

School of Medicine Tenure/Tenure Eligible Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures

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: 09/24/1981

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 are shown in boxes in blue italics.

Policy Statement and Purpose

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

Excellence is the original and continuing goal of Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU). A prerequisite of this goal is the recruitment and retention of a distinguished faculty. This requires the appointment, promotion, and tenure 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.

Appointment, promotion, and tenure 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, promotion, and tenure process is VCU's commitment to recognize and reward faculty members who help fulfill the mission and vision of the university.

Recognized and rewarded contributions include those made to the intellectual and academic success of the student body through teaching; to research and discovery that advances knowledge, inspires creativity and improves human health through scholarship; and to the global engagement of students, faculty, and staff that transforms lives and communities through service in support of the university's mission.

Promotion in rank reflects quality of performance in appropriate teaching, scholarship, and service as noted above. Tenure shows the university's continuing commitment to the faculty member, whose position shall not be terminated without adequate reason.

The promotion and tenure 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 various 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 Contents

Who Should Know This Policy..... 3

Definitions..... 3

Contacts 3

Policy Specifics and Procedures	4
Forms	41
Related Documents	41
Revision History	41
FAQ	42

Who Should Know This Policy

All faculty eligible for tenure and promotion are responsible for knowing this policy and familiarizing themselves with its contents and provisions.

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

Definitions

School

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

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 Promotion and Tenure Policy

Each unit shall establish written guidelines for promotion and tenure, including expedited tenure. 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 the relationship of the unit's promotion and tenure 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 and tenure relative to the unit's mission. The guidelines shall include specific measures for evaluating faculty member performance.

The guidelines for all departments and/or schools shall be formulated and reviewed periodically by a committee of the department and/or school. The faculty shall recommend and elect the committee members. A majority vote of the unit faculty and approval of the dean shall be required for the approval of all unit guidelines. Finally, the Office of the Provost must approve unit-level and school-level guidelines for compliance with university policy prior to them becoming effective.

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 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.

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 and any department or unit guidelines at least every 5 years and at the request of the dean.

1.2 Appointing Authority

Tenure of the faculty is made under the ultimate authority and with the final approval of the Board of Visitors.

The President is authorized to approve tenured and tenure-eligible faculty promotions and to recommend conferral of tenure to the Board of Visitors according to the procedures set forth in this document.

1.3 Applicability of This Policy

The provisions of this policy shall apply to all tenure-eligible faculty hired on or after July 1st, 2026. Tenure-eligible faculty hired prior to July 1, 2026 may elect to be evaluated for tenure and, for tenure-eligible assistant professors, promotion to associate professor under the guidelines that were effective at the time of their hiring, but must make that choice known to their dean and the Office of the provost by September 1st, 2026. Otherwise, they will be evaluated under the provisions of this policy.

Tenured associate professors hired before July 1, 2026 may choose to be considered for promotion under the former VCU promotion guidelines through the 2028-2029 promotion cycle.

<i>SOM Tenure/Tenure Eligible Policy Applicability</i>			
<i>*This Policy refers to 2026 SOM Tenure Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures</i>			
<i>Hire Date</i>	<i>Rank</i>	<i>Policy Choice and Timing</i>	<i>Decision</i>
<i>Hired on or after July 1, 2026</i>	<i>Any</i>	<i>This policy*</i>	
<i>Hired before July 1, 2026</i>	<i>Tenure Eligible Assistant Professor</i>	<i>This policy* or VCU Transition Policy and school specific from the SOM 2021 Revised Policy</i>	<i>For promotion to associate and tenure review must declare by September 1, 2026</i>
<i>Hired before July 1, 2026</i>	<i>Tenure eligible</i>	<i>This policy* or VCU Transition Policy and school specific from the SOM 2021 Revised Policy</i>	<i>For tenure review must declare by September 1, 2026</i>

<i>Hired before July 1, 2026</i>	<i>Tenured Associate Professors</i>	<i>This policy* or VCU Transition Policy and school specific from the SOM 2021 Revised Policy policy at time of hire until July 1, 2029</i>	<i>For promotion after July 1, 2029 must use this policy</i>
<i>All tenure/tenure eligible faculty no matter hire date</i>		<i>Section 8 will be effective July 1, 2026</i>	

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 (non-tenure) faculty.

Exceptions to this may be considered on a case by case basis and must be approved by the provost. All probationary (tenure-eligible) faculty appointments shall be full-time.

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.

A tenured appointment is an appointment that continues until the faculty member voluntarily leaves the university, is separated pursuant to applicable university policy, or is dismissed for cause as specified in Section 11. Tenure is conferred in accordance with the criteria and procedures established by this document and supplemented by appropriate school and unit guidelines. Tenure is granted only at the rank of Associate professor or professor.

Affiliate and adjunct faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure.

2.1 Tenured Appointments

Tenure is conferred based on the faculty member's demonstrated capabilities, achievement, and the university's anticipated long-term academic needs.

