

School of Medicine Personnel Document

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to present the policies, procedures and criteria employed within the School of Medicine (the unit) for the evaluation of promotion, appointment and tenure requests and for periodic career reviews and for annual performance reviews of faculty. The contents of this unit document apply to all faculty: executive faculty and general faculty as defined in the School of Medicine Bylaws. (A member of the executive faculty of the School of Medicine holds a full-time, academic appointment in the University of Louisville with a primary appointment in the School of Medicine; or may be a part-time or gratis general faculty member who has been elected to the executive faculty).

Changes to the School of Medicine ~~Policy for Promotion, Appointment, and Tenure~~ ~~Personnel Document~~ and/or its appendices shall be presented for discussion and comment to the Medical Council, Performance Criteria and Policy Committee and the School of Medicine Promotion Appointment and Tenure Committee (SOM PAT Committee). Policy changes and changes to ~~Appendices A and B~~ ~~and Ball~~ ~~appendices~~ must be approved by the School of Medicine Faculty Forum, and the School of Medicine Executive Faculty. The Provost shall submit the document to the Faculty Senate for confirmation that it is in accordance with *The Redbook* and the Minimum Guidelines. It shall then be presented to the President for review and recommendation to the Board of Trustees for final approval.

Requests for appointments and promotions to the rank of associate professor and professor (excluding gratis and emeritus actions), award of tenure, and periodic career reviews of tenured faculty must be reviewed by the SOM PAT Committee whose recommendations are forwarded to the Dean of the School of Medicine.

All Executive Faculty members shall have access to this document and, if one exists, a copy of the departmental guidelines for promotion, appointment, tenure, and periodic career review.

I. Classification of Faculty Appointments

A. Full-Time Academic Appointments

Full-time faculty appointments are those at 0.80 to 1.0 full time equivalent (FTE).

1. The requirements for appointment to a full-time faculty position in the School of Medicine shall include, as a minimum, an advanced, usually doctoral, degree (M.D., Ph.D., D.Sc., Ed.D. or equivalent). ~~In disciplines where board certification is available and patient care is provided, appointments at the rank of assistant professor and higher or above shall require board certification completion of a residency training program. For and for appointments at the rank of associate professor or higher, board certification shall will be required. For others, post-doctoral training shall be required for these ranks appointment to assistant professor or higher. Requirements for appointment such as board certification, possession of a license to practice medicine in Kentucky, etc. shall be stipulated in the departmental documents where applicable.~~
2. The appointee shall sign a contract, approved by the Board of Trustees, stipulating that the appointment is made subject to the regulations, policies, and provisions of employment at the University of Louisville including participation in the School of Medicine Professional Practice Plan.

Formatted: Highlight

B. Part-Time Academic Appointments

1. Part-time faculty may be appointed by contract to teach specified courses or to engage in specified instruction, research or service less than full-time for a designated period.
 - a. The requirements for appointment to a part-time faculty position in the School of Medicine shall be the same as those for full-time academic appointments. No such appointment, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent periods.
 - b. Reviews of part-time faculty will be commensurate with the candidate's % FTE. Although a satisfactory annual review will be a criterion in deciding renewal of contract, there is no guarantee that faculty will be renewed beyond the term of the contract.

C. Non-tenurable Appointments

1. Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments to the various academic ranks, which include lecturers and visiting faculty, are those made for specifically limited time periods less than one year for special purposes. In no case shall temporary appointments or renewals result in the acquisition of tenure.

2. Term Faculty Appointments

- a. All non-tenurable full-time faculty who are not "temporary" are "term". Term faculty are full-time faculty appointments without tenure for a stipulated contract period not to exceed three years. No term appointments, continuation or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent terms.
- b. Term faculty may be funded through general funds, restricted funds, or clinical revenues.
- c. Term faculty shall meet the standards for appointment to the designated rank with consideration for the areas assigned in the annual work plan and shall be subject to annual and career reviews for faculty of the Unit. Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria in this document.
- d. Term faculty appointments may be renewed for the convenience of the University if the dean determines that the services of the incumbent are needed for the renewal term.
- e. Faculty on term appointments shall be eligible to apply for probationary (tenure track) appointments if they were not previously on a probationary appointment. Productivity during the term appointment may be counted toward the probationary period if requested in writing by the department chair, endorsed by the dean, and approved by the provost at the time of appointment to the probationary track. Transfers out of the probationary appointment back into a non-tenurable status may be requested by the faculty member at any time but must be requested prior to the start of the tenure review by the SOM PAT committee.
- f. Rolling contracts recognize and reward the accomplishments of term faculty. Rolling contracts of two or three-year duration will be available after five years of service at the University of Louisville. Rolling contracts are only available to those faculty members at the rank of associate professor or above. Rolling contracts are renewable every year for

an additional two or three years. Appointment on such contracts is at the discretion of the chair and be approved by the dean and provost.

