

School of Medicine Term Faculty Promotion Policies and Procedures
Responsible Office: Office of Faculty Affairs

Replaces Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures last revised by SOM Faculty Vote 2021

Responsible Office: SOM Office of Faculty Affairs
Replaces Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures last revised by SOM Faculty Vote 2021
Current Revision Approved by Faculty Vote: xx/xx/xxxx

Based on the University Policy: Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures
Policy Type: Board of Visitors
Responsible Office: Academic and Faculty Affairs
Initial Policy Approved: 11/21/2025
Current Revision Approved: 11/21/2025

SOM specific policy and procedure clarifies and operationalizes the University Policy within the School of Medicine. SOM specific policy and procedures and shown in blue italics.

Policy Statement and Purpose

Virginia Commonwealth university herewith establishes its policies and procedures for term faculty promotion. This document institutes a unified promotion system throughout the university, while allowing variations in the academic units to accommodate their specific needs.

Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) pursues excellence as a goal. A prerequisite of this goal is the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. This requires the appointment and promotion of faculty in a way that encourages excellence in the creation, dissemination, and application of new knowledge and artistic expression and fosters an atmosphere of free inquiry and innovation in a global setting.

Appointments and promotions are based on the merit of the individual's contributions, consideration of comparable achievement in the faculty member's particular field, and the faculty member's contributions to the mission, needs, and resources of the university. Central to the appointment and promotion process is VCU's commitment to recognize and reward faculty members who help fulfill the mission and vision of the university.

VCU rewards contributions made to the intellectual and academic success of the student body through teaching; the advancement of knowledge, creativity and human health through scholarship; and the engagement of students, faculty, and staff to transform lives and communities through service in support of the university's mission.

The promotion system at VCU is designed to foster:

- Academic freedom of thought, teaching, learning, inquiry, and expression
- Fair and equitable treatment for all individuals
- Appropriate participation by the faculty, the administration, and the Board of Visitors
- An ongoing succession and infusion of new faculty members

Objectives

The objectives of the system described in this document are:

- Promotion of an engaged, learner-centered environment that fosters inquiry, discovery, and innovation in a global setting
- Faculty achievement to the highest attainable level within the context and resources of the university
- Support of university goals and support of the varied missions and characteristics of its individual academic units
- Commitment to administrative management, which provides for fair and reasonable allocation of time and resources
- Assurance of the financial integrity of the institution
- Sufficient flexibility to permit modifications of programs, curricula, and academic organizational units to meet changing academic, institutional, and societal needs

- *Recognition of the value and importance of faculty achievements in the areas of research/scholarship, teaching, service including clinical care and education is central to the mission of VCU School of Medicine and VCU Health.*

Noncompliance with this policy may result in disciplinary action up to and including termination. VCU supports an environment free from retaliation. Retaliation against any employee who brings forth a good faith concern, asks a clarifying question, or participates in an investigation is prohibited.

Table of Content

Who Should Know This Policy	3
Definitions.....	3
Contacts.....	4
Policy Specifics and Procedures	4
Forms	36
Related Documents	36
Revision History	36
FAQ	37

Who Should Know This Policy

All faculty eligible for promotion under term (non-tenure track) faculty guidelines are responsible for knowing this policy and familiarizing themselves with its contents and provisions.

All term faculty should be aware of this policy and refer to it. Chairs, supervisors and members of peer and SOM Promotion Committees are responsible for knowing and utilizing this policy.

Definitions

Term Appointment

For the purposes of this policy, term appointments refer to non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments with VCU (not to include adjunct faculty), and to faculty with affiliate appointments who serve as Clinical Educators. Clinical Educators will be considered eligible for promotion just like term faculty members, in accordance with section 2.0 below.

School

The term “school” is used throughout this document to refer to a school, college, or other major academic unit such as VCU Libraries.

Unit

The term “unit” is used throughout this document to mean the smallest organizational unit with a promotion and tenure policy, such as a program, department, or school.

Department

The term “department” is used throughout this document to refer to an organizational unit within a school or college, such as a program, department, or school (within a college).

Department Chair

The term “department chair” is used throughout this document to refer to the administrative head of a “department”

Service

Service is used throughout this document to refer to service to the university, profession, and community, and includes clinical service. Service may represent a faculty member’s primary, secondary, or tertiary area of effort or workload allocation.

Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary areas of effort or workload allocation

Primary area of workload allocation typically refers to the area with the greatest percentage of effort. The secondary and tertiary areas refer to other areas of effort, and may or may not apply. The designation of primary, secondary, and tertiary areas of effort for the purposes of promotion shall be determined by unit guidelines.

SOM Affiliate Faculty with Rank for the purposes of promotion in the SOM will follow this policy for promotion. This includes Clinical Educators with Affiliate appointments in the SOM including faculty who are MCVP-exclusively employed and VA-exclusively employed.

Contacts

The Office of Faculty Affairs officially interprets this policy. The Office of Faculty Affairs is responsible for obtaining approval for any revisions as required by the policy Creating and Maintaining Policies and Procedures through the appropriate governance structures. Please direct policy questions to the Office of Faculty Affairs, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

For the SOM, the Office of Faculty Affairs led by the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs is responsible for obtaining approval for any revisions as required by this policy and the SOM Creating and Maintaining Policies and Procedures. Please direct questions to the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs or designee.

Policy Specifics and Procedures

1.0 Authority and Applicability

1.1 Relationship of Schools and Departments to university Term Promotion Policy

Each unit shall establish written guidelines for promotion, and departments, may establish written guidelines for promotion. Unit guidelines shall be consistent with this policy and shall also specify the details involved in meeting the particular goals and objectives of those units. Unit guidelines may be more proscriptive than this policy. If there is any conflict between university and unit-level policy and guidelines, the university policy shall govern.

Guidelines shall define term faculty positions and the relationship of the unit's promotion system to the unit's work plan and individual faculty member work plans developed in accordance with the Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy. Unit guidelines shall include a process, composition of committees, and criteria for promotion relative to the unit's mission. The guidelines shall include specific measures for evaluating faculty member performance.

The guidelines for all units shall be formulated and reviewed periodically by a committee of the unit. The faculty shall elect the committee members, and the committee members shall be open to faculty recommendations. A majority vote of the unit faculty shall be required for the approval of all unit guidelines. Finally, the Office of the Provost must approve unit-level guidelines prior to them becoming effective.

Departments may develop specific guidelines which provide criteria which are relevant to that specialty. These must be written and approved by the faculty of the department and reviewed and approved by the SOM Office of Faculty Affairs.

Once approved, the SOM Faculty Advisory Council will review the SOM policy and any department or unit guidelines at least every 5 years and at the request of the dean.

The SOM will utilize the Policy on Policies to review, approve and revise this policy. The Faculty Advisory Council (an elected faculty body) will review and advise the Senior Associate Dean of SOM OFA on any recommended revisions. A redlined and revised copy will be sent to the faculty 10 business days prior to a faculty meeting, following a discussion of the revision at the meeting an electronic vote of the faculty will be held. A majority of votes cast by the faculty will be required for approval.

1.2 Appointing Authority

The provost is authorized to approve faculty promotions according to the procedures set forth in this document.

1.3 Applicability of This Policy

For term faculty hired before July 1, 2026, this policy will not become effective until three years after approval of this policy by VCU's Board of Visitors. Term faculty hired before July 1, 2026, may choose to be considered for promotion under the former VCU promotion guidelines through the 2028-2029 promotion cycle.

All term faculty hired before July 1, 2026 must choose between this new SOM Term Promotion policy and the university transition policy until July 1, 2029. All affiliate Clinician Educators including MCVP exclusive and VA faculty will begin using either the Transition Policy with SOM specifics that do not contradict the policy or this policy beginning July 1, 2026.

2.0 Defining Appointments

All faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), term (non-tenure), or adjunct (non-tenure). Adjunct (non-tenure, non-term) appointments are part-time. All other appointments shall be full-time tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), or term (non-tenure), or part-time tenured or term (non-tenure). "Part-time" is considered not less than 75% for tenured faculty and not less than 50% for term faculty. Exceptions to this may be considered on a case by case basis and must be approved by the provost.

Exceptions to this for the SOM, must first be approved by the dean and submitted to the provost by the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

. The Adjunct titles; Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, or Adjunct Instructor apply to individuals employed by the University as part-time faculty for a defined role.

The Visiting title is a temporary appointment for less than one year. The prefix “visiting” should be added to the appropriate rank designation.

Certain faculty members may also hold Administrative appointments, which are either primary for the duration of the administrative appointment or secondary in that the faculty member’s employment is still governed by the Term category guidelines.

A term (non-tenure) appointment is an appointment to the faculty for a specified mix of duties and does not lead to tenure. Term appointments shall always be at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor. When appropriate to the duties assigned to the faculty member holding a term appointment, modifiers as defined by the unit (e.g., clinical professor, visiting professor, research professor, or teaching professor) may be used. A term appointment may be up to one year or multi-year and is renewable unless stated otherwise in the employment contract. Conditions and notifications for non-renewal are specified in the terms and conditions of employment for term appointments. If the employment contract/terms and conditions conflict with this policy, then the employment contract/terms and conditions take precedence.

A term faculty member may be reviewed for promotion in any review cycle. However, a term faculty member who is reviewed and denied promotion may not reapply for promotion for the following two cycles. This ensures adequate time has passed for the dossier to be meaningfully more developed than in the prior review. The restriction on reapplication does not apply to cases in which the faculty member withdraws their application prior to submission to the provost.

Example: A term faculty member denied promotion during the 2028-29 cycle would not be eligible to reapply until the 2031-32 cycle.

Term appointments are defined in the Term Promotion Policy (this policy).