A recommendation for a tenured appointment is initiated only by an academic unit. The guidelines for each unit and school shall specify written criteria and standards for recommending tenure in that unit or school. These criteria shall require that recommendations are based on a record of effectiveness in scholarship appropriate to the discipline, teaching, professional growth, and service to the university, the profession, and/or the public. These guidelines shall also specify each unit's procedures for consultation with external evaluators and how the use of external evaluators is reported to the candidate, in accordance with the requirements for external evaluators in Section 4.1.2.

For new hires who have been tenured at another institution, units may develop special criteria for an expedited process for recommending tenure that considers the individual's expertise, experience, and skills.

See section 3.1.1.1 and 4.4 of this policy for SOM expedited tenure review procedures.

A tenured faculty member may elect to be reviewed for promotion in any review cycle. However, a tenured faculty member who is reviewed and denied promotion may not reapply for promotion for 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 the dean's recommendation.

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

2.2 Probationary (Tenure-Eligible) Appointments

Probationary appointments are granted to faculty members with suitable preparation and experience and are appointed in positions identified by the department and/or school as appropriate for tenured faculty.

The maximum period of probationary service for an assistant professor is six academic years, except as noted in 3.2.1. An initial appointment at the rank of professor or associate professor may also be a probationary appointment. The maximum period of probationary service is two years as a professor and three years as an associate professor, except as noted in 2.2.1.

The probationary years are counted beginning with the first July 1 of the faculty member's probationary appointment. The tenure review takes place during the final year of the probationary period and must be completed before the end of the probationary period. For example, an assistant professor hired May 1 of 2026, the six year probationary service is counted from July 1, 2026. The sixth year and year of review would begin July 1, 2031. See probationary calculator in appendix 2. At the end of the probationary period, unless extended (see 2.2.1), the faculty member must be given an appointment with tenure or a one-year terminal appointment.

2.2.1 Alterations of the Probationary Period

There are some situations where reductions or extensions in the typical probationary period are warranted and may be established at the time of the initial appointment by the mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department chair and/or dean.

A reduced probationary period may be warranted and may be granted due to prior service at an academic institution at the rank of assistant professor or above.

A faculty member may elect to be considered for promotion and tenure before the end of the

probationary period.

A tenure-eligible faculty member may request an extension of the agreed-upon probationary period when extenuating circumstances are projected to significantly impede normal progress. Such circumstances might include, but are not limited to, childbirth, adoption, care of a terminally ill immediate relative, personal trauma, short-term disability as defined by the Virginia Sickness and Disability Program, natural disaster, major accidents, or other circumstances beyond the control of the candidate. Extensions may also be granted for public or appointed university service. Application for extensions must be made through the unit within one year of the onset of the extenuating circumstances.

The faculty member's prior annual reviews shall be considered in making the decision about the extension of the initial probationary period. In no case shall an extended probationary period be granted based solely on lack of progress toward work plan goals. Extensions may only be granted when faculty have existing evaluations of at least Very Good in both Scholarship and Teaching in the most recent annual evaluation prior to the onset of the extenuating circumstance.

Written approval of the extension by the dean and the provost is required for any alteration of the probationary period. All extensions of the initial probationary period shall be entered in writing in the faculty member's personnel file.

Alterations to the normal probationary period or extensions granted to the probationary period may not be considered as a factor in the tenure and promotion process. The decision to grant tenure and/or promotion is based on the candidate's body of work at the time of evaluation. Extensions give the candidate additional time to develop their body of work so that it meets the criteria, but the criteria shall not be altered based on the number of years they spent in the probationary period.

In no case shall such an altered probationary period exceed 10 years for an assistant professor, five years for an associate professor, and three years for a full professor.

Units must specify and clearly describe the situations for an altered probationary period in their unit guidelines and apply the criteria for the alterations uniformly for all faculty.

At the end of the agreed-upon probationary period, the faculty member must be given an appointment with tenure or a one-year terminal appointment.

The SOM recognizes extenuating circumstances may occur which are projected to significantly impede normal progress of a tenure-eligible faculty member. For consideration of an extension the candidate must be satisfactory in professionalism and an overall rating of satisfactory. Circumstances for extension might include, but are not limited to, childbirth, adoption, care of a terminally ill immediate relative, personal trauma, short-term disability as defined by the Virginia Sickness and Disability Program, natural disaster, major accidents, or other circumstances beyond the control of the candidate.

Extensions may also be granted for public or appointed university service. Application for extensions must be made through the unit within one year of the onset of the extenuating circumstances and before July 1 if it is the start of the review year.

The faculty member or unit chief/chair initiates the discussion for an extension of the probationary period. The faculty member's prior annual reviews shall be considered in making the decision about the extension of the initial probationary period. In no case shall an extended probationary period be granted based solely on lack of progress toward work plan goals. After discussion between the chief/chair and faculty member, the faculty member will request an extension through the SOM Office of Faculty Affairs using the form. The Senior Associate Dean for faculty affairs will review all requests for extension.

If approved by the SOM written approval of the extension will be given by the dean and the Office of Faculty Affairs will forward to the provost for review and approval. All extensions of the initial probationary period shall be entered in writing in the faculty member's personnel file.

If an extension is not granted, the Senior Associate Dean for faculty affairs will work with the faculty member and chair to determine next steps.

2.2.2 Evaluation of Faculty with Probationary Tenure Eligibility

Probationary appointments at the rank of assistant professor must be reviewed periodically for progress toward promotion and tenure (e.g., third-year review) by the academic unit. The guidelines for each unit shall specify how this review shall be conducted and the criteria to be used to evaluate progress toward tenure. The guidelines shall specify the frequency of the review(s), how the individual work plan developed in accordance with the Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy shall be incorporated into the review process, and how the candidate shall be informed regarding progress toward meeting the standards and criteria for tenure in that unit. In addition, at the time of annual evaluation, there should be a separate evaluation of the candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure to be included in the candidate's promotion and tenure file.

Tenure-eligible faculty will annually discuss progress during their faculty evaluation and document in Portfolio. Tenure-eligible Assistant Professors will have an informal third-year review. The department chair will ask 3-5 tenured faculty at or above associate professors to review. The faculty member will provide an up-to-date portfolio CV, a narrative of research, teaching, and service accomplishments, a list of research grant submissions, funded, and pending. The review committee will create a document with an assessment of current progress including recommendations for strengthening the body of work in each of the areas (research, teaching, service). This document will be shared with the faculty member and chair. This document will not be shared with the formal peer tenure review committee or with the SOM promotion and tenure committee. The chair may use content for summary comments in their letter as part of the formal review process.

A faculty member may be reviewed for tenure once before the normal review occurring at the end of the probationary period. Faculty members reviewed for tenure before the end of their maximum probationary period shall not be subject to any extraordinary requirements and shall be required to meet the same standards required of them at the end of the maximum probationary period.

A decision to terminate a probationary appointment may be made during any year of the probationary period and need not wait until the end of the normal probationary period. The decision to terminate a probationary appointment is ultimately made by the provost based on the recommendation of the school dean. A department chair may initiate a recommendation to the school dean for consideration. Notification of terminations of probationary appointments in the first year of employment must be issued by March 1st to become effective at the end of that academic year. Notification of terminations of probationary appointments in the second year of employment must be issued by December 1st to become effective at the end of the academic year. Terminations of probationary appointments in the third year and beyond require a minimum of twelve months' notice prior to the termination date.

2.2.3 Linkage

Tenure- eligible assistant professors shall be reviewed in one process, with both promotion and tenure awarded or denied in a single decision in accordance with the criteria in Section 3.1.10.

Tenure-eligible associate professors may be reviewed for tenure alone or for promotion to professor and tenure simultaneously. These are separate decisions, whereby a decision to deny a promotion does not preclude a decision to award tenure.

The tenure eligible associate professor candidate must declare whether they are requesting review for tenure or for tenure and promotion by July 1 of the review year.

2.3 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments

Within the sole discretion of VCU, a tenure-eligible faculty member on a probationary appointment may transfer to a term appointment with the concurrence of the provost and the dean, department chair (where applicable), and the faculty member concerned. This transfer

terminates the period of probationary service, but the faculty member retains rights consistent with other term appointment guidelines.

When a track transfer from tenure eligible to term is requested by the faculty member, they will meet with the SAD OFA or designee to review the process and implications of the transfer. The transfer request must be approved prior to July 1 of the review year.

2.4 Continuing Review of Faculty

All tenured and tenure-eligible 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 and should include a separate section outlining the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure or promotion, if not fully promoted and tenured.

All SOM faculty are evaluated annually. All Tenure-eligible faculty and tenured associate professors will have a discussion of promotion and/or tenure at their annual evaluation.

2.5 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 School of Medicine Faculty Bylaws.

2.6

Administrative Titles

Faculty members may be assigned administrative titles designating administrative responsibilities held in addition to any tenured/tenure-eligible or term (non-tenure) faculty rank concurrently held.

Administrative titles and compensation for administrative responsibilities are held independently 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 and/or tenure 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 tenure based on an administrative title.

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

2.7 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 (tenured, tenure eligible, term, or adjunct), period of appointment, whether it is part-time or full-time, and salary. If it is a tenure-eligible position, the notice of appointment shall also include the length of the probationary period and the tenure review date.

2.8 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, and assistant professor. All faculty appointments shall be either tenured, probationary (tenure-eligible), term (non-tenure, including clinical educator), or adjunct (non-tenure). Section 2.0 defines these types of appointments. Tenure-eligible and tenured appointments are subject to this policy. Term appointments are subject to the Term Promotion Policy.

3.1 General Criteria and Information Supplied by Candidates

In order to ensure distinguished contributions in teaching, scholarship (including research and creative expression), and service, the following criteria shall apply in the evaluation of all tenured and tenure eligible faculty members for promotion and tenure. 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 service should not exceed 6000 words.

For SOM dossiers, 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 tenure and/or promotion based on university guidance specifying that, for 9/10-month faculty, the following shall be completed before annual contracts end in May. For 12-month faculty, the following shall be completed by the end of the fiscal year prior to submitting documentation for promotion.

- Faculty declaration of candidacy for promotion or P&T
- Formation of peer review committee/s, including identification of a chair
- Identification of potential external reviewers
- Invitations sent to external reviewers
- Faculty provision of external reviewer materials to be shared by the PRC chair;

This timeline must be included in the unit guidelines or otherwise 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 to the unit (as outlined below) for evaluation. Unit guidelines may add specificity to the dossier requirements below, but may not reduce or waive any requirements in this policy.

SOM Timeline for Non Expedited 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 letters*
- *Faculty provide CV in portfolio, narrative, and biosketch, workload distribution, and 4-6 artifacts (ex manuscripts)*

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

- *Letters are received*
- *Peer Review Committee hold meetings discuss and vote*
- *Chair writes Chair Letter and votes*
- *All letters, forms, documents must be submitted by the department to the SOM for SOM 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 Senior Vice Provost Health Sciences*
- *The remainder of the schedule follows university guidelines*

The remainder of the schedule follows university guidelines

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

3.1.1.1 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.

Non-Expedited Review

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 Table 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*

Documentation for Expedited Tenure Review

1. *Complete CV*
2. *Documentation of tenure designation from previous institution*
3. *A Workload Distribution Form*
4. *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).*
5. *A Promotion Biosketch (<350 words)*
6. *A Reference Letter Table Form will be completed by the department.*

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 should include links to evidence and artifacts. There is no length limitation on the CV.

Except for expedited review (see section 3.1.1.1), 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. The Peer Review committee verifies the CV. Incomplete CV's will not be reviewed and will delay promotion and or tenure 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/MPI*

3.1.3 Appropriate credentials and experience

Tenured or tenure-eligible faculty must hold a terminal degree ~~in their field~~ 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. Tenure-eligible or tenured faculty hired prior to July 1, 2026, are not required to hold a terminal degree to be granted tenure and/or be promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor.

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 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, 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 research, translational or community-engaged research, 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; or development and dissemination of materials for use in teaching beyond one's own classes. Integration of research 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 fine and performing arts, and literary, graphic, and digital 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 the 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 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.

The Scholarship Statement will be included in the SOM Narrative.

3.1.5 Teaching

Demonstrated quality in teaching: Teaching shall be evaluated based primarily upon the impact of the faculty member's teaching in programs relevant to the mission of their academic unit. 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, 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. Mentoring as an advisor 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 the unit.

Teaching should be well-rounded, demonstrating effectiveness across multiple educational modalities rather than focusing solely on one type 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 1 for items considered satisfactory and excellent for the teaching area.

Teaching Statement and Evidence: Candidates 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 teach courses, student end-of-course evaluations of teaching 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, 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, or other forms of documented impact, such as those mentioned 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.

The Teaching Statement will be included as part of the SOM narrative.

3.1.6 Service

Demonstrated performance in service: Faculty members are expected to spend a portion 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 at home and abroad. Demonstrated performance in service may include university, professional, community-engaged, and clinical service.

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 internal and external colleagues, students, and 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 unit- or university-level service, professional and community-engaged service, and/or clinical service. The statement ought to connect the service work of the candidate to their national/international scholarly reputation and how their service advances the institution and/or profession. In general, documentation of service is not required beyond the CV and narrative, unless clarification is requested during the review process. However, candidates should include brief supporting materials for service roles that are unusually time-intensive, innovative, or externally impactful.

The Service Statement will be included in the SOM narrative. Note that some service activities, such as participation in study sections, grant reviews, or leadership in professional societies may be used in the Personal Narrative as external evidence of excellence in service activity.

3.1.7 Annual Evaluations

Annual evaluations are not included in the promotion and tenure 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 tenure and/or 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 and/or promotion and tenure from department chairs at the time of annual evaluation and/or third year reviews should be included.

All SOM faculty are evaluated annually.

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 distributions as well.

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 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.

On the Workload Distribution Table for P and T, the candidate will note if their research effort is less than or equal to 20%. If it is less than or equal to 20% ($\leq 20\%$) they must note what area has been their majority of work. This will be considered when determining rating criteria.

3.1.9 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Tenured and Tenure-eligible 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 tenure and tenure-eligible 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 scholarship and holds promise for further professional development.

Appointment or promotion to associate professor requires a minimum rating of excellent in scholarship, a rating of at least very good in teaching, and a rating of at least satisfactory in service. Candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishment in scholarship that indicates progress toward a national or international reputation in their discipline.

Appointment or promotion to professor requires a minimum rating of excellent in scholarship, a rating of at least very good in teaching, and a rating of at least very good in service. Candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of

distinguished accomplishment in scholarship that indicates achievement of a national or international reputation in their discipline.

3.2 Unit Criteria

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

The individual unit guidelines shall define the scholarship, teaching, and service criteria and define what is meant by ratings of excellent, very good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory in each area. These criteria must emphasize national and international recognition.

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 and or Tenure for Tenured/Tenure-Eligible Faculty

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. This must be approved before first Monday of July of the review year.