D. Probationary Appointments

1. Probationary (tenure-track) appointments are appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure, distinct from term appointments as described in *The Redbook*.
 - a. No probationary appointment to the University shall extend beyond the period when tenure would normally be granted as described in *The Redbook*.
 - b. Transfers out of a probationary appointment into a non-tenurable appointment may be applied for at any time but must be requested prior to the start of ~~the SOM PAT committee's the~~ tenure review ~~by the SOM PAT committee~~. Transfers back to probationary status after that point are prohibited.
 - c. Probationary appointments shall be in accordance with the stipulated terms associated with each rank per *The Redbook*.

E. Tenure Appointments

1. Tenure is the right of certain full-time faculty who hold academic rank to continuous full-time employment without reduction in academic rank until retirement or until dismissal as provided in *The Redbook*.
 - a. Tenure is granted in the School of Medicine in accordance with the procedures established in *The Redbook*.
 - b. Administrators - Administrative personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the regulations herein on tenure and the provisions governing termination only in their capacities as faculty members.
 - c. Tenure recommendations - Recommendations concerning the award or denial of tenure shall originate in the faculty of the academic units in which tenure is to be granted.
2. Immediate tenure on appointment
 - a. Generally, tenure will not be granted concurrent with initial appointment; however, a faculty member may be hired with tenure when such action is warranted. Ordinarily, in the School of Medicine such actions will be considered only on initial appointment of persons of exceptional merit who already have tenure in another university.
 - b. For appointments at the rank of associate professor a minimum of one year must elapse after the initial academic year of appointment, or fraction thereof, before a tenure consideration may be initiated.

F. Joint and Associate Appointments

1. Faculty may have additional appointments outside their primary department (their primary appointment)
 - a. Joint appointments as defined in the *Redbook* require that a faculty member's work plan include a percent effort in the joint (secondary) department and this percent effort must have equivalent associated salary originating from the secondary

department. Career reviews (mid-tenure, tenure, promotion, periodic) are done in both departments.

- b. Associate appointments do not entail salary commitments. Criteria for appointment as an associate in a department shall be stipulated by the department. Examples of criteria for associate membership include contributions by associate faculty in teaching, mentoring of students, and research collaborations.

G. Emeritus Appointments

Such honorary title may be conferred upon retirement if requested by the departmental faculty and Dean and approved by the Provost and Board of Trustees.

H. Gratis Appointments

1. Gratis (voluntary) faculty appointments can be held at the School of Medicine. Gratis faculty appointments must be based in departments and are non-tenurable.
2. Gratis appointments and promotions are approved by the Dean (or designee) and do not require SOM PAT Committee review.
3. The term of the initial appointment is at the discretion of the chair but may not exceed five years. Reappointments may be made at the same maximum terms as initial appointments.

II. Conditions of Faculty Employment

A. Annual Work Plan

Each faculty member shall collaborate with the department chair to develop an annual work plan to be signed by both parties indicating their agreement and approved by the Dean. The annual work plan must specify the percentage of effort to be spent in teaching, research and service. Service may be further specified as clinical service, non-clinical/community service, and/or service to research. The faculty work plan shall describe specific goals and objectives to be achieved by the faculty member during the period covered.

1. For faculty in non-tenurable positions the faculty work plan shall be specific to the duties particular to their contract periods and shall reflect the need to demonstrate evidence of excellence in one area of the work plan (typically this is the numerically largest percentage area, but may be any area with a 20% or higher effort, if so designated), and proficiency in all other areas of their workplan in order to satisfy the requirements for promotion. There is no required minimum percentage of effort for areas that are assigned in the faculty member's work plan, but percentages must total 100%.
2. For probationary faculty the faculty work plan shall reflect the need to demonstrate evidence of excellence in one area of the work plan (typically this is the numerically largest percentage area, but may be any other area with a 20% or higher effort, if so designated) and proficiency in all other areas of

the work plan in order to satisfy the requirements for the award of tenure. In addition, for probationary faculty a minimum assignment of 20% research and the corresponding time away from service and/or teaching obligations is required. Probationary faculty must have work assignments in each area of work plan including research, teaching, and service. (Redbook Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews)

3. For tenured faculty, the faculty work plan shall respect both the faculty member's need to shape his/her career and the missions of the department, school, and university. In order to accomplish this, the annual work plan shall permit individual faculty members to concentrate, at various times in their careers, on one or more of the areas of teaching, research, and service. Tenured faculty are not required to have assignments in all of the areas of teaching, research, and service. There is no required minimum percentage of effort for areas that are in the faculty member's work plan, but percentages must total 100%.

