentoring and advising students, and educational leadership and administration. The Department of Integrative Biology and Physiology believes that teaching should be held to the common standards for scholarship that include the ability to be reflective, systematic, replicable and public.

The following sections provide examples of (a) competencies expected of IBP faculty on the teaching track, (b) evidence of quality that will be used to evaluate performance, and (c) how the impact of the faculty member’s performance will be judged. The lists are not inclusive.
B. Direct Teaching

**Definition:** Examples of direct teaching are lecturing, leading workshops, facilitating small groups, and role modeling in any setting (e.g., a research lab). Also included in this category is the development of instructional materials, which may involve the creation and use of teaching handouts, slides, computer-assisted instructional materials, interactive distance learning modules, and other audio-visual learning materials.

**Activities:**
- Preparing and giving lectures
- Facilitating small groups
- Leading workshops
- Role modeling
- Precepting
- Working one-on-one with learners
- Making education-related presentations
- Assisting in evaluations of learners
- Preparing and conducting laboratory sessions
- Preparing and presenting teaching cases
- Preparing and facilitating journal clubs
- Preparing and implementing computer-based instructional programs
- Demonstrating skills and procedures using simulations, demonstrations and patients.
- Regularly committing to the effort of teaching undergraduates, medical students, residents, fellows, physicians in practice and the general public.

**Evidence of quality; quantification:**
- Use of a teaching portfolio: philosophy of teaching statement, description of your goals, preparation to teach, and ongoing development
- Learner evaluations of teaching
- Letters from former learners/trainees about the value of their educational experience with faculty
- Peer observations and review
- Course and course director ratings when compared with peers
- Outcome indicators: Learner performance
- Role in teaching (i.e., lecturer, course/site director, curriculum developer, etc.)
- Number of hours teaching
- Number of years teaching
- Number of learners and/or groups taught (during the past 5 years)
- Number of learners placed in professional leadership roles
- Teaching with different levels of learners
- Different types of courses taught
- Materials developed for instructional activities (i.e., lectures, teaching guides, seminars, etc.)
- Number of successful projects, including undergraduate (e.g. UROP), mentored and completed
- Enrollment figures (applicable to undergraduate courses or electives)
- Departmental, institutional or national recognition of teaching ability (e.g., teaching awards)
- Invitations to teach in other departments/courses/institutions
- Presentations about teaching
- Development of skills in the areas of teaching and/or curriculum development

Assessment of teaching impact:
- Application of principles, theories and findings from the literature to teaching
- Internal or external presentations/demonstrations of teaching skills
- Internal or external reviews of performance
- Mentoring of other faculty on teaching skills
- Considered an expert in field by national organizations
- Submissions of posters, abstracts, seminars to internal or external review process

C. Mentoring and Advising

Definition: Mentoring and advising include activities that involve a developmental relationship in which an educator provides guidance or counsel to a learner or colleague to facilitate accomplishment of the learner’s or colleague’s goals. Mentoring implies a sustained, committed relationship from which the mentor and protégée obtain reciprocal benefits. Advising may occur over a very limited period of time with the advisor serving as a guide or source of expertise to help the advisee achieve her or his goals.

Activities:
- Mentoring learners through the range of professional development in basic, applied or clinical sciences
- Mentoring learners on projects in basic, applied or clinical sciences
- Counsel to learners or colleagues to facilitate their goals
- Advisor to students/residents/junior faculty/staff
- Advocacy for the professional development of learners

Evidence of quality: quantification:
- Individuals who were mentored or advised met goals
- Testimonials from those advised/mentored
- Accomplishments of those advised/mentored
- Self and peer assessment of effectiveness
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- Departmental/Institutional/National awards for mentorship/advising
- Faculty development on mentoring/advising skills (i.e., readings, workshops, meetings)
- Selected to have a leadership role in a mentoring organization (i.e., Learning Community Head)
- Number of individuals mentored/advised
- Names of individuals mentored/advised and their positions
- Time invested (duration, number of hours, frequency of contact, total hours)
- Description of process for helping individuals achieve their goals