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 and documented in the prior annual evaluation in portfolio 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 1. 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

(1) General Promotion to the rank of Professor (and tenure) 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 Appendix 1. 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 As a general rule, the candidate should have held appointment as Associate Professor for a minimum of five years.

(3) 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.

(4) 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.

(5) Service The candidate should demonstrate continued contributions in administrative and clinical service and assume a leadership role in the SOM, health 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.

SOM Criteria for Promotion and or Tenure for Tenure/Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Credential and experience must be satisfactory.

<u><i>Appointment or Promotion to:</i></u>	<u><i>Terminal Degree</i></u>	<u><i>Research/ Scholarship</i></u>	<u><i>Teaching</i></u>	<u><i>Service</i></u>
<i>Assistant Professor</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Indicates that the candidate is expected to perform at an excellent level in scholarship and holds promise for further professional development.</i>		
<i>Associate Professor</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good unless Research is ≤20% and teaching is the majority of work then Excellent</i>	<i>Satisfactory unless Research is ≤20% and service is the majority of work then Excellent</i>
<i>Professor</i>	<i>Required</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good unless Research is ≤20% and teaching is the majority of work then Excellent</i>	<i>Very Good unless Research is ≤20% and service is the majority of work then Excellent</i>

4.0 Academic Review Procedures for Promotion and Tenure for Tenured and Tenure-eligible 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 file following the guidelines established by the unit. The completed file shall be forwarded to the peer review committee to conduct a substantive evaluation of the candidate's record and performance.

No individual may vote on a case more than once. This means that the same individual may not serve on a peer 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 vote. All documents, reports, and discussions related to candidates for tenure and/or 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 and be composed of tenured faculty only, with a majority from the unit if possible. There must also be at least one tenured faculty member from outside the unit on the committee. 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. For promotions to the rank of professor, the chair of the peer review committee must hold the rank of professor. 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 tenured faculty from within a department to meet this criterion, 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/and 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 tenured and 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 or tenure or both.

The Peer Committee will consist of a total of five (5) tenured faculty with at least two faculty members from within the department where possible, and at least two faculty members from outside the department. The senior associate dean OFA may recommend suitable individuals to the candidate's chair. The faculty members of a 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. Emeriti faculty may not serve on tenure peer or SOM committees. 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.

4.1.2 Evaluation Process

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 scholarly 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 detail each evaluator as being selected 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, and at least three should be from a doctoral university - Very High Research Activity (R1) institutions. An additional two letters may be from other types of institutions in accordance with unit-level guidelines. A minimum of five external letters must be received for review. 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 should not be asked to determine whether the candidate meets the criteria for tenure and/or promotion at VCU or at their home institution. Instead, they should be asked to provide an evaluation of the significance, quality, and national/international reputation of the candidate's scholarship.

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

The SOM utilizes a form for all letters for external independent evaluators and recommends the use 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 there is a minimum of 5 external independent evaluator letters from R1 institutions obtained prior to departmental peer review.

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 and all external evaluator letters. 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, then the overall rating is Very Good.) Committee ratings below the level of Very Good must be accompanied by a written explanation for that rating or vote.

The committee must recommend in favor of promotion to associate professor and tenure or tenure only (if applicable), when the overall rating for Scholarship is Excellent, Teaching is at least Very Good, and Service is at least Satisfactory. The committee must recommend in favor of promotion to professor when the overall rating for Scholarship is Excellent, Teaching is at least Very Good, and Service is at least Very Good. The committee must recommend against promotion and/or tenure if the overall ratings do not meet these thresholds.

The peer committee shall forward the file to the chair of the department, or in units without departments, the School Promotion and Tenure Committee.

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 is utilized in the deliberation, it must be included in the Peer Review report or notes of the committee. The candidate may request to appear 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. With respect to scholarship, the Peer Committee should solicit letters both 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). 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 candidate should make available upon request their entire file of publications. They should, in any case submit three to five for scrutiny by the Peer Committee and the external independent evaluators. The Peer Committee will document on the SOM form the names of individuals contacted (or attempts to contact them), and whether or not responses were obtained. 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.

G. The Peer Committee will obtain at least five external independent evaluator letters from experts in the candidate's field. The committee should plan to solicit at least 12 external independent letters to achieve this outcome. Additionally, the committee should solicit internal and external reference letters, aiming at receiving 5-10 reference letters. All letters received must be included in the packet. See section 4.1.2 for more information.

H. The peer committee will use the SOM standardized peer review form to document its discussions and vote. The peer committee discussions, vote and recommendation are confidential and should not be shared with anyone other than the chair, those assisting with the P and T process, or the SOM OFA. It is not to be shared with others including the candidate.

I. The peer committee will complete a report. The report will not identify letter writers by name or identifiable titles. for example, not Dean of the SOM for a named institution but can identify as from a dean of a medical school. The report, minutes of the meeting, vote, and letters obtained are given to the chair and added to the dossier.

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 3.1.7, 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. The department chair's evaluation is independent of the peer committee, though the chair shall consider the peer review committee recommendation as evidence. For units without departments, this step is not included.

