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PART I. MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT
This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether faculty meet the general criteria for promotion on the Research Track (W). Criteria and standards described in this Statement are used for appointment at all ranks and for promotion of faculty on the Research Track. The Research Track Statement also defines the criteria for annual performance review of Research Track faculty at all ranks, and where appropriate, post-promotion review.

This document contains Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

A. Appointment
B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
C. The process for the annual faculty performance review

Research Track Statements are reviewed and approved by the Dean of the Medical School.

The criteria, standards and procedures are applied without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status or sexual orientation.

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.

It is a long term goal of the University and the Medical School that all Research Track faculty achieve the rank of full Professor.

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 values Co-Investigators and interdisciplinary collaboration on major funding proposals as well.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY
A. Appointment of Faculty

Research Track appointments may be made on all University of Minnesota Medical School campuses and affiliated sites, following the processes described in the Medical School Policy on Faculty Appointments.

1. 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:

   a. Possession of a Terminal Degree (MD or equivalent, or Ph.D.)
   b. Board eligibility or certification (if applicable - clinical specialties)
   c. Demonstrated ability in teaching
   d. Demonstrated involvement in high quality research which has been accepted for publication or is published in peer-reviewed national journals.
   e. Documentation of competence in the skills of communication, including effective communication in teaching students and in oral and written presentations of research.

Each Department may add specialty-specific criteria for appointment, in PART 2.

DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM

2. **Associate Professor and Professor**

The criteria for appointment as Associate Professor or Professor are the same as the criteria for promotion to the proposed rank, found in Sections IV.B. and IV.C.

B. **Annual Performance Review of Faculty**

1. **Process**

   All Research Track faculty, at all ranks, undergo an annual performance review. The process for this review is described in the Medical School Faculty Review Policy: Annual Review. The Department defines the criteria for annual performance review in PART 2. DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM of this Research Track Statement. 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 VI).

   The Department Head and (if applicable) departmental faculty will meet annually to review and discuss the performance of Research Track Assistant Professor faculty, relative to the Research Track Statement. The annual review of all Research Track faculty will be recorded on the Medical School Form 12a and will reflect the faculty member’s performance relative to the Departmental Research Track Statement. The Department may choose to empower a committee (for example, a Research Track Committee or the Promotion and Tenure Committee) to assist the Department Head with the review of Research Track faculty. For promotion in rank, a vote of the faculty must be taken. For continuation of the appointment, a vote of the faculty is optional. A record of the vote will be included on the Form 12a, if a vote was taken. The Department Head and faculty member will sign the completed Form 12a. The Form 12a is forwarded to the Dean of the Medical School for review, comment, and signature. The signed Form 12a will be kept in the faculty member’s personnel file and will subsequently become a part of the dossier for promotion.

2. **Criteria**

   The criteria for satisfactory performance for the annual review are the same as those for the appropriate rank, as defined in this Research Track Statement.
Joint and/or secondary appointment requests will be made by the secondary department, with the support of the primary department, in the form of a request letter(s) signed by both department heads, addressed to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the Medical School.

IV. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN RANK

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 Research Track Statement.

1. Teaching
   While quantity and type of teaching is highly variable for Research Track faculty, teaching is required for promotion. Evidence of high-quality contributions to the teaching of undergraduate, graduate or post-graduate students is required. This may be documented by formal peer evaluations and student evaluations.

2. Research/Scholarship
   Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence may be based upon the following:
   a. Scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether focused on laboratory endeavors, clinical investigations or analysis or synthesis of clinical observations and experience.
      • First author and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions to multi-authored journal articles
      • Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to multi-authored publications.
   b. External research funding from granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, and institutions which sponsor programs in biomedical research subject to peer review.
      • Principal investigator or a collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts
      • Contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research.
   c. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.
   d. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine, and descriptions of new techniques; participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.

3. Clinical Service (if applicable)
   Clinical Service expectations for promotion to Associate Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation inside and outside the local area as an authority in a clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the area, evidence of clinical outcomes, invited visiting lectureships, memberships in professional
societies, and participation in administrative and leadership groups related to the medical specialty.

Clinical excellence is not defined by a revenue metric. Clinically active faculty are expected to achieve and maintain appropriate Board certification in their particular field.

4. Service
Service, although not a primary criterion for advancement, will be taken into consideration in making decisions on promotion. Performance of service, however exemplary, cannot substitute for the primary criteria, research and teaching.
Examples of service contributions include:
- Service to the Department, School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees.
- Roles in discipline-specific regional and national organizations,
- Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

C. To Professor
A recommendation for promotion to Professor is made when an eligible faculty member is recognized as a leader in research, achieves national visibility and presents evidence of effective mentoring of other faculty members; fosters a culture which enhances diversity; and has made additional academic, scientific, scholarly, and/or professional achievements, which include but are not limited to the following, recognizing that not all standards will apply to all faculty:

1. Teaching
While quantity and type of teaching is highly variable for Research Track faculty, teaching is required for promotion to Professor. Continued evidence of high-quality contributions to the teaching of undergraduate, graduate or post-graduate students is required. This may be documented by formal peer evaluations, student evaluations, and teaching awards.

2. Research/Scholarship
- Assessment of excellence and leadership in scholarship may be based upon one or more of the following:
  - Scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals, with an increasing trend towards senior authorship.
  - Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research.
  - External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, and institutions which sponsor programs in biomedical research subject to peer review as Principal investigator, co-investigator, or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts.
  - Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.
  - Senior role on significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine (if applicable).

- Reviews by peer evaluators.

3. Clinical Service (if applicable)
Clinical Service expectations in decisions for promotion to Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation at the national level as an authority and a leader in a
clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the region, invited national visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

4. Service
   In the Medical School leadership in service contributions is expected for promotion to Professor. Examples include:
   a. Leadership roles in discipline-specific national organizations, including but not limited to: committee chair, symposium organizer, session chair, grant reviewer, member of editorial board.
   b. Leadership roles in the service to the Department, Medical School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees (e.g.: committee chair).
   c. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

D. Joint Appointments
   If a faculty member has a joint appointment in another department and is being considered for promotion, the primary department will contact the other department(s) to obtain their assessment and record of vote on the proposed promotion.

V. PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW
   All senior Medical School 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.

VI. PROCEDURES
   Promotion in the Medical School requires a positive vote by two-thirds of eligible voting faculty members at the department level 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 Research 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.

VII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS STATEMENT
   The Medical School will review its Research Track Statement Preamble 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 faculty will be invited to review and give input on the Statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote of the faculty, in conjunction with approval of their departmental criteria, with the approval date noted on the document.

   History of Revisions:
   - Original Document: Date of Faculty Assembly
   - Revision: [Month] 2010
I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT
This statement describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether faculty on the Research Track in the Department of Medicine meet criteria for:

A. Appointment
B. Annual performance review
C. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
D. Periodic career review

The criteria, standards, and procedures are applied without regard to race, religion, color, gender, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

II. MISSION STATEMENT
The Department of Medicine is committed to the overall objectives of the University of Minnesota and its Medical School in maintaining the highest standards of academic excellence in programs of undergraduate and graduate medical education, providing outstanding and state-of-the-art patient care, providing continued medical education for physicians, and supporting basic and applied research to clinical problems.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF FACULTY
A. Appointment of Faculty - Criteria
The Department of Medicine accepts and subscribes to the statement on criteria and standards for appointment of faculty in the University of Minnesota Medical School. Faculty are expected to support and foster all aspects of the mission of the Department, including scholarship, education, administration, applied medical science, and service. Research track faculty should possess a doctoral degree (MD, PhD, PsyD, EdD, PharmD, or equivalent), and a significant portion of their time should be spent in research, as well as education and clinical practice (as applicable). The following standards are specific to the Department.

1. Assistant Professor
   Individuals being appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor in the Research Track should have experience with, and commitment to research in biomedical sciences.

2. Associate Professor or Professor
   The specific criteria for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor and Professor will be the same as for promotion to the rank.

B. Annual Performance Review of Faculty
1. Process
Annual reviews will serve to evaluate the contributions of the faculty member to the mission of the Department and the Medical School.

The performance of research track faculty members will be reviewed in light of the goals and expectations established in this statement. This review will serve to evaluate the...
contributions of the faculty member to the mission of the Department and the Medical
School and will also be used for faculty development.

As part of this annual process, the faculty member will prepare an updated curriculum
vitae. The faculty member will be asked to meet individually with the Division Director
and/or Department Head, to discuss his/her accomplishments of the preceding year, and
goals for the upcoming year. A Medical School Form 12a will be completed and sent to
the Medical School Dean. This annual review covers all components of the Department’s
mission, as they apply to the individual’s assigned responsibilities.

When the faculty member, following an annual review, is believed to be ready for
promotion, the process will be:

A. Recommendation for promotion is submitted by the Division Director to the
   Department Head for approval.
B. Department of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Committee reviews curriculum vitae
   and supporting documents for eligibility for promotion.

2. Criteria
   The criteria for satisfactory annual performance review will be consistent with the criteria
described for the appropriate rank or the next rank if promotion is anticipated.

IV. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

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

B. To Associate Professor
   Associate Professors are expected to have increasing achievements (both quantity and
   quality) in the areas listed below, with local or regional recognition in one or more of
   these areas:

   1. Teaching
      While quantity and type of teaching is highly variable for Research Track faculty,
teaching is required for promotion. Evidence of high quality contributions to medical
education, as manifest by:

      • Development of teaching materials, including new curriculum offerings,
education programs, textbooks, syllabi, computer programs, or videotapes that
make a unique contribution to quality and methods of teaching a given subject
through the medical school and outside the local community;

      • Contributions toward the teaching of undergraduate students, medical students,
residents, fellows, post-graduate students or CME, including recognition
available from formal peer evaluations, student evaluations or teaching awards;

      • Laboratory mentorship of students and trainees

   2. Research
      Faculty in the Research Track may, but are not required to have an independent
research program or they may play a significant role in an established research
program. Evidence may be based on the following:
a. Peer-reviewed scientific publications where they had a significant role.

b. External research funding from granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, and institutions which sponsor programs in biomedical research subject to peer review:
   - Principal investigator or major contributor on funded research grants, contracts or established research programs
   - Director of a core laboratory for a peer-reviewed, funded research grant or contract

c. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.

d. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine, and descriptions of new techniques; participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.

3. Clinical Service (if applicable)
   Clinical Service expectations for promotion to Associate Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation inside and outside the local area as an authority in a clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the area, evidence of clinical outcomes, invited visiting lecturerships, memberships in professional societies, and participation in administrative and leadership groups related to the medical specialty.

Clinical excellence is not defined by a revenue metric. Clinically active faculty are expected to achieve and maintain appropriate Board certification in their particular field.

4. Service
   Service, although not a primary criterion for advancement, will be taken into consideration in making decisions on promotion. Performance of service, however exemplary, cannot substitute for the primary criteria, research and teaching.
   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.
   d. Service as a member (not the committee chair) on some key and labor intensive committees (e.g., admissions, IRB, etc).

C. To Professor:
   A recommendation for promotion to Professor is made when an eligible faculty member is recognized as a leader in research, achieves national visibility and presents evidence of effective mentoring of other faculty members; fosters a culture which enhances diversity; and has made additional academic, scientific, scholarly, and/or professional achievements, which include but are not limited to the following, recognizing that not all standards will apply to all faculty:
1. **Teaching**
   While quantity and type of teaching is highly variable for Research Track faculty, teaching is required for promotion to Professor. Continued evidence of high-quality contributions to the teaching of undergraduate, graduate or post-graduate students is required. This may be documented by formal peer evaluations, student evaluations, and teaching awards.

2. **Research/Scholarship**
   Assessment of excellence and leadership in scholarship may be based upon one or more of the following:
   a. Scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals, with an increasing trend towards senior authorship.
   b. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contributions to established research programs.
   c. External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, and institutions which sponsor programs in biomedical research subject to peer review as principal investigator, co-investigator, or a major contributor on peer-reviewed, funded research grants, contracts or established research programs.
   d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, or reviewer for national journal, etc.
   e. Senior role on significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine (if applicable).
   f. Reviews by peer evaluators from inside and outside the Institution to evaluate the accomplishments of the individual.

3. **Clinical Service (if applicable)**
   Clinical Service expectations in decisions for promotion to Professor include enjoying an excellent reputation at the national level as an authority and a leader in a clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the region, invited national visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

4. **Service**
   In the Medical School leadership in service contributions is expected for promotion to Professor. Examples include:
   a. Leadership roles in discipline-specific national organizations, including but not limited to: committee chair, symposium organizer, session chair, grant reviewer, member of editorial board.
   b. Leadership roles in the service to the Department, Medical School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees (e.g.: committee chair).
   c. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

V. **PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW**
   All senior Department of Medicine faculty at the ranks of 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.

VI. **PROCEDURES**
   The procedures defined in Part 1: MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE will apply.
VII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS STATEMENT
The Department of Medicine will update its Research Track Statement every five years or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Department of Medicine Promotion and Tenure Committee. 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. Approval requires the majority of faculty who voted.

History of Revisions:
- Original Document: May 17, 2011
- Approved June 29, 2011