Affiliate faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure and are defined in the Affiliate Faculty Appointments Policy.

Clinician Educators with an affiliate faculty designation provide clinical care as a component of their work distribution, service to the university, and support for accreditation standards. Clinician educators provide direct patient care, contribute significantly to the operations of academic medical facilities, may participate in research activities, and play a vital role in clinical teaching for VCU learners. Clinician educator faculty are eligible for promotion and

applicable faculty privileges. Note that in accordance with the Affiliate Faculty Policy, Clinical Educators with an affiliate faculty designation who are promoted in rank are not eligible for promotion-based salary increases as affiliate appointments are not compensated by VCU.

Salary for Affiliate Faculty is determined and compensated by their respective hiring authorities

2.1 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments

Transfers from term appointments to tenure-track positions must follow the VCU Guidelines for Faculty Transfers. Upon transfer, their appointment would be governed by the university Promotion and Tenure Policy.

A term (non-tenure), dually-employed or VCU exclusively employed faculty member is eligible to apply for a probationary (tenure-eligible) appointment upon termination of an existing term (non-tenure) appointment. Time spent as a term (non-tenure) faculty member is not included in the probationary period for tenure appraisal. Accomplishments as a term (non-tenure) faculty member should be considered.

2.2 Continuing Review of Faculty

All term faculty members shall be evaluated annually using criteria established in the guidelines of the school and/or department. The guidelines for all evaluations shall be consistent with and fully incorporate the guidelines in the Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy.

All term faculty members shall receive regular feedback on their progress toward promotion, if not yet fully promoted. The procedures for providing this feedback should be described in unit guidelines, and may include a separate statement from the department chair at the time of annual evaluations, a pre-promotion review, or both.

All SOM faculty are evaluated annually. Dual (VCU and MCVP), VCU exclusive and MCVP exclusive will have a discussion of promotion at their annual evaluation. VA exclusive faculty are evaluated by the VA policy.

2.3 Honorary Titles

The president and/or Board of Visitors (or designee) may designate the rank of university professor, commonwealth professor, or emeritus professor as deemed appropriate. The voting privileges of faculty holding honorary titles shall be specified in the guidelines of the units where they are appointed.

Voting privileges for the SOM are outlined in the Faculty Bylaws.

2.4 Administrative Titles

Faculty members may be assigned administrative titles designating administrative

responsibilities held in addition to any term faculty rank concurrently held.

Administrative titles and compensation for administrative responsibilities are held independent of any concurrently held faculty rank. Periodic reviews of a faculty member's performance as an administrator are separate and independent of academic reviews conducted for faculty promotion under this document.

Administrative titles and responsibilities are held for specific terms or at the discretion of a superior administrative officer. Removal from an administrative position does not impair any rights the administrator held as a faculty member.

It is not possible for an administrator to earn a promotion based on an administrative title.

Accomplishments in an administrative position can be considered toward evaluation of promotion by category, however the holding of an administrative position or title is alone not sufficient for promotion.

2.5 Notice of Appointments

Every faculty appointment or change of status shall be specified in a written notice of appointment issued by or on behalf of the provost, president, and/or Board of Visitors to the faculty member.

The notice shall include the following information: rank, academic unit(s) in which the appointment is made, type of appointment (term), period of appointment, whether it is part-time or full-time, and salary.

2.6 Joint Appointments with Non-university Agencies

A joint appointment for a faculty member with a non-university entity does not in any way fiscally obligate the university for salary or benefits supplied by the non-university entity in the event of a change in the relationship between the faculty member and the non-university entity or between the entity and the university.

Joint appointments with a non-university entity shall require a letter of approval from the university and non-university administrative units involved in the appointment. Such letters shall specify the privileges granted to the faculty member by each unit and the responsibilities and obligations of the faculty member to that unit during the appointment.

3.0 Faculty Ranks and Appointments

This document applies to the university faculty appointments at the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. This policy applies only to term appointments. Tenured and tenure-eligible appointments are subject to the university Tenure

and Promotion Policy. Adjunct faculty appointments and affiliate faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure.

3.1 General Criteria and Information Supplied by Candidates

In order to ensure distinguished contributions in the specific mix of duties for term faculty, which include teaching and/or research, scholarly pursuits and creative expression, and service and/or clinical service, the following criteria shall apply in the evaluation of all term faculty members for promotion. All faculty members' work plans are developed in accordance with the Faculty Roles and Rewards policy. Faculty members holding administrative positions must meet the guidelines of their own academic unit.

The narrative describing scholarship, teaching, and/or service should not exceed 6000 words.

For SOM applications, typical narrative lengths have been 3-4 pages (~1500 words).

3.1.1 Timeline

Units must establish a timeline by which candidates declare their candidacy for promotion based on university guidance specifying that, for 9/10-month faculty, the following steps shall be completed by May 15. For 12-month faculty, the following steps shall be completed by July 1 prior to submitting documentation for promotion.

- Faculty declaration of candidacy for promotion to department chair or dean (for units without departments).
- Formation of peer review committee/s, including identification of a chair
- Identification of external reviewers
- Invitations sent to external reviewers
- Faculty provisions of external reviewer materials, if applicable, to be shared by the PRC chair

The timeline must be included in unit guidelines or communicated to candidates with at least 45 days' advance notice before declarations of candidacy are due. After declaring their candidacy, the peer committee is formed. Candidates then submit their dossier (as outlined

below) for evaluation to the unit. Unit guidelines may add specificity to the dossier requirements below, but may not reduce or waive any requirements in this policy.

SOM Timeline for Promotion Reviews

Departments may clarify their timeline in their written approved guidelines but they may not extend the timeline below. Any extension of the timeline below must be requested in writing two weeks prior to a deadline and approved by the SAD OFA or designee. Extensions may not exceed 4 weeks. Failure to meet deadlines without an approved extension may result in delaying the review for a year. It is at the discretion of the SAD OFA whether the packet can move forward with an altered timeline.

Supervisors/Chairs to discuss promotion and or tenure with any tenure/tenure-eligible faculty member not a full professor during the annual evaluation.

By the first Monday of May at 5pm of each year

- Information regarding the cycle for Promotion and/or Tenure is provided to faculty*

By the first Monday of July at 5pm of each year

- Faculty declare candidacy for promotion and or tenure to the department chair*
- Peer review committee is formed and approved by the candidate*
- Candidate submits to the departmental peer review committee names and contact information for external independent reviewers and internal and external reference letters*

- *Peer review committee identifies external independent reviewers and internal and external reference letter writers*
- *Faculty provide CV in SOM portfolio, narrative, biosketch, workload distribution form, 4-6 artifacts (ex manuscripts)*

By the first Monday in November at 5pm of each year

- *Letters are received*
- *Peer Review Committee holds meetings discuss and votes*
- *Chair writes Chair Letter and votes*
- *All letters, forms, documents must be submitted by the department to the SOM for review*

By February 1 at 5pm of each year

- *SOM P and T Committee reviews and votes on all packets SOM OFA reviews all packets and dean's decisions are made*
- *All packets are submitted to the Provost*

The remainder of the schedule follows university guidelines

**For the July 2026-Jun3 2027 cycle the timeline is being adjusted and documented separately.*

Required Dossier For SOM

The Candidate will prepare the following documents to be submitted initially to the department and then included in the P N T electronic system.

1. *CV completed in portfolio and transferred to the P N T system.*
2. *A Workload Distribution Form*
3. *A Narrative- The narrative describing scholarship, teaching, and service should not exceed 6000 words. For SOM applications, typical narrative lengths have been 3-4 pages (~1500 words).*
4. *A Promotion Biosketch (<350 words)*
5. *A Reference Letter Form will be completed by the department.*
6. *Suggestions for a peer review committee. The candidate must approve the final peer review committee in the PNT system.*
7. *Teaching Portfolio (optional)*
8. *Either copies of manuscripts or other scholarly works or an active link included in the CV with these documents*

3.1.2 Curriculum Vitae

Candidates must supply a comprehensive CV that documents their body of work across their academic career. The exact format of the CV may vary by discipline, and unit guidelines may specify certain format stipulations. However, the CV must document performance in all areas of the candidate's workload. When possible, the CV shall include links to evidence and

artifacts. There is no length limitation on the CV.

Candidates must complete their CV in the SOM Portfolio system and submit into the P N T system. Any clarifications to SOM Portfolio CV should be included in the Narrative. A properly formatted SOM Portfolio CV is required for the departmental peer review. The candidate is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the CV. Candidates employed exclusively at the Veterans Administration can submit in a pdf using a standard professional format including the minimal standards below. Incomplete CV's will not be reviewed and will delay promotion review.

Minimal standards for a properly formatted portfolio CV must include:

- *Publications*
 - *Full reference with citation, authors (specify applicant author position) and publication date.*
- *Grants*
 - *Pending, current, and past in reverse chronological order*
 - *Title of grant*
 - *Identify the granting agency and grant number*
 - *Note award total, demarcating total direct and indirect costs*
 - *State your role and effort also identifying the PI/MPI if you are not the PI/MP*

3.1.3 Appropriate credentials and experience

Term faculty must hold a degree as outlined by unit guidelines and in accordance with applicable accreditation requirements to be eligible for promotion or appointment to the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor.

Term faculty must hold a terminal degree to be appointed at the rank of assistant professor or to be promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor. In cases of extraordinary professional accomplishment, the provost, at the request of the dean, may make an exception to this requirement.