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 and third year review 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 Committee review. The chair will inform the candidate that the file is moving to the SOM review.

4.3 School Promotion and Tenure Committee

4.3.1 Committee Election and Term of Office

Each school shall select a school promotion and tenure committee as provided by the guidelines of the school. The school guidelines shall allow for both election by the faculty and appointment by the dean to the School Promotion and Tenure committee.

The committee shall consist of no fewer than three faculty members, all of whom shall be tenured. None of the committee members shall hold an administrative title at the level of department chair or above.

Members of the school promotion and tenure 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 may appoint a faculty 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 SOM will have two committees, one for term and one for tenure. Annually the Senior Associate Dean OFA will solicit nominations for the School Promotion and Tenure Committee. They will prepare a slate of candidates for the School Promotion and Tenure 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 Tenure Committee will consist of five tenured professors. 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 tenure and promotion recommendations.

4.3.2 Evaluation Process

The school promotion and tenure 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 service, for or against recommending promotion and/or tenure, and the rationale for the recommendation. The report shall also include the results of a vote by secret ballot. The vote and resulting overall recommendation shall follow the procedures and criteria outlined for the Peer Review Committee in Section 4.1.2.

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 committee will review all of the data submitted by each tenure 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 tenure and/or 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.

4.4 Expedited Tenure Review

The SOM offers expedited tenure review for new hires who are associate professors or professors and tenured at their previous institutions. The SOM requires documentation of the granting of tenure by the previous institution. See section 3.1.1.1 for dossier requirements. Five external independent letters will be required. The department will gather the dossier, and submit in PNT. For Chair candidates or dean's office candidates, the OFA will work with the department to complete the dossier. The review will begin with the SOM Committee using this policy and process. Expedited Tenure Review may occur at any time during the year.

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. 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 and/or tenure is not supported by either the peer committee, the chair of the department, or the school tenure and 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 and request reconsideration. Unit promotion and tenure guidelines may also allow for candidates to add a written response to the file after a negative peer review committee, department chair, and/or school committee recommendation, which will then be submitted to the dean.

When promotion and/or tenure 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 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, SAD OFA 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 and/or tenure 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 and/or tenure, the provost shall forward the original complete file to the President with that recommendation.

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

6.0 Appeal Process

6.1. Committee Composition

The University Appeal Committee shall consist of at least one tenured faculty member from each school, none of whom may hold administrative titles at the level of department chair or above. No school shall have more than three members serving on the committee at any given time.

To fill a vacancy, the president shall appoint each committee member from a list composed of three names jointly recommended by the President of the Faculty Senate and the dean of the school with the current committee vacancy. The president shall designate the chair of the committee.

The members of the committee shall serve staggered three-year terms. In the case of vacancies due to unfulfilled terms, the president shall make appointments to fill the uncompleted terms. Persons who have served a complete three-year term are ineligible for reappointment for three years.

Members of the University Appeal Committee may serve on a concurrent peer review or school promotion and tenure committee, and must recuse themselves from any case from their home Unit.

6.2 Grounds for Appeal

A decision to deny tenure and/or 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 University Appeal Committee will review the documents in question and will meet to discuss whether grounds for an appeal exist. The vote shall be by 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 who may not speak to the committee or present evidence. 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. 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 that are based on the grounds for the appeal.

After reviewing the record and hearing testimony, the University Appeal Committee shall take one of the following actions based on a 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 Appeals Committee chair, the dean, and the provost. The president's decision is not appealable within the university.

7.0 The President and Board of Visitors

The president is authorized to approve promotions of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. The president is also authorized to recommend conferral of tenure to the Board of Visitors. Tenure of the faculty is made under the ultimate authority and with the final approval of the Board of Visitors (1.2).

When the president does not support the recommendation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, the president shall notify the Board of Visitors, the candidate, the provost, and the dean of this decision in writing. If the president does not support a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure, no further appeal exists within the university.

If the president recommends a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure to the Board of Visitors and the Board of Visitors does not support the recommendation, the president shall notify the candidate, the provost, and the dean of this decision in writing. If the Board of Visitors does not support the recommendation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure, no further appeals exist within the university.

8.0 Procedure for Termination of Employment of Tenured Faculty Members

8.1 Reasons for Dismissal for Cause

Tenure is designed to protect the academic freedom of individual faculty members who have established themselves during probationary periods. Tenured faculty members are expected to continue to strive for excellence in all of their academic and scholarly tasks. Adequate reason for dismissal of a tenured faculty member may be established by a demonstration of any of the following:

- a. Neglect, inability, or failure to do the customary and expected satisfactory teaching, research, and other services within the areas of presumed professional competence.
- b. Professional incompetence, which includes failure to continue scholarly 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.

8.2 Post Tenure Review

Post Tenure Review is described in a separate policy.

8.3 Dismissal for Cause Procedures

To initiate the termination of a tenured faculty member for just cause, the dean shall inform the faculty member and the provost in writing of the proposed termination, the specific reasons for it, and the effective date of termination. The dean must also inform the faculty member that a request for a hearing of the case by the University Appeal Committee must be initiated within 45 working days. In the absence of such a request, the dean's action becomes final.