Assessment of mentoring/advising impact:
- Presentations at workshops/meetings on mentoring/advising
- Scholarly work on advising/mentoring
- Presentations/papers/workshops on mentoring/advising
- Development of mentoring/advising materials
- Modeling mentoring skills in other faculty
- Contributing to a review of a mentoring program
- Selected as a consultant to an internal or external program on mentoring
- Invited to be a peer reviewer on topics in this area

D. Learner Assessment
Definition: Learner assessment encompasses the processes of measuring the learner’s knowledge, skills and attitudes against pre-defined instructional objectives and/or standards. Assessment instruments or tools refer to the methods of gathering data about learner performance and understanding.

Activities:
- Authoring test questions for national testing organizations (e.g., NBME)
- Developing original assessment tools including essay tests, simulations, paper assignments, etc.
- Analyses of learner assessment data
- Dissemination of reports on learner assessment in preparation for internal and external reviews
- Synthesis and reporting of assessment information
- Development of innovative assessment methodology
- Collaborative assessment development across disciplines

Evidence of quality: quantification:
- Linking assessments to educational objectives
- Documenting evidence of reliability and validity of assessment tools
- Application of current literature, models and test theory (i.e., using best educational practice)
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- Development of skills in the areas of assessment or evaluation
- Number of assessment tools
- Types of assessment tools
- Frequency with which tools are used
- Number of learners assessed by tools

Measurement of learner assessment impact:
- Use of assessment tool by other programs/courses
- Presentations regarding assessment tools
- Submission and acceptance of assessment tools in peer reviewed repository (i.e., APS Archives of Teaching Resources, MedEdPortal)
- Implementation of original assessments by other professionals at a national level
- Invited presentations locally or nationally on learner assessment

E. Educational Leadership/Administration

Definition: A successful educational administrator and/or leader is one that achieves desired outcomes and transforms the institution through their administrative and leadership efforts.

Activities:
- Leadership of an educational committee or task force
- Significant contribution to the development of a large scale educational initiative
- Course/clerkship/program director leadership
- Development of funding/infrastructure for educational initiatives
- Leadership at national meetings

Evidence of quality; quantification:
- Formal development of leadership skills
- Evidence of best practices and use of literature in leadership
- Type and scale of changes initiated
- Commitment to excellence
- Type of programs/problems addressed
- Evaluations by peers and collaborators
- White papers or working documents reviewed by peers
- Evidence of self-evaluation/self-reflection
- Resources acquired and documented efficiency of use
- Efficient and effective use of budgets/resources
- Relationships with other individuals involved in a project
- External requests to lead/administer projects/programs
- Demonstration of programmatic evaluation process
Demonstration of faculty/staff development
Number and type of programs/projects led
Size of programs/courses/projects led
Length of time as an administrator/leader
Number of administrative/leadership positions
Number and type of personnel supervised/involved in project
Size of budget/financial resources

Assessment of Leadership/Administration Impact:
- Disseminated results of program/project within institution
- Project plans/proposals utilized and sustained
- Similar projects/programs adapt/adopt outcomes

F. Scholarship
Definition: A successful educator should show evidence of educational scholarship.

Activities:
- Publishing of textbooks
- Publishing of lab manuals
- Publishing of education based studies in peer reviewed journals.
- Publishing of educational related reviews
- Publishing of teaching theory or other educational related articles.

Evidence of quality: quantification:
- Publishing in peer reviewed journals.
- Publishing in textbooks.

Assessment of Scholarship:
- Successful publication in peer reviewed journals or textbooks.

VII. PROCEDURES
The normal procedures defined in Part 1: MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE will apply.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS STATEMENT
IBP will update its teaching track statement every five years or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by an appointed IBP subcommittee. All faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a vote by faculty with the approval date noted on the document.

History of Revisions:
Approved by Department, Medical School and AHC: November 11, 2010.