B. University Practice Plan

For full-time faculty, The Practice Plan defines the conditions under which work outside of the University may be carried out for all full-time School of Medicine faculty.

C. Faculty Presence at the University

Although professional activities may require a faculty member's absence on occasion, faculty members normally are expected to be available to be on campus and at the School of Medicine when required to meet with their colleagues, attend department functions including meetings, and to teach and meet with students and/or clinical trainees. Exceptions to this rule require department chair and School of Medicine Dean approval.

III. Faculty Personnel Reviews

A. Annual Review

1. All part-time, term, probationary, and tenured faculty must be reviewed in writing annually by their department chair or designee. The School of Medicine Policy for Faculty Annual Performance Reviews is attached as Appendix C of this document. The annual review must evaluate faculty performance under the distribution of the effort indicated in the approved annual work plan (*The Redbook's* Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews).
2. Annual work plans and reviews shall be part of all career review files. Annual Performance Reviews shall be part of a promotion, tenure or periodic career review, but do not make up the entirety of requirements for a successful promotion or tenure review, or a satisfactory periodic career review.
3. The appeal process for annual reviews is outlined in the School of Medicine Policy for Annual Performance Reviews document.

B. Promotion and Tenure of Tenurable Faculty

1. Time Required
 - a. Each faculty member eligible for tenure must (with the exceptions listed in Article III.B.2 and 3, below) be evaluated by the SOM PAT Committee before the end of twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure. Evaluation for tenure, once originated, in the School of Medicine shall proceed unless the faculty member resigns from the University or is subject to termination.
 - b. All probationary faculty who have had seven years of service counted as in a tenurable

faculty position, if reemployed full-time shall be granted tenure.

2. Leaves of Absence

One year spent on an officially approved leave of absence may be counted toward the seven years of full-time service necessary for tenure. Any leave granted during the probationary period must carry with it a stipulation in writing as to whether the leave counts toward tenure.

3. Extension of Probationary Period

A faculty member who faces extenuating circumstances that do not require a leave of absence but result in a significant reduction in ability to perform normal duties may request an extension of the probationary period for no less than six months and no more than one year. A second extension may be granted for a second extenuating circumstance. An extension shall not be granted more than two times within the probationary period of a faculty member. Such extensions must be requested and approved at the time the circumstances exist and before the end of the fifth year of the probationary period and must have documentation satisfactory to the dean for recommendation to the provost for approval.

4. Prior Service

Previous full-time service with the rank of instructor or higher in institutions of higher learning may be counted toward the acquisition of tenure. The letter of offer must specifically request that previous productivity at another institution or at the University of Louisville in a non-tenurable position be applied towards tenure and this request must be approved by the SOM dean

C. Tenure, Promotion and Appointment to Associate Professor of Tenurable Faculty

1. The requirements for promotion to associate professor are equivalent to those for granting tenure. It is recommended that requests be submitted jointly, i.e., a request for promotion should be coupled to a request for tenure. The departmental executive faculty and the chair, as determined by procedures outlined in Appendix B, have the responsibility for initiating consideration of promotion and tenure.
2. The candidate's record shall provide evidence of excellence in the major or designated area of the work plan (no less than 20% effort in the work plan) and proficiency in all other areas of the work plan. Criteria for excellence and proficiency in each area are defined in Appendix A. The individual's accomplishments should indicate promise of continuing proficiency in those endeavors that best support the research and academic mission of the School of Medicine and the University commensurate with the proportion of non-administrative duties in the department.
3. In addition, scholarship, defined as the creation of new knowledge and the dissemination and acceptance of it by peers, must be demonstrated at the time of review. Scholarship in the areas of research, teaching and service is defined in Appendix A.
4. Normally, requests for promotion to associate professor and tenure will not be considered until a full probationary period of five years in faculty status has been served. Requests for early action are appropriate if the faculty member's accomplishments meet the stated criteria. Service prior to employment at the University or while serving in a non-tenurable appointment at the University can be considered in these deliberations if so stated in the letter of offer. A faculty member may request only one evaluation for early tenure. Once originated this evaluation shall proceed as indicated in *The Redbook* unless the faculty member requests its withdrawal.

Promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or higher shall require board certification in disciplines where boards are available and patient care is provided. Candidates for new appointments at the rank of associate professor shall satisfy the same criteria as described above for promotion to that rank.

D. Promotion or Appointment to Professor of Tenured or Tenurable Faculty

1. Promotion to professor should be awarded with care and only to those who show promise of continuing excellence in the major or designated area of their annual work plan, and proficiency in all other areas of their work plan commensurate with the percent effort in the department. However, despite this anticipatory element, a recommendation for granting the rank of professor shall be made in recognition of accomplishments already attained.
2. Scholarship must be demonstrated at the time of review. Scholarship in the areas of research, teaching and service is defined in Appendix A.
3. Normally, a minimum of five years in rank as an associate professor shall be served before a recommendation for promotion is considered. Requests for early promotion are appropriate if the faculty member's accomplishments as an associate professor meet the stated criteria. A department is not obligated to make a recommendation after the fifth year; a longer interval commonly is necessary to establish acceptable credentials.
4. Promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or higher shall require board certification in disciplines where boards are available and patient care is provided. Candidates for new appointments at the rank of professor shall satisfy the same criteria described above for promotion to that rank.

E. Promotion or Appointment to Associate Professor of Non-Tenable Faculty

1. The candidate's record shall provide evidence of excellence in the major or designated area of the work plan and proficiency in all other areas of their work plan. Criteria for excellence and proficiency in each area is defined in Appendix A.
2. In addition, scholarly activity, as defined in Appendix A, on average annually is required.
3. Normally, requests for promotion to associate professor will not be considered until a full period of five years in faculty status has been served. Requests for early action are appropriate if the faculty member's accomplishments as an assistant professor meet the stated criteria.
4. Promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or higher shall require board certification in disciplines where boards are available and patient care is provided. Candidates for new appointments at the rank of associate professor shall satisfy the same criteria as described above for promotion to that rank.

F. Promotion or Appointment to Professor of Non-Tenable Faculty

1. Promotion to professor should be awarded with care and only to those who show promise of continuing evidence of excellence in the major/designated area of their annual work plan, and proficiency in all other areas of their work plan commensurate with the percent effort in the department. However, despite this anticipatory element, a recommendation for granting the rank of professor shall be made in recognition of accomplishments already attained.
2. In addition, scholarly activity, as defined in Appendix A, on average annually is required.
3. Normally, a minimum of five years in rank shall be served before a recommendation for promotion is considered. Requests for early promotion are appropriate if the faculty

member's accomplishments as an associate professor meet the stated criteria. It should be understood that a department is not obligated to make a recommendation after the fifth year; a longer interval commonly is necessary to establish acceptable credentials. Accomplishments made as an associate professor prior to employment at the University can be considered in these deliberations.

4. Promotions to the rank of Associate Professor or higher shall require board certification in disciplines where boards are available and patient care is provided. Candidates for new appointments at the rank of professor shall satisfy the same criteria described above for promotion to that rank.

G. Appointment and Promotion of Part-Time and Gratis Faculty

1. Part-time faculty shall be held to the criteria specified for full-time non-tenurable faculty with consideration for their percentage effort and work plan.
2. Appointment and promotion of gratis faculty is initiated at the departmental level and does not require SOM PAT Committee review. These appointments and promotions are reviewed at the level of the Dean (or designee). Specific guidelines and criteria for the appointment and promotion of gratis faculty are provided to departments.

H. Periodic Career Review

All tenured faculty in the School of Medicine (with the exception of department chairs and the dean who are reviewed by other means) shall undergo periodic career review after every fifth year of service to evaluate their contribution to the missions of the University, School of Medicine, and department. Candidates shall be evaluated as either “satisfactory: meeting School of Medicine criteria”, or “unsatisfactory: not meeting School of Medicine criteria”.