The University Appeal Committee shall begin all requested hearings within 30 working days following receipt of a faculty member's request. At least two-thirds of the Committee must be present at the hearing.

The faculty member shall have the opportunity to attend the hearing. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, to present evidence, and may be accompanied by one nonparticipating advisor.

A complete record of the hearing shall be maintained and available to the parties involved. The hearing shall be closed to the public.

The recommendation of the University Appeal Committee (in the form of a recommendation to the provost) shall be by majority vote. The University Appeal Committee shall submit a completed written report to the provost within 30 working days after conclusion of the hearing.

The provost shall review the University Appeal Committee's findings and recommendations and convey a decision with a rationale in writing to the faculty member and to the University Appeal Committee within 10 working days. If the decision is for dismissal, they shall also inform the president. The Office of the President, upon written request, shall review a decision for dismissal of the faculty member. However, unless the request is made within 15 working days after the provost has rendered a decision, the provost's decision shall be final and not subject to further appeal or review.

If a review by the president is requested within the 15 working day period, the president shall review the full record of the University Appeal Committee hearing, the Committee's findings and recommendations, and the provost's decision and rationale before rendering a decision. The decision of the Office of the President shall be final and not subject to further appeal or review.

8.4 Dismissal for Financial Emergency, Reorganization, and Termination of Programs

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.

9.0 Procedures for Review and Amendment of this Document

Changes in the Faculty Promotion and Tenure 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 tenured and tenure-eligible faculty. Upon such a request, the president shall appoint an ad hoc faculty committee to review issues and recommendations regarding appointment, promotion, and tenure 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 Promotion and Tenure 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. **Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy [link](#)**
2. **Fulbright Scholar Program <https://fulbrightscholars.org/sites/default/files/2024-07/USScholar-Terminal-Degrees.pdf>**
3. **Procedures for Declaration of Financial Emergency and Consequent Reduction, Reorganization, or Elimination of Programs Requiring Termination of Faculty Members Policy [link](#)**
4. **Teaching Effectiveness Report [link](#)**
5. **Term Promotion Policy**
6. **Virginia Sickness and Disability Program https://www.dhrm.virginia.gov/docs/defaultsource/hrpolicy/pol457vsdp.pdf?sfvrsn=e049034c_2**

Revision History

This policy supersedes the following archived policies:

Approved by the Board of Visitors: September 24, 1981

Effective Date: September 24, 1981.

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: January 17, 1985.

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: November 19, 1987

Effective Date: July 1, 1988.

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: January 20, 1993

Effective Date: July 1, 1993.

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: September 19, 1996

Effective Date: July 1, 1997

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: May 16, 2003

Effective Date: May 16, 2003

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: November 11, 2004

Effective Date: November 11, 2004

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: May 19, 2006

Effective Date: May 19, 2006

Revision approved by Board of Visitors: May 10, 2013

Minor revision made on February 28, 2017. Corrected “Policy Type” to Board of Visitors.

For the SOM the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures supersedes the following SOM Policy.

Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures (Revised 2014) Additional Revisions Approved 2021 by Vote of the Faculty

FAQ

1. Where should candidates undergoing a review for promotion or promotion with tenure 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. 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.

3. 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.

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.

Appendix 1

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.

VCU School of Medicine – Service Matrix for Promotion & Tenure

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 (Assoc Prof / Prof)	Excellent (Assoc Prof)	Excellent (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	• 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 • Sustained service on national or international study sections, review panels, or advisory boards
Committee Work	• Membership on any VCU, VCU health, SOM, or departmental committee • Service to profession and discipline (university, local, state, regional)	• Significant contributions on University, SOM, VCUHS, MCVP, or departmental committees • Membership on IRB, MCVP Board, IACUC, Admissions Committee. • Significant contributions to service to profession and discipline (state, regional), such as membership on committees of local, regional, or national professional organizations	• Chair of University, SOM, VCUHS, MCVH, MCVP, or departmental 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

<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>
--------------------------------	--	---	--

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.

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 (All Ranks)	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. 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</i>	<i>Sustained excellence and leadership in course teaching, sustained teaching presentation history (e.g., seminars, grand rounds), including course directorship or major instructional responsibility, with consistently excellent evaluations.</i>	<i>Sustained, outstanding teaching contributions with national or international visibility and leadership of recognized courses or CME programs, or delivery of named or endowed lectures.</i>	<i>Teaching evaluations including unredacted student course comments; peer reviews; syllabi; course schedules; CME programs; teaching awards; teaching presentation titles. Documented assessments of student learning outcomes. See page 20 for information on evidence.</i>

	<i>teaching conferences</i>			
<i>Clinical Teaching and Precepting</i>	<i>Effective clinical supervision and teaching demonstrating proficiency as an attending physician 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 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,</i>	<i>Session evaluations; teaching materials; peer observation reports; adoption of methods by other units</i>

			grants, awards, policy actions).	
<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 development), and receipt of external funding for educational or training initiatives</i>	<i>Nationally competitive education or training grants and high-impact educational scholarship (e.g., authoring or editing textbooks), leadership roles in national assessment development (e.g. chairing board examination committee</i>	<i>Publications; grant award letters; funded proposals; institutional training grants; textbooks or chapters</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</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Sustained</i>	<i>National,</i>	<i>Evaluation</i>

<i>Effectiveness and Recognition</i>	<i>teaching evaluations from learners and peers across assigned settings.</i>	<i>excellent teaching evaluations and recognition through departmental, SOM, or regional awards.</i>	<i>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>summaries; award letters; teaching portfolios; invited talks</i>
--------------------------------------	---	--	--	---

VCU School of Medicine – Scholarship and Research Matrix for Promotion & Tenure

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.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Satisfactory (Assoc Prof / Prof)</i>	<i>Excellent (Assoc Prof)</i>	<i>Excellent (Professor)</i>
<i>Grants and Funding</i>	<i>Evidence of external funding or scholarly productivity</i> <i>Participation in funded projects or clinical trials (any role)</i>	<i>External funding as PI/MPI</i> <i>Continued effort toward national funding</i> <i>PI/MPI of subprojects or investigator-initiated trials</i> <i>Co-I/team scientist roles in funded collaborations</i>	<i>Sustained, significant extramural funding (typically federal) as PI/MPI</i> <i>Leadership on large institutional grants (P, U, T mechanisms)</i> <i>Ongoing funding with national impact</i>

<i>Publications</i>	• <i>Authorship on peer-reviewed publications (original research, reviews, editorials, case reports, book chapters)</i> • <i>Publications from clinical trials</i> • <i>Demonstrated independence from mentor</i>	• <i>Sustained publication record as first/senior author</i> • <i>Publications in highly regarded journals</i> • <i>Citation impact demonstrating influence</i> • <i>Development of intellectual property (e.g., patents)</i>	• <i>Sustained, high-impact publication record as first/senior author in top-tier journals</i> • <i>Major scholarly work (books, textbooks)</i> • <i>Widely recognized intellectual contributions with field level impact</i>
<i>Scholarly Contributions</i>	• <i>Clinical or basic science collaboration leading to new insights</i> • <i>Abstracts/posters at local/regional meetings</i> • <i>Local/regional presentations (research or education)</i> • <i>Participation in clinical guidelines or public health initiatives (local/regional)</i>	• <i>National/international presentations and invited talks</i> • <i>Regular reviewer for journals, study sections, 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>Leadership roles in national/international research programs</i> • <i>Leadership in national guideline development or public health initiatives</i> • <i>National/international awards and recognition</i> • <i>Editorial board membership or major journal roles</i> • <i>Leadership in multidisciplinary collaborations with sustained impact</i>

Appendix 2 Tenure Review Calculator

Assistant Professor

Tenure clock begins on July 1 AFTER hire date; If hired on July 1, tenure clock begins immediately	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Assistant	1	2	3	4	5	Review											
Assistant*		1	2	3	4	5	Review										
Assistant			1	2	3	4	5	Review									
Assistant				1	2	3	4	5	Review								
Assistant					1	2	3	4	5	Review							
Assistant						1	2	3	4	5	Review						
Assistant							1	2	3	4	5	Review					
Assistant								1	2	3	4	5	Review				
Assistant									1	2	3	4	5	Review			
Assistant										1	2	3	4	5	Review		
Assistant											1	2	3	4	5	Review	
Assistant												1	2	3	4	5	Review
Assistant													1	2	3	4	5
Assistant														1	2	3	4
Example; If hired on July 1, 2015, the tenure clock begins on Hire Date																	
Example: If hired on August 1, 2015, the tenure clock begins on July 1, 2016																	

Associate Professor

Tenure clock begins on July 1 AFTER hire date; If hired on July 1,	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Associate				1	2	Review											
Associate					1	2	Review										
Associate						1	2	Review									
Associate							1	2	Review								
Associate								1	2	Review							
Associate									1	2	Review						
Associate										1	2	Review					
Associate											1	2	Review				
Associate												1	2	Review			
Associate													1	2	Review		
Associate														1	2	Review	
Associate															1	2	Review
Associate																1	2
Associate																	1
Example; If hired on July 1, 2015, the tenure clock begins on Hire Date																	
Example: If hired on August 1, 2015, the tenure clock begins on July 1, 2016																	

Professor

Tenure clock begins on July 1 AFTER hire date; If hired on July 1, tenure clock begins immediately	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Professor				1	Review												
Professor					1	Review											
Professor						1	Review										
Professor							1	Review									
Professor								1	Review								
Professor									1	Review							
Professor										1	Review						
Professor											1	Review					
Professor												1	Review				
Professor													1	Review			
Professor														1	Review		
Professor															1	Review	
Professor																1	Review
Professor																	1
Professor																	
Example; If hired on July 1, 2015, the tenure clock begins on Hire Date																	
Example: If hired on August 1, 2015, the tenure clock begins on July 1, 2016																	