Accepted terminal degrees include those recognized by the Fulbright Scholar Program. Degrees on this list qualify as terminal for the purposes of promotion. If a faculty member holds a degree not listed that they believe should be recognized as a terminal degree for the purposes of seeking promotion, they may submit a written request with documentation to the dean who will make a recommendation and request to the Office of the Provost for consideration. Requests may also be submitted on behalf of a program, department, or school by the dean on an as-needed basis or as described in unit-level guidelines for promotion and tenure. The provost or their designee makes the final determination of whether degrees not on the above-referenced list qualify as terminal for the purposes of promotion within VCU. Any requests related to the terminal degree requirement must be submitted by December 1st of the year before they intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure. Once an exception is approved for an individual faculty member, it will apply to future promotions for that individual faculty member in the current academic appointment.

Degrees that are determined to be acceptable as terminal degrees will apply to all faculty with that degree. The Office of Faculty Affairs will maintain this list.

3.1.4 Scholarship

Demonstrated continuing scholarship, professional growth, and national or international contributions. Faculty members with a percentage of effort dedicated to scholarship must be consistently engaged in productive and creative scholarly activity in areas relevant to the goals and mission of the university. They must make a substantive contribution to the body of knowledge in their discipline and/or in an interdisciplinary capacity that reflects high standards of quality in creativity, scholarship, and professional competence and demonstrates national or international recognition. They must demonstrate leadership and professional competence in independent and/or collaborative scholarship that leads to the creation of new knowledge or creative expression. Scholarship can be in the form of research and discovery scholarship, the scholarship of teaching and learning, integration of scholarship, translational and community-engaged research, and/or creative activity. Research and discovery scholarship breaks new ground in the discipline and answers significant questions in the discipline. Scholarship of teaching and learning includes applied research regarding various pedagogies, student learning, and assessment practices; development and dissemination of materials for use in teaching beyond one's own class. Integration of scholarship examines knowledge in a broader context, focusing on synthesizing, interpreting, and connecting data most often in an interdisciplinary way. Examples include a comprehensive literature review, or a textbook used in multiple fields of study. Community-engaged research is a collaborative process between the researcher and community partner at all stages of the research process. Examples are community-based participatory and action research. Creative activity includes original works in the arts, including the fine, performing, digital, literary, and graphic arts.

Scholarly Activity This includes peer-reviewed contributions in basic, clinical and/or educational scholarship. Scholarship may also be in the form of community-engaged research. The SOM recognizes the expanded definition of scholarship proposed by Boyer and colleagues that includes:

The scholarship of discovery that advances new knowledge in a discipline.

The scholarship of integration that makes connections between new knowledge across disciplines such as translational and interdisciplinary research.

The scholarship of application which takes the outcome of new knowledge to socially consequential problems such as outcomes research, clinical guidelines, diagnostic or treatment response criteria, and the creation of new or innovative quality improvement programs or methods based on the outcomes of empirical research.

The scholarship of teaching and learning which explores ways to help students acquire new knowledge and develops specific skills and attitudes such as the creation or evaluation of new teaching methods or curriculum and the use of new technologies to improve learning or the dissemination of learning (Boyer EL. Scholarship Reconsidered. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990)

The SOM recognizes Community engaged research as research that is grounded in relationships of shared knowledge production with those outside the university, and is defined by qualities of reciprocity, mutual respect, shared authority, and co-creation.

The SOM also recognizes scholarship in policy research, the use of rigorous scientific methods to evaluate the impact of policies on health outcomes. Examples include difference-in-difference modeling and quasi-experimental studies. The field of policy research also uses systematic inquiry to examine the development, implementation, and impact of policies and practice guidelines, analyzing how policies are formulated, how they function in practice, and how they influence patients, populations, and systems.

Both quantity and quality should be assessed to achieve a balanced evaluation and all possible evidence of scholarly activities and capabilities should be sought, including published materials in refereed journals as well as in press publications. Products on preprint servers may be discussed in narrative but should not be counted as peer reviewed publication. The candidate's narrative must specify named author publications versus Workgroup or similar publications; the role in Workgroup or similar publications should be clearly specified. Any pending patent application approved by the University shall be given appropriate credit

Candidates must identify whether their authorship position represents a first-author role (indicating primary intellectual and/or experimental contribution) or a senior-author role (indicating leadership, supervision, and intellectual direction). When fields use nonstandard authorship conventions, candidates should provide a brief explanation of the norms and their role according to those norms.

The review committee should evaluate the candidate's evidence of independence, leadership, and innovation in scholarly research. This includes assessing whether the candidate has established a research trajectory that is clearly self-directed and distinct from their mentors; taken intellectual and organizational leadership roles in projects, grants, and publications; and contributed original, impactful ideas or methodologies to their field. The review committee should assess whether these qualities are evident and proportional across the candidate's overall research activities, not just isolated examples. Special attention should be paid to differentiating research that reflects the candidate's own scholarly vision from work that primarily extends their mentor's research program. This should be clearly summarized in the candidate's narrative.

Scholarship Statement and Evidence: Candidates with a percentage of effort for scholarship must supply a scholarship statement that articulates their line or lines of scholarship, providing a narrative rationale for their work and its significance, influence, and national or international reputation. The statement must emphasize the significance of the candidate's work. When possible, linking to scholarly artifacts within the CV may suffice. However, candidates may also choose to supply approximately five exemplar scholarly artifacts.

SOM Faculty with effort in scholarship should supply a scholarship statement in the SOM Narrative. Individuals who do not have effort but choose to be evaluated and rated in this area must include documentation in the Narrative.

3.1.5 Teaching Demonstrated quality in teaching.

Faculty members with a percentage of effort dedicated to teaching shall be evaluated based primarily upon the impact of the faculty member's teaching in programs relevant to the mission of the university. Faculty members must demonstrate mastery of their subject matter and in communicating this understanding to student learners; in other words, faculty members are required to demonstrate that their students learn. There must be evidence of the candidate's sustained commitment to high quality instruction, the incorporation of advising and availability to students as a component of teaching, creating a positive environment for learning, sustained effectiveness as a contributor to the intellectual development of students through devices such as course design, course material, curriculum development, and attention to other mechanisms of enhancing student learning. Faculty members whose teaching is not course based (e.g., librarianship, clinical supervision) shall articulate how their professional practice contributes to the teaching mission of the unit and university in accordance with unit promotion guidelines. Mentoring and other forms of beneficial interactions between the candidate and learners should be given appropriate weight as a part of the teaching criteria, as determined by the unit. Demonstrated quality of teaching may include community-engaged teaching (e.g., service-learning experiences), and clinical teaching. Each unit shall explicate the quality of teaching for their unit.

Teaching should be well-rounded, demonstrating effectiveness across multiple educational modalities rather than focusing solely on one area such as mentoring. Teaching activities may include formal lectures, small-group instruction, one-to-one teaching, formal mentorship involving substantive direct contact hours, and education delivered through online platforms, websites, and other technologies. Faculty are expected to engage in multiple forms of teaching and to contribute broadly to the educational mission.

Contributions should also include innovative development, implementation, and assessment of new teaching materials, course designs, and educational technologies that promote learning and improve instructional effectiveness. Teaching may occur within the School of Medicine, the health system, the community, professional organizations, or other relevant settings.

Candidates should demonstrate the ability to teach purposefully and critically, to broaden students' intellectual interests, to provide thoughtful mentorship, to adopt innovative instructional methods when appropriate, and to communicate knowledge effectively to students, staff, patients, professionals, and the public. See appendix for items considered satisfactory and excellent for the teaching area.

Teaching Statement and Evidence: Candidates with a percentage of effort for teaching must supply a teaching statement that summarizes their contributions in the area of teaching. Candidates must supply evidence to support their teaching effectiveness. For faculty who engage in course instruction, student end-of-course evaluations must be included, and candidates must include the full, unredacted student comments. Unit guidelines should describe how course evaluations will be considered; review committees may consider trends and themes from course evaluation data, or they may consider benchmarking scores and comments while accounting for key contextual factors as described in the Assessing Teaching Effectiveness Report. In addition to course evaluations, evidence of the candidate's efforts toward continuous improvement in teaching effectiveness must be included, as specified by unit guidelines. Acceptable evidence may include peer observations, syllabi, student work (with identifiers removed), assessments of student learning outcomes and other forms of documented impact such as those described in the Assessing Teaching Effectiveness Report.

For faculty who teach courses, student end-of-course evaluations of teaching must be included, and candidates must include the full, unredacted student comments. For lectures or workshops student ratings and comments may be summarized with evidence of response rates and context (course size, level, delivery mode). Committees must weigh known bias risks when interpreting student feedback - there are known nationwide biases in student provided evaluations that should be considered.

For SOM Faculty with effort in teaching, a teaching statement should be included in the SOM Narrative. Individuals who do not have effort but choose to be evaluated and rated in this area must include documentation in the Narrative.

3.1.6 Service

Demonstrated performance in service. Faculty members give of their time and expertise for the betterment of their department, school, and university, profession, and/or the broader community. Service includes engaging in the application of learning and discovery to improve the human condition and support the public good. Demonstrated performance in service may include university service (i.e., service to the department, school, or university), professional service (e.g., service in national organizations), community-engaged service (e.g., service to address a community-identified need), and clinical service (e.g., patient care and consultation).

Service - Clinical Activities Faculty with health care responsibilities shall be evaluated for excellence in the care of patients, and contributions to improvements in systems of care as measured by the quality, quantity, collaboration, innovation, as well as diagnostic and/or therapeutic expertise. The impact of the faculty member's contributions can be documented by evaluations from professional colleagues within and without the institution, students, housestaff, and patient satisfaction if available. Attitude toward patients shall be evaluated by inquiries of clinical peers as well as patient satisfaction questionnaires, if available.

General Service - The quantity and quality of the candidate's service to the department, SOM, health system, university, local community (in ways related to the candidate's academic position), profession, professional organizations, and academic and scientific communities, both regionally and nationally, should be carefully assessed. Membership on key committees in the SOM or health system such as the MCV Physicians Board, Institutional Review Board (IRB), SOM Admissions Committee, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) are examples of excellent service

Service Statement and Evidence: Candidates must supply a service statement that summarizes their work in the area of service. This statement must include a description of university, professional, community-engaged, and/or clinical service, and should connect the service work of the candidate to their professional reputation and how their service advances

the institution and/or profession. When service is a tertiary area of workload, documentation of service may not be required beyond the CV and narrative, unless clarification is requested during the review process. In cases where service is a primary or secondary area of workload, faculty should have documentation and evidence that illustrates the impact on teaching and learning and/or impact in the department or unit and profession while highlighting outcomes that are innovative. Candidates may also elect to include supporting materials for service roles that are unusually time-intensive, innovative, or externally impactful.

SOM Faculty with effort in service should provide a service statement and evidence as outlined in the SOM Narrative. Individuals who do not have effort but choose to be evaluated and rated in this area must include documentation in the Narrative

3.1.7 Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluations are not included in the promotion dossier, as they serve a separate purpose. The annual evaluation is an administrative evaluation on productivity per year, which is a different purpose and criterion than the evaluation of the body of work for promotion. However, in cases where additional context is needed, summary commentary regarding the annual evaluations may be provided in the Chair's or dean's evaluation report.

In addition, statements on progress toward promotion from department chairs at the time of annual evaluation and/or pre-promotion reviews should be included.

All SOM faculty are evaluated annually. VCU term and MCVP affiliate faculty will have a discussion of promotion at their annual evaluation. VA exclusive faculty are evaluated by VA policy.

3.1.8 Workload Distribution

The dossier must include clear documentation of the workload distribution across time at VCU. This may be a simple table that shows the percentage distribution per category for each year of VCU faculty employment. Those with service at prior institutions may choose to include those workload distribution as well. Unit guidelines shall specify the methodology for determining a faculty member's primary, secondary, and tertiary (if applicable) effort or workload allocations for purposes of promotion.

Term faculty may have appointments that do not include allocations in all categories. If a faculty member has no allocation in a given category, they do not need to submit documentation for that category.

The SOM Workload Distribution Table for P and T will be completed and provided to peer committee by the department in consultation with the candidate. Workload and distribution for the candidate's full faculty career at VCU should be included. If the candidate's application includes work prior to hire at VCU, that workload distribution can be included but is not required. This will be provided by the department prior to the first Monday of July of the year of review. If there has been significant change in workload distribution it should be noted and clarified in the narrative.

If this includes work prior to hire this should also be included. If the faculty member disagrees with this distribution, this will be discussed with the chair. The faculty member may add a note to the form and the chair will document the workload distribution to be used for the promotion and or tenure review. When there is disagreement regarding work distribution, the SOM Office of Faculty Affairs led by the Senior Associate Dean will be consulted and if necessary will determine the distribution for review. This must be done prior to the first Monday of July of the year of review. If there has been significant change in workload distribution it should be noted and clarified in the narrative.

3.1.9 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Term Faculty

Faculty member performance with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service shall be rated (in descending order) as excellent, very good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Credentials and experience shall be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. All written reports and evaluations of term faculty performance ratings shall use this terminology.

Appointment or promotion to assistant professor shall indicate that the candidate is expected to perform at an excellent level in the area of their primary workload allocation and holds promise for further professional development.

Appointment or promotion to associate professor requires a minimum rating of excellent in the primary area of effort or workload, either teaching, scholarship, or service; at least very good in a secondary area; and at least satisfactory in a tertiary area, if applicable.

Appointment or promotion to professor requires a minimum rating of excellent in the primary area of effort or workload, either teaching, scholarship, or service; at least very good in a secondary area; and at least very good in a tertiary area, if applicable.

	<i>Primary</i>	<i>Secondary</i>	<i>Tertiary</i>	
<i>Assistant Professor</i>				<i>Expected they will be able to perform at an excellent level in their primary area</i>
<i>Associate Professor</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>At least Very Good</i>	<i>At least satisfactory if</i>	

			<i>effort (>0) Not required to be reviewed if ZERO effort</i>	
<i>Professor</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>At least Very Good</i>	<i>At least Very Good if effort. Not required to be reviewed if ZERO effort</i>	

3.2 Unit Criteria

The detailed unit guidelines shall amplify the general criteria of the university and include additional special criteria unique to a given unit.

The individual unit guidelines shall define scholarship, teaching, and service criteria and define what they mean by ratings of excellent, very good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory in each area. These criteria must require national and international recognition in at least one area of effort for those seeking promotion to professor.

These guidelines shall be developed with input from unit faculty and approved by the unit's faculty, the school dean, and the Office of the Provost. After approval, the guidelines should be provided to all new faculty members and filed with the school and the Provost's Office.

Each department of the School of Medicine (SOM) is expected to develop and sustain an outstanding faculty actively engaged in teaching, scholarship, and service. Where departmental guidelines have been created, they may amplify but not contradict this document. Departments may develop specific guidelines which provide criteria which are relevant to that specialty. These must be written and approved by the faculty of the department and reviewed and approved by the Senior Associate Dean, SOM Office of Faculty Affairs.

SOM Criteria for Promotion

In order to show continued activity and excellence, a faculty must have been in rank for 5 years before being reviewed for promotion. This time can include time served in rank at another institution. Exceptions to the 5 year requirement in rank can be proposed by the Chair in writing to the SOM OFA and approved by the Dean or designee.

All levels of review for the SOM will consider work load distribution and requirements for ratings in proportion to the candidate's work load distribution over time (e.g. an individual with 25% research time vs 90% research time)

For all faculty and ranks, professionalism must be satisfactory to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure.

Assistant Professor

For appointment to this rank, a candidate should have: (1) the highest appropriate degree (terminal degree) in a specific discipline or field (2) demonstrated professional competence in a specific discipline or field (3) demonstrated potential for teaching, service, and scholarship.

Associate Professor

(1) General The performance of the candidate should indicate a sustained record of professional achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service. Examples of satisfactory and excellent performance are provided in Appendix. Although candidates must achieve a balance between teaching, scholarship and service, the apportionment of teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities should be given consideration in the overall assessment.

(2) Academic Credentials and Experience The candidate must hold a terminal degree in an appropriate discipline, plus such postgraduate training as to satisfy specialty board eligibility, where such training is appropriate.

(3) Teaching The candidate should demonstrate contributions in teaching at a local or regional level including contributions to courses, curriculum design, implementation, or assessment, teaching in the clinical setting, continuing medical education or teaching through professional organizations or health care groups. The candidate should have successfully served as a mentor or advisor of students, housestaff, colleagues, or postdoctoral trainees.

(4) Scholarship The candidate should demonstrate maturity and professional competence in independent scholarship or as a leader in collaborative research that should lead to publication of new knowledge. Publications in refereed journals, books and book chapters, sustained for a number of years, will be used as a guideline for measuring scholarly achievement and growth. For faculty whose major contribution is in research, funding for research efforts, service to study sections, review committees or invitations to referee or provide editorial duties for national or international scientific journals also reflects the candidate's achievements and recognition in his or her area of expertise.

(5) Service The candidate is expected to demonstrate creative contributions in administrative and/or clinical service to the SOM, health system, community and profession as outlined under the general guidelines above.

Professor

General Promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon continued achievements in teaching, service, and scholarship, with national and international recognition in at least one of these areas. Examples of satisfactory and excellent performance are provided in the Appendix. Although candidates must achieve a balance between teaching, scholarship and service, the apportionment of teaching, scholarship and service responsibilities should be given consideration in the overall assessment.

(1) Academic Credentials and Experience As a general rule, the candidate should have held appointment as Associate Professor for a minimum of five years.

(2) Teaching Continued contributions to improvements and innovation in teaching. The candidate should have successfully served as the mentor or advisor of students, housestaff, colleagues, and/or postdoctoral trainees. Examples of national recognition for teaching include editing or writing a textbook, being an invited speaker at national meetings, national awards, publications, lectures or consulting, national impact on teaching methods or assessment, national funding of training grants or instructional programs, participation in national or international committees that develop educational programs or credentialing or certifying examinations.

(3) Scholarship The candidate should have demonstrated a sustained pattern of research productivity and funding. The candidate's publication record should be distinguished by originality and creativity, including peer-reviewed articles in journals, reviews and book chapters. Funding for research efforts, service to national study sections, review committees or invitation to referee or provide editorial duties for national or international scientific journals also reflects the candidate's achievements and recognition in his or her area of expertise. The candidate should have demonstrated an appropriate degree of collaboration as evidenced, for example, by the initiation of formal cooperative research ventures with his or her colleagues, or served as a resource for junior faculty within the institution. National recognition of scholarship must be corroborated by external scientists of outstanding reputation.

(4) Service The candidate should demonstrate continued contributions in system, community, and/or at a national level. The candidate should actively participate in his or her profession outside of the university. National recognition of service includes awards, publications, lectures, consulting, adoption of new clinical or administrative programs or processes at a national level and participation in national committees, programs, or panels relating to health care or academic medicine.

4.0 Academic Review Procedures for Promotion of Term faculty members _

In no case may a chair or dean serve on any peer review committee or school promotion committee. Individuals may vote on any given case at only one level of review.

The candidate shall develop a dossier following the guidelines established by the unit. The completed dossier shall be forwarded to the peer review committee to conduct a substantive evaluation of the candidate's record and performance.

Chairs, the dean, Senior Associate dean of Faculty Affairs, may not serve on any SOM peer review committees or any SOM P&T review committee. Direct supervisors (the one who completes the annual evaluation) may not serve on a peer committee for that individual faculty. Students/trainees may not serve on peer committees. Individuals who are being reviewed for promotion and or tenure may not sit on other peer committees or the SOM committee for that year.

No individual may vote on a case more than once. This means that the same individual may not serve on a peer review committee and a school promotion committee. When individuals serve on a peer or school promotion committee and the university promotion and tenure appeals committee, they must recuse themselves from the university-level role. All documents, reports, and discussions related to candidates for promotion are strictly confidential and may not be shared or discussed with anyone outside of the processes described in this policy, unless otherwise required by applicable law.

4.1 Peer Review Committee

4.1.1 Committee Formation

The dean or designee shall form a peer review committee following procedures described in the unit guidelines. Peer review committees must have at least three members with at least one term faculty member, and the committee may be composed entirely of term faculty. The majority of committee members should come from the unit, if possible, and there should be one member from outside the unit. All committee members must be at or above the rank sought by the candidate. The committee may include tenured faculty. The unit guidelines shall indicate whether the chair of the committee will be appointed by the dean or designee (e.g., department chair) or elected by its members. Candidates may challenge, in writing, the appointment of a member to the peer review committee for cause, such as a conflict of interest. The dean or designee shall consider any such challenges and determine whether to

replace that member.

In the event that there is an inadequate number of eligible faculty from within a unit to meet peer review committee composition criteria, the dean or designee may solicit members from another unit, unless unit guidelines specify a different process.

Students may not serve in any capacity on peer review committees. Student feedback on teaching shall be elicited through other teaching evaluation practices, and student feedback on aspects such as mentorship may be collected by schools through other processes used to evaluate faculty. The committee may consider any form of student feedback that is supplied as part of the dossier or provided by the department chair or dean.

School of Medicine Peer Committee Composition

Each candidate should have an individual peer committee appointed for their review. One committee cannot serve for all candidates in a department. In the event that there is an inadequate number of tenured faculty within the department to serve on the peer committee, tenured faculty from outside of the department with the requisite expertise will be able to serve. All members must be at or above the rank being proposed. A Peer Committee is formed by the department chair or their designee with consultation of the Senior Associate Dean for the office of faculty affairs or their designee, to review a faculty member for promotion.

The Peer Committee will be composed of 5 members; all members will be at or above the rank sought; all members must be term, clinical educators with affiliate appointment, or tenured faculty. The majority must be term faculty. The committee needs to be composed of 2 members within the department, 2 members from a different department. For a VA-exclusive faculty member, they must have at least one faculty committee member with VA effort. Peer Committee must hold an academic rank the same as or higher than the rank proposed for the candidate and may not be also being reviewed for promotion or tenure during the same cycle. If a member of the Peer Committee believes that they cannot be impartial, they should withdraw immediately from the committee by notifying the department chair, and chair of the Peer Committee in writing.

The department will document the committee composition in the PNT system and the candidate will approve of the committee in the system. The candidate shall have the right to challenge any member of the committee for cause. Such challenges must be made in writing to the chair within five working days following the date the candidate is notified of the composition of the committee. Ideally, the candidate and the department chair (in consultation with the senior associate dean OFA) will resolve any differences based upon challenges. Any challenges submitted in writing will be returned to the candidate upon resolution of the committee structure. The candidate will approve of the final committee. Potential committee members will be asked to serve on the committee and verify no conflict of interest as above

Chairs, the dean, Senior Associate dean of Faculty Affairs, may not serve on any SOM peer review committees or any SOM P&T review committee. Direct supervisors (the one who completes the annual evaluation) may not serve on a peer committee for that individual faculty. Students/trainees may not serve on peer committees.

Peer committees must be submitted in the PNT system and approved by the candidate by the first Monday of July of the review year.

Emeriti faculty who are actively engaged with the School of Medicine may serve on the Peer Committee but may not serve on the SOM P&T committee.

4.1.2 Evaluation Process

For faculty with scholarship as the primary area of effort or workload, three external reviews are required for promotion to associate professor or professor. The peer review committee solicits and receives external evaluations. External evaluators must be individuals with expertise in the candidate's field or a closely related field, be from outside of VCU, and be individuals who can provide an independent review of the candidate's work. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, been institutional colleagues, or been academic mentors or advisors of the candidate shall be excluded from consideration as an external evaluator.

Reviews must be solicited from individuals suggested by the candidate and individuals suggested by the peer review committee. Candidates may also provide names of potential external reviewers who should not be solicited. The peer review committee shall maintain an electronic list of all individuals solicited for external review letters that details each evaluator as being identified by the candidate or the committee, identifies any relationship of the evaluator to the candidate, and whether the individual agreed to provide an evaluation letter. All external evaluators must be faculty at or above the rank sought by the candidate. At least two must be at a doctoral university - Very High Research Activity (R1) institution. The third letter may be from other types of institutions in accordance with unit-level guidelines. All external letters that are received must be included in the file for review. Committees will only include information on letters they received and will not consider evaluators who were invited but declined to provide a letter.

Candidates will provide materials to the peer review committee for dissemination to external reviewers. The materials for external review should include, but are not limited to, the faculty member's curriculum vita and four to six artifacts representative of the faculty member's scholarship. The external review materials may not be altered once they are shared with external reviewers.

External evaluators must not be asked to determine whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion at VCU or at their home institution. Instead, they are being asked to provide an evaluation of the significance, quality, and national/international reputation of the candidate's scholarship. Unit guidelines may also require external letters for promotion for faculty with teaching or service as the primary area of effort or workload. Unit guidelines may require other evaluations of teaching or service, such as letters from colleagues within the university.

All letters from external evaluators are strictly confidential unless disclosure is otherwise required by law.

The SOM utilizes a form for all letters for independent external evaluators and may be used for all internal and external reference letters. These letters must be obtained prior to departmental peer review. The peer review committee will verify independence, rank, type of institution and number of letters for external evaluators. The peer committee will be responsible for ensuring that for faculty with research as the primary area, there are a minimum of 2 external independent evaluator letters from an R1 institution and a third external independent letter is obtained. The peer committee will be responsible for ensuring that for faculty with teaching or service as their primary area, there are a minimum of 2 external independent letters from either an R1 or LCME institution, and a third external independent letter.

All candidates and their committees may suggest up to 20 individuals to provide reference letters. Reference letters may be external or internal and do not need to be independent. These letters will include a majority of faculty and may include students, trainees, or other professionals. All individuals solicited must be documented via the SOM Table of Letters and must be included in the candidate's packet.

The peer review committee shall review all elements of the candidate's dossier, including external evaluator letters or internal letters, if applicable. They shall add a written report to the candidate's file that summarizes the outcome of their discussion, including the rationale for ratings on each criterion. The report shall also include the results of a vote by secret ballot. The final evaluation in each category is determined by the highest category at which there is a majority vote (for example, if there were five members with two voting Excellent, one voting Very Good, and two voting Satisfactory, the overall rating is Very Good). Ratings and votes for ratings below the level of Very Good must be accompanied by a written explanation for that rating or vote.

The SOM Peer committee will use the SOM criteria as shown in section 3.2.

Peer Committee Process

A. The committee quorum will consist of at least four of the members present at the informational meetings, but all members must receive minutes of the meeting pertaining to the faculty member under review and respond to the Chairman prior to each subsequent meeting. All members will attend the final meeting and will provide, in writing, a secret vote. Meetings may be in person or virtual and votes may be taken electronically and documented on the voting page. The minutes of the meetings will contain the members of the meeting that were present.

B. The Peer Committee will evaluate the candidate in four categories (credentials and experience, teaching, scholarship and service). The candidate dossier, see section 3.1.1.1, will be reviewed and discussed.

C. A minimum of two committee meetings will be held: initial introduction and organization and discussion/evaluation/vote. Additional meetings can be held as needed to discuss, request additional information or clarification, or meet with the candidate. Members will be given specific charges or subcommittees will be appointed by the chair. Reports by members or subcommittees will be made in writing and presented to and discussed with the entire committee. The committee may require that additional information be sought. Sources of information shall be identified by type and included in the report. The committee or a subcommittee may interview the department chair or their authorized representative and may interview any other faculty who might have information that would aid the committee in its deliberations. The purpose for such interviews is to obtain information on the areas to be evaluated and not to obtain opinions on the ultimate decision concerning promotion or tenure; those called by the committee will be apprised of this fact. If any information from these interviews are utilized in the deliberations, it must be included in the minutes of the committee meeting or the Peer Review report. The candidate may request to appear before the committee before the final vote. All proceedings will be confidential and members of the committee are charged not to discuss the proceedings outside the committee meetings, before, during, or after the proceedings.

D. The Peer Committee should examine various sources of input in order to evaluate the teaching performance of the candidate. This will include classroom, laboratory, continuing education, community-engaged teaching, and clinical teaching, where appropriate. It is important for the Peer Committee to elicit from students their evaluations with respect to course content, and relevance as well as fairness of assignments and tests. Preparation, organization, communication and availability, and professional and ethical behavior will also be carefully evaluated. Former students can be a valuable source of input for evaluating the teaching performance of a faculty member and the Peer Committee can contact previous students, housestaff, and advisees of the faculty member. The development of educational materials shall be considered in a like manner. Self-instructional packages, slide-tape packages, video tapes, computer-assisted instructional units, computerized videodisc materials, textbooks or chapters and other similar materials shall be evaluated and may be reviewed. Refereed materials (accepted by national educational organizations or professional groups or used at other schools of medicine) will be given greater credit.

E. The peer committee is responsible for requesting letters containing information on the candidate teaching, contributions to educational programs, educational innovation. This can include letters from other professional schools., colleagues, students, housestaff, and trainees.

F. If scholarship is the primary area, the Peer Committee should solicit letters from experts in the candidate's research field, who have known the candidate personally (internal and external reference letters), and from several experts who have not been close professional or personal associates of the candidate (external independent evaluator letters). See university policy for criteria. Evaluations shall be an integral part of the review process. The evaluator letters will be solicited by the Peer Committee and will include persons recommended by the candidate and the peer committee. The peer committee will have the ultimate right to select all evaluators. The candidate should make available upon request his/her entire file of publications. He/she should, in any case, submit three to five for scrutiny by the Peer Committee and the referees. The Peer Committee will document on the SOM Table of Letters the names of individuals contacted (or attempts to contact them), and whether or not responses were obtained. Relevant dates should be noted. All letters obtained must be submitted to the PNT system. The committee must bear in mind that the letters of evaluation regarding the candidate's scholarship constitute a major component of the review process. See also section 4.1.2.

When the overall rating for the primary area of workload allocation is Excellent, and the secondary area allocation, if applicable, is at least Very Good, and the tertiary area (if applicable) is at least Very Good for promotion to professor and at least Satisfactory for promotion to assistant or associate professor, the committee shall recommend promotion. With any other combination of ratings, the committee shall recommend against promotion.

See table 3.1.9 for SOM criteria for promotion.

The peer committee shall forward the file to the department chair. Where the smallest unit is the school, the peer review committee shall forward the file to the School Promotion and Tenure or School Term Promotion Committee.

4.2 Department Chair

For units with departments, after receiving the file from the peer committee, the chair of the department shall review the file using the unit guidelines, request supplementary material as needed, add a written recommendation, and forward the recommendation, the file, and the peer committee report to the school promotion and tenure committee. As noted in 7.1, the department chair may also provide summary comments regarding the annual evaluations in cases where additional context is needed. If included, such comments must summarize relevant patterns and feedback regarding the candidate's performance as a faculty member. The department chair's evaluation is independent of the peer committee, though the chair shall consider the peer review committee's recommendation as evidence. For units without departments, this step is not included.

For candidates with effort at the VA, a statement from their chief must be provided to the Chair and added to the dossier.

After review of the file, the Chair will write a letter and complete a voting form. The letter may also include information as summary comments of annual evaluations in cases where additional context is needed. The department will upload the documents to the PNT system and note the file is ready for SOM review. The chair will inform the candidate that the file is moving to the SOM review.

4.3 School Promotion and Tenure Committee or School Term Promotion Committee

4.3.1 Committee Election and Term of Office

Schools shall specify in their guidelines how their school-level committee will be composed for term faculty. Schools may elect to use the same School Promotion and Tenure Committee as specified in Section 4.3.1 of the university Promotion and Tenure Committee and add at least one term faculty member when evaluating term promotion cases. Alternatively, schools may elect to form a separate School Term Promotion Committee. If a school elects to form a separate School Term Promotion Committee, the following provisions apply:

The committee shall consist of no fewer than three faculty members, all of whom shall be at the rank of associate professor or higher. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of department chair or above. The members of a School Term Promotion Committee may be term or tenured faculty, but must include at least one term faculty member.

Members of the school term promotion committee shall serve staggered three-year terms. Those who have served three consecutive years are eligible to serve again for one year, if needed. In the event that committee vacancies occur, the dean or designee may appoint a member or an interim election may be held to fill the incomplete term. Each year, the committee shall elect a chairperson from its members.

The school shall select a school term promotion committee as provided by the guidelines of the school. The school guidelines may allow the dean to appoint committee members in addition to the election of committee members. Only full-time faculty members shall be eligible to vote.

The SOM will have two committees, one for term and one for tenure. Annually the Senior Associate Dean OFA will solicit nominations for the School Term Promotion Committee. They will prepare a slate of candidates for the School Term Promotion Committee. This slate will be submitted to the faculty for vote with write-in candidates allowed. The majority of those voting will constitute approval of the slate. The School of Medicine Term Promotion Committee will consist of at least seven term professors. At least 5 members will review, discuss and vote on each candidate. Members may not serve on any peer committees during the cycle. The Senior Associate Dean OFA or designee will work with the committee to select a chair for the year. Faculty will serve a three- year term on the committee and may serve another term after one year off the committee.

Members will have staggered terms. The dean or designee will fill a vacancy for an incomplete term. The composition of the committee will be announced following the election. This committee will review all promotion recommendations.

Regional Campuses:

In consideration of the special nature of the faculty, the regional campuses of the School of Medicine shall elect a school-wide promotion review committee consisting of 3 members. The School of Medicine Dean shall appoint three additional committee members, either tenured or term, from either their campus or the VCU Campus following the election of the committee. Only fulltime faculty members at the Associate Professor rank or higher shall be eligible to serve. A student/trainee member shall serve ex-officio. A committee member who resides in the same academic unit shall not be a part of deliberations or voting concerning a faculty member from that unit. In order to maintain a quorum, the dean can appoint an "ad hoc" member who meets the above criteria to serve for that deliberation. Four voting members constitute a quorum.

4.3.2 Evaluation Process

The school promotion and tenure committee or school term promotion committee shall receive the file from the chair of the department, or from the peer review committee in schools without departments, and review the file using the guidelines of the school as a reference. The committee shall review prior recommendations and enter a written report of its proceedings, including the results of a secret ballot with evaluations in scholarship, teaching, and/or service, for or against recommending promotion, and the rationale for the recommendation. The report shall also include the results of a vote by secret ballot. The file shall be forwarded to the dean of the school.

The SOM OFA will review each packet submitted by the department to assure it is complete prior to review of the SOM committee. The SOM Term committee will review all of the data submitted by each term peer review committee, including the chair's letter of evaluation. Additional information may be requested from the chair, the Departmental Peer Review Committee or from the candidate, if desired. The committee will complete a review form for each candidate and will do a secret ballot for each after discussion. The School Committee will make an independent recommendation to the dean regarding promotion for each faculty member it reviews. The work of the committee is confidential. They will work with the OFA if policy clarifications, specific candidate questions or logistical assistance is required.

The report of the SOM Committee will be added to the PNT file.

5.0 Administrative Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Actions

5.1 The Dean

After receiving a file, the dean shall review the file and add a recommendation that includes, but is not limited to, addressing the fiscal and programmatic impact of the proposed academic personnel action on the school and forward the original file to the provost. A copy of the file, complete with all recommendations but excluding the letters from the external reviewers, shall be given to the candidate.

If the promotion is not supported by either the peer committee, the chair of the department, or the school tenure and promotion committee or school term promotion committee, then the dean has the option of agreeing with their recommendation, disagreeing with their recommendation, or returning the file, no more than once, to those review bodies that did not support the proposed personnel action to request reconsideration. Unit promotion guidelines may also allow for candidates to add a written response to the file after a negative peer committee, department chair, and/or school committee recommendation which will then be submitted to the dean.

When promotion is not recommended, the dean shall inform the candidate of this decision. At this time, the dean shall also give the candidate a copy of the file, without the letters from the external reviewers unless disclosure of these letters is required by law, and notify the candidate of the right to add a written statement to be included in the file. The candidate has 10 working days after notification by the dean to add a statement to the file or to withdraw the file from further consideration.

The dean shall forward the original file, containing the candidate's written response (if one is provided) and all recommendations and letters to the provost.

The Dean of the SOM, the Senior Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs or designee may request reconsideration by peer, chair or SOM committee. They will provide a written request including why they are requesting reconsideration. If there has been a negative recommendation by the peer, chair or SOM committee, they will meet with the candidate and review the file. The candidate will be given the option of withdrawal prior to the dean's recommendation. If the candidate does not withdraw, the dean will review and make a recommendation. When promotion is not recommended, the dean shall inform the candidate of this decision. At this time, the dean shall also give the candidate a copy of the file, without the letters unless disclosure of these letters is required by law, and notify the candidate of the right to add a written statement to be included in the file. The candidate has 10 working days after notification by the dean to add a statement to the file or withdraw the file from further consideration.

The dean's recommendation will be noted in the PNT system. The file will be forwarded to the Provost.

Other than for discussion with a faculty member who has a negative recommendation, the packet will not be provided to the candidate until after being notified by the university that the review process is complete. At that time the candidate will receive the packet without letters (unless required by law).

5.2 The Provost

The provost shall receive and review files from deans and add a recommendation that includes, but is not limited to, addressing the university's fiscal and long-range planning impact of the proposed academic personnel action.

If the administrative review of the provost supports promotion, the provost shall approve the proposed personnel action.

If the administrative review of the provost does not support promotion, the provost shall inform the candidate of the decision in writing and notify the candidate of their right to appeal to the university Term Appeal Committee. The candidate has 15 working days from notification to appeal the decision of the provost.

6.0 Appeal Process

6.1 University Term Appeal Committee

The university Appeal Committee is composed as specified in Section 6.1 of the university Promotion and Tenure Policy. However, for appeals from term faculty, the committee will add at least two term faculty, appointed by the provost, to add term faculty perspectives to their deliberations.

6.2 Grounds for Appeal

A decision to deny promotion may be appealed by the candidate only on the following grounds:

1. The proper procedures in this policy were not followed, and the procedural error had a material impact on the outcome.
2. New evidence (including factually incorrect information not provided by the candidate) is discovered after the decision of the provost, and the evidence was not available before the decision of the provost, and the candidate could not have discovered the evidence by the use of reasonable diligence.

6.3 Appeal Procedure

The university Appeal Committee shall receive all appeals. The candidate must provide a written request to appeal a decision to deny tenure and/or promotion to the Office of the Provost. The request must specify how proper procedures were not followed and how that materially affected the outcome, and/or specify the new evidence and detail why the evidence was not available or discoverable before the decision of the provost. The Office of the Provost shall forward the written appeal to the Appeal Committee.

The Appeal Committee will review the documents in question and determine if grounds for an appeal exist via secret ballot.

If a majority of the Appeal Committee votes that grounds for an appeal exist, then the candidate shall have the right to address the Appeal Committee at a time convenient for both the candidate and committee members. Such presentations shall be limited in scope to the specific grounds for appeal alleged in the written appeal request. New subject areas not addressed in the appeal may not be introduced. The candidate may be accompanied by one nonparticipating advisor. The candidate may suggest to the Appeal Committee the names of additional witnesses to speak at the hearing, but the committee determines whether or not to call additional witnesses. The Appeal Committee may decide whether it needs limited additional information or testimony and may call appropriate witnesses for a hearing or contact those individuals or review bodies identified in the denial for additional information. The committee shall invite the dean of the relevant school to provide evidence, and the committee may also contact those individuals or review bodies identified in the denial for additional information or to provide evidence at the hearing. It shall confine any such hearings to those questions or issues specified in the appeal.

After reviewing the record and hearing testimony, the university Appeal Committee shall take one of the following actions based on a majority vote by secret ballot.

- a. Vote to support the appellant. When the Appeal Committee votes to support the appellant, the committee shall forward the file to the president with a letter describing their recommendation, with copies to the appellant, the provost, and the dean. The letter shall include a rationale for the recommendation and the number of committee members voting for and against the recommendation.

b. Vote to deny the appeal. When the Appeal Committee votes to deny any appeal, the committee shall forward the file to the president with a letter describing their recommendation, with copies to the appellant, the provost, and the dean. The letter shall include a rationale for the recommendation and the number of committee members voting for and against the recommendation. In the event of a tie vote, the appeal is considered denied.

For each case reviewed by the Appeal Committee, the president will review the materials provided and the recommendation from the Appeal Committee, and render a decision. The decision will be shared with the candidate, the Appeal Committee chair, the dean, and the provost. The president's decision is not appealable within the university.

7.0 The President

In the event of an appeal, the president will make the final decision about promotion after reviewing the report of the university Appeal Committee and any reconsidered prior reviews the president may order. If, after appeal, the president does not support the recommendation of a faculty member for promotion, the president shall notify the candidate, the provost, and the dean of this decision in writing. If the president does not support a recommendation for promotion, no further appeal exists within the university.

8.0 Termination of Employment of Term Faculty Members

Term faculty appointments carry no guarantee of reappointment or continued employment beyond the terms of the current faculty contract. Any non-renewal of a term faculty appointment shall be in keeping with the notice provisions outlined in the corresponding terms and conditions of employment, which are also outlined in the VCU Faculty Handbook. Non-renewal of a faculty appointment is separate and distinct from the dismissal for cause procedures described below.

In the case of dismissal for financial emergency, reorganization, and termination of programs, the Procedures for Declaration of Financial Emergency and Consequent Reduction, Reorganization, or Elimination of Programs Requiring Termination of Faculty Members policy will apply.

Adequate reason for dismissal of a term faculty member for cause may be established by a demonstration of any of the following:

- a. Neglect, inability, or failure to do the normal and expected satisfactory teaching, research, and other services within the areas of presumed professional competence.
- b. Professional incompetence, which includes failure to continue professional development within the individual's discipline and failure to fulfill university assignments.
- c. Serious misconduct that impairs the ability of the faculty to carry out their professional duties or that substantially negatively affects the operation of the unit or university.
- d. Violation of university policy or academic or professional ethics.

e. Unprofessional conduct that significantly adversely affects the functioning of the department, school, or university.

Term faculty terminations for cause may be appealed by the faculty member to the provost in writing, who will review the reasons for the appeal and determine whether to uphold the termination. If the provost upholds the termination, no additional appeal exists within the university.

9.0 Procedures for Review and Amendment of this Document

Changes in the Faculty Term Promotion Policies and Procedures may be initiated at the request of the president, the provost, the Faculty Senate, the University Council, or upon petition by 20% of the term faculty. Upon such a request, the president shall appoint an ad hoc faculty committee to review issues and recommendations regarding appointment and promotion policies and procedures and, if necessary, to recommend modifications.

Any members of the university community may raise issues or recommend a review of these policies and procedures. They must address such requests to the university president, who shall refer them to the Faculty Senate and University Council. Any changes in the Faculty Term Promotion Policies and Procedures of VCU shall take effect only after review through the university governance system.

Changes to the SOM policy will follow the SOM Creating and Revising Policies Policy and will require sending a redline change to the faculty two weeks prior to a faculty meeting where it will be presented and discussed. A final version with a redline version will be electronically sent to the faculty for a vote. Approval requires a majority of voting faculty.

Forms

There are no forms associated with this policy and procedures

Related Documents

1. Affiliate Faculty Appointment Policy
2. Faculty Administrative Contracts and Compensation Structure
3. Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures
4. Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy
5. Fulbright Scholar Program <https://fulbrightscholars.org/sites/default/files/2024-07/US-1.Scholar-Terminal-Degrees.pdf>
6. Teaching Effectiveness Report
7. Virginia Commonwealth university Faculty Track Transfer VCU Faculty Handbook link
8. VCU Faculty Handbook

Revision History

None – New Policy

FAQ

1. Where should candidates undergoing a review for promotion first turn with questions

If a peer review committee (PRC) has been established, a candidate would direct questions to the chair of the peer review committee within their unit. If a PRC has not yet been established, questions would be directed to the unit head for topics not addressed by the university, school, and unit guidelines.

The candidate should first address questions to the department. The OFA offers support for guidance and clarification throughout the process.

2. Can I duplicate entries in different sections of my CV?

It is best to avoid duplications in multiple sections of a CV. If necessary, the Peer Review Committee Chair can recommend the appropriate location in the dossier. Candidates will select in which category an item best fits, and can address in the narrative statement how material relates to both sections.

3. How do I submit my materials?

Once a candidate's dossier is complete, materials will be submitted via a designated online system determined by the school. (Ex: School of the Arts provides a google drive folder in which the candidate uploads materials by an established deadline.)

The SOM uses the PNT electronic system. The candidate will submit their dossier to the department. The department will upload the file into the PNT system once the peer committee and chair have been completed.

4. How do I select potential external reviewers?

To identify external reviewers, a candidate must consider field experts at R1 universities serving at a comparable or higher rank to the rank the candidate strives to achieve. Reviewers shall have no conflicts of interest (such as personal or close professional relationships) and must be able to objectively review materials.

5. Why follow the established promotion and tenure timeline?

To maintain the integrity and consistency of the review process, candidates must follow a predetermined timeline that culminates in the approval of the Board of Visitors.

6. What types of unit-level criteria may be included?

Units may elect to specify formatting and/or elements of the dossier, expectations for service

minimums, or other unit-specific criteria.

7. What is unique for exclusively employed VA candidates in the process?

Candidates exclusively employed by the VA will utilize the same promotion process as other affiliate term faculty under this Term Policy. There is no longer an option for an expedited separate review.

A few differences in the process are:

- 1. Candidates must submit a professional, accurate and complete CV that addresses all accomplishments considered in the promotion process*
- 2. Peer committees must contain at least one VA employed member*
- 3. The Section Chief at the VA will submit a summary report to the School of Medicine Department Chair for consideration in promotion review*
- 4. The Chair of the department in the School of Medicine will complete the Chair letter and review*

8. What is unique for exclusively employed MCVP candidates in the process?

Candidates exclusively employed exclusively by MCVP will utilize the same promotion process as other term faculty, including those dual employed by the SOM.

Appendix with Tables (Examples of Ratings by Category)

VCU School of Medicine – Matrix for Promotion & Tenure

These tables are provided as examples of activities that represent both Satisfactory and Excellent level activities. It is not designed to be a checklist of what should be accomplished for that rating in each area. Rather, the examples show the type and level of activity that should be considered in that rating. The quality, quantity, and consistency should be considered. The proportion of work in an area should be considered when evaluating the activities.

Table 1: Service — Examples of Accomplishments to be Considered for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor

Service:

Evidence of service should be documented on the Portfolio generated CV and verified for accuracy and completeness. The service portion of the narrative should clarify the extent and impact of the service. Breadth, quality and volume of service activities should be proportionate to effort allocation at all academic ranks.