1. When the review period ends in a sabbatical (or other leave) year, the career review shall be deferred until the next academic year. A promotion review shall replace career review for the period in which the promotion occurs.
2. Periodic career reviews shall be conducted in the same way as promotion reviews except as otherwise noted in this document. Criteria shall be evidence of excellence in the major or designated area of the annual work plan, and proficiency in all other areas of their work plan, commensurate with the percent effort in the department, for the period under review, and scholarly activity as defined in Appendix A. The review process shall not extend beyond the Office of the Dean of the School of Medicine, but the results of such reviews shall be reported annually to the Office of the Provost.
 - a. Tenured faculty members evaluated as satisfactory shall begin the next review cycle in the following academic year.
 - b. Tenured faculty members evaluated as unsatisfactory shall prepare a career development plan within 30 days in consultation with the chair that is acceptable to the dean to remedy the deficiency in one year unless the dean approves a longer period. If the faculty member and chair or divisional head are unable to agree upon a career development plan acceptable to the Dean, the Dean may set the requirements to be met so long as the requirements are equitable in light of the obligations and responsibilities expected of faculty at the same rank with comparable work plans as the faculty member under review. If the faculty member completes the agreed upon professional development plan, the faculty member shall then have one year to demonstrate satisfactory performance on a subsequent career review. Meeting all requirements as stipulated in the career development plan will be the criteria used for demonstrating satisfactory performance on the second review. If

the faculty member is again evaluated unsatisfactory, the career record of performance shall be forwarded to the Dean of the School of Medicine for appropriate disciplinary action that may include proceedings for termination as per the Redbook. However, if the faculty member's performance is evaluated as satisfactory at the time of subsequent career review, the next five-year review cycle begins with the following year.

3. For faculty with non-tenurable and part-time appointments, consideration for reappointment shall serve as their periodic career reviews. The criteria shall be pertinent to their defined areas of appointment and performance. Satisfactory reviews require documented proficiency in all assigned areas of the annual work plan. Although a satisfactory annual review will be a criterion in deciding renewal of contract, there is no guarantee that a faculty contract will be renewed beyond the term of the contract. Non-tenurable faculty who are evaluated as unsatisfactory on annual review may be considered for non-renewal of contract.
4. All University *Redbook* and School of Medicine rights of due process and appeal for non-tenurable, probationary, and tenured faculty shall pertain in these periodic career reviews.

IV. Departmental PAT Policies

A. Allowance for Departmental PAT Policy Documents

1. Separate departmental documents are not required, and their function can be fulfilled by adopting the school's criteria elaborated in this document (Policy for Promotion, Appointment and Tenure and for Periodic Career Review in the University of Louisville School of Medicine) and its accompanying Appendices. However, departments have the option of preparing written criteria that specify additional requirements and procedures for promotion, appointment, tenure and periodic career review.
2. The document must be adopted by a majority vote of departmental executive faculty and approved by the unit Faculty Forum committee and the Dean of the School of Medicine and reported to the University Provost.

B. Requirements of Departmental PAT Policy Documents

1. Departmental documents and procedures shall not disrupt due process nor set performance requirements less stringent than those established in this unit document.
2. Departmental documents must be explicit in specifying the responsibilities of the appointee and the criteria by which proficiency, excellence, and scholarship and other categories, if any, shall be measured. If factors such as professional licensing are required, this must be stated clearly, as well as how documentation shall be established.
3. The document must be explicit in specifying the procedures by which consideration of promotion, appointment, tenure and periodic career reviews are conducted.
4. Departmental PAT documents must not conflict with the requirements of *The Redbook* and Minimum Guidelines and the School of Medicine Policy on Promotion, Appointment, Tenure and Periodic Career Review in the University of Louisville School of Medicine document.

Approved by the Board of Trustees: August, 1984
Revised: August, 1989
Revised: June, 1990
Revised: March, 1995
Revised: November, 1995
Revised October, 1998
Revised: December, 1999
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 19, 2000
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 10, 2000
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 28, 2000

Following the 2001 Redbook Chapter 4 changes:
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: June 20, 2001
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: November 14, 2001
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 23, 2002
Reviewed by Faculty Senate Redbook Committee: February 28, 2002
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: March 13, 2002
Approved by the Board of Trustees: April 22, 2002
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 16, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: April 24, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 14, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: May 21, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: August 7, 2008
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: December 17, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: February 16, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: April 13, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: April 21, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 27, 2011
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: October 6, 2011
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: October 13, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: November 17, 2015
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: March 2, 2016
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: September 22, 2016
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 15, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 13, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: May 15, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 15, 2015
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: March 2, 2016
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: September 15, 2017
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 6, 2022
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: May 4, 2022
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: June 23, 2022

Appendix A

Definitions and Examples of Excellence, Proficiency and Scholarship in the Areas of Research, Teaching and Service

Below are the definitions of excellence and proficiency in the areas of research, teaching, and service. Excellence and proficiency in these areas includes community-engaged scholarship, a form of scholarship that embraces research, teaching, and service for the mutual benefit of external audiences and the University. Examples include community-based research, service-learning, