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). Research Track appointments are annually renewable and are not in the tenure stream. 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

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

Research 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 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 (M.D. or equivalent and/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 in a small group laboratory, classroom or clinical setting is required. This may be documented by formal peer evaluations, student evaluations, and teaching awards.

2. Research/Scholarship
   Independence of research accomplishments, significant, intellectual contribution to collaborative or interdisciplinary research are also highly valued. Evidence will be based upon fulfilling criteria “a.” and AT LEAST ONE of the other criteria (b-f) below, corroborated by internal and external peer evaluation:
   
   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.
      • Documentation of major, substantial contributions to multi-authored journal articles.
      • Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and/or 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.
      • Serving as a collaborator or principal investigator 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 laboratory or 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.
   
   e. Peer-reviewed presentations (poster or platform) at scientific meetings
   
   f. Research awards

3. 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 awards

4. Clinical Service (only 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.

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 and/or international visibility; 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:

3. 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.

4. Research/Scholarship
Assessment of excellence and leadership in scholarship may be based upon fulfilling criteria “a.” and AT LEAST TWO of the other criteria (b-f) below, and corroborated by internal and external peer evaluation:

a. Continued productivity in scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals, with substantive contributions documented. Middle-authorship is acceptable but the majority of publications should be as the lead or senior author.

b. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research.

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
   • Principal investigator, co-investigator, or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts

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

e. Senior role on significant original contributions based on laboratory or clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of physical medicine or physical rehabilitation, participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.

f. Research awards.
3. Service
In the Medical School, leadership in service contributions is expected for promotion to Professor. Examples include:
   a. Evidence of skills in ongoing mentorship for advancing the careers of younger professionals (e.g., continuing mentorship of pre-doctoral students, medical students, and residents, advancement of post-doctoral associates, junior faculty members, and other professional colleagues).
   b. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.
   c. Service awards.

4. Clinical Service (only 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.

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: March 11, 2014