Category	Satisfactory for Associate Professor or Professor	Excellent for Promotion to Associate Professor	Excellent for Promotion to Professor
Expertise and Administrative Service	- Participation in innovative professional pursuits that bring value to the SOM or health system - Reviewing for scientific journals or other professional publications	- Outstanding performance in professional pursuits that bring value to the SOM or health system - Consultation to external entities such as state and local government or non-profits - Editorial work for scientific journals or other professional - Publications Service on national or international study sections, review panels, or advisory boards Service to Significant academic	- Leadership of professional pursuits that bring value to the SOM or health system and garner national recognition - Consultation to external entities such as state and local government or non-profits with demonstrated impact on policy - Editorial work for high-impact scientific journals or other professional publications including major textbooks - Sustained service

		<i>journals as a reviewer or member of the editorial board</i>	<i>on national or international study sections, review panels, or advisor Boards</i>
<i>Clinical Service</i>	• <i>Consistent provision of high-quality clinical service</i> • <i>Respected as a medical consultant</i> • <i>Consistently meets clinical productivity expectations, such as RVU generation or shift coverage</i> • <i>Consistently meets clinical quality metrics such as timely documentation and timely consultation</i> • <i>Adherence to institutional performance standards</i>	• <i>Regional recognition for clinical excellence service</i> • <i>Development of innovative clinical program(s) with regional recognition</i> • <i>Development of strong referral relationships with community physicians for unique, successful clinical programs</i> • <i>Implementation of practice improvement programs</i> • <i>Significant contributions in leadership of clinical services (e.g., medical director or other important roles)</i> • <i>Participation in development of local, regional, or national guidelines or quality improvement efforts</i>	• <i>Consistent regional recognition or national recognition for clinical service</i> • <i>Growth and sustainment of innovative clinical program(s)</i> • <i>Major leadership role for clinical programs with recognition for safety, quality, or effectiveness (e.g., patient safety goals, mortality, readmissions)</i> • <i>Leadership in the development of innovative clinical approaches nationally recognized for innovation, quality, efficiency, effectiveness, or improved outcomes/access</i> • <i>Leadership of regional or national guidelines or quality improvement efforts</i>
<i>Committee Service</i>	• <i>Membership on any VCU, VCU health, SOM, VHA, [JM2] or departmental or</i>	• <i>Significant contributions on University, SOM, VCUHS, MCVP, VHA,</i>	• <i>Leadership on University, SOM, VCUHS, MCVH, MCVP, VHA, or departmental</i>

	division committee Service to profession and discipline (university, local, state, regional)	departmental or division committees - Membership on IRB, MCVP Board, IACUC, Admissions Committee. [JM3] - Significant contributions to service to profession and discipline (state, regional), such as membership on committees of local, regional, or national professional organizations	committees - Membership on IRB, MCVP Board, IACUC, Admissions Committee. - Leadership in service to profession and discipline (national, international), such as committee chair; member of boards of directors, or executive committees
--	--	---	---

Table 2: Teaching - Examples of Accomplishments to be Considered for [1] Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor

VCU School of Medicine – Teaching Matrix for Promotion & Tenure

- *At all academic ranks, teaching excellence is evidenced by participation across multiple teaching domains rather than concentration in a single activity type. As a teaching hospital, VCU expects all faculty to contribute to the education and development of learners and to engage in activities that support the continuous improvement of teaching practice.*
- *For Teaching-and-Research faculty, excellence at the Professor level is demonstrated not solely by volume of teaching, but by sustained leadership, innovation, and dissemination of educational practices that influence teaching beyond the institution.*
- *Breadth and volume of teaching activities should be proportionate to effort allocation at all academic ranks.*

Category	Satisfactory for Associate Professor or Professor	Excellent for Promotion to Associate Professor	Excellent for Promotion to Professor	Examples of Evidence
	<i>Baseline / expected teaching activities at an R1 institution.</i>	<i>Satisfactory accomplishments plus evidence of innovation, leadership, and sustained excellence.</i>	<i>This level emphasizes dissemination, adoption, and leadership at national or international levels.</i>	
<i>Course and Didactic Teaching</i>	<i>Competent and effective instruction in assigned courses and teaching settings (SOM, VCUHS, community, or CME) with satisfactory learner and peer evaluations. Creating a positive learning environment.</i>	<i>Sustained excellence and leadership in course teaching, workshops, sustained teaching presentation history e.g., seminars, grand rounds), including course directorship or major instructional responsibility, with consistently</i>	<i>Sustained, outstanding teaching contributions with national or international visibility and leadership of recognized courses, workshops, or CME programs, or delivery of named or endowed</i>	<i>Teaching evaluations including unredacted student course comments; peer reviews; syllabi; course schedules; CME programs; teaching awards; teaching presentation titles. Documented assessments of</i>

	<i>Documented evidence of efforts toward continuous improvement. Can include evidence of teaching in other settings, such as departmental seminars, grand rounds, clinical conferences, or departmental teaching conferences.</i>	<i>excellent evaluations.</i>	<i>lectures.</i>	<i>student learning outcomes. See page 15 for information on evidence</i>
<i>Clinical Training and Precepting</i>	<i>Effective clinical supervision and teaching demonstrating proficiency as an attending physician or preceptor, with satisfactory evaluations.</i>	<i>Sustained excellence in clinical teaching, including leadership in improving clinical teaching models, curriculum, or assessment.</i>	<i>Outstanding leadership and recognition in clinical education at the regional, national, or international level.</i>	<i>Learner evaluations; clinical teaching evaluations; peer assessments; teaching innovations; letters from program leadership; delivery of professional development (e.g., CME)</i>
<i>Mentoring and Training Including Laboratory Supervision</i>	<i>Effective mentoring and training of students, residents, fellows, or postdoctoral trainees with documented outcomes appropriate to role and rank.</i>	<i>Sustained excellence in mentoring with evidence of trainee success (e.g., publications, awards, career placement) and development of structured or innovative mentoring approaches.</i>	<i>Outstanding, sustained mentoring impact; leadership of training programs and recognized record of mentoring excellence.</i>	<i>Mentee outcomes; publications; fellowship or job placements; mentoring awards; trainee letters; program evaluations; thesis, dissertation, or scholarly project</i>

				<i>committees</i>
<i>Individual and Small Group Teaching</i>	<i>Effective leadership of small-group, case-based, or individualized learning activities with satisfactory learner evaluations. Includes oversight of student/trainee seminars and journal clubs.</i>	<i>Excellence in learner-centered or small-group teaching demonstrated across multiple cohorts or years.</i>	<i>Leadership in dissemination and adoption of small-group or active-learning pedagogies nationally or internationally, or evidence of national or international outcomes from individuals or small groups (e.g., publications, grants, awards, policy actions).</i>	<i>Session evaluations; teaching materials; peer observation reports; adoption of methods by other units</i>
<i>Curriculum and Educational Program Development</i>	<i>Participation in curriculum development, creation of learner focused materials and service on education or curriculum committees.</i>	<i>Leadership in development and evaluation of innovative curricula or teaching methods shown to improve learning outcomes; educational publications.</i>	<i>Outstanding leadership in curriculum development with national or international recognition or adoption.</i>	<i>Curriculum documents; outcome data; publications; implementation letters; invitations to share curriculum</i>
<i>Educational Scholarship and Funding</i>	<i>Engagement in scholarly educational activities appropriate to faculty role.</i>	<i>Peer-reviewed educational scholarship, book chapters, contributions to national assessment instruments (such as board or certification exam item</i>	<i>Nationally competitive education or training grants and high-impact educational scholarship (e.g., authoring or editing textbooks), leadership roles</i>	<i>Publications; grant award letters; funded proposals; institutional training grants; textbooks or chapters</i>

		<i>development), and receipt of external funding for educational or training initiatives.</i>	<i>in national assessment development (e.g. chairing board examination committees)</i>	
<i>Educational Leadership</i>	<i>Service on departmental or institutional education committees or programs, or service on admissions committees.</i>	<i>Significant educational leadership including, UME, graduate school, residency, or fellowship program directorship. Service on regional or national committees.</i>	<i>Outstanding national or international leadership shaping educational policy, programs, or assessment, including chairing or organizing committees for national or international educational or CME meetings.</i>	<i>Leadership roles; committee appointments; accreditation reviews; national service letters</i>
<i>Teaching Effectiveness and Recognition</i>	<i>Satisfactory teaching evaluations from learners and peers across assigned settings.</i>	<i>Sustained excellent teaching evaluations and recognition through departmental, SOM, or regional awards.</i>	<i>National, international, or university-wide teaching awards, national or international invited lectures and consultations on teaching or assessment, and broad recognition of teaching excellence.</i>	<i>Evaluation summaries; award letters; teaching portfolios; invited talks</i>

Table 3: Scholarship - Examples of Accomplishments to be Considered for [1] Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor

Scholarship evidence should be documented on the Portfolio generated CV and verified for accuracy and completeness. The scholarship portion of the narrative should clarify the extent and impact of the scholarship. Breadth and volume of scholarship activities should be proportionate to effort allocation at all academic ranks.

Category	Satisfactory for Associate Professor or Professor	Excellent for Promotion to Associate Professor	Excellent for Promotion to Professor
<i>Grants and Funding (For term faculty extramural funding is only applicable if primary area of effort is scholarship)</i>	• Evidence of external funding or scholarly productivity • Participation in funded projects or clinical trials (any role)	• Internal or External funding as PI/MPI • Continued effort toward national funding • PI/MPI of subprojects or investigator-initiated trials • Co-I/team scientist roles in funded collaborations	• Sustained, significant extramural funding (typically federal) as PI/MPI • Leadership on large institutional grants (P, U, T mechanisms) • Ongoing funding with national impact
<i>Publications</i>	• Authorship or contributions to on peer-reviewed publications (original research, reviews, editorials, case reports, book chapters) if scholarship or teaching are primary area of effort	• Sustained publication record • Publications in highly regarded journals • Citation impact demonstrating influence	• Sustained, high-impact publication record as first/senior author highly regarded journals, textbooks, or other venues reflecting widespread dissemination of scientific knowledge • Widely recognized intellectual contributions with field-level impact
<i>Scholarly Contributions</i>	Support department and division scholarship including research and teaching efforts for faculty and learner development	• Clinical or basic science collaboration leading to new insights • Abstracts/posters at regional or national meetings • National/international presentations and invited talks • Reviewer for journals,	• Leadership roles in national/international research programs • Leadership in national guideline development or public health initiatives • National/international awards and recognition

		<i>study sections, or advisory panels</i> <i>Regional/multi-institutional guideline development</i> • <i>Leadership in collaborative research teams</i> • <i>Awards or recognition for scholarship</i> • <i>Adoption of tools/resources developed by candidate</i>	• <i>Editorial board membership or major journal roles</i> • <i>Leadership in multidisciplinary collaborations with sustained impact</i>
--	--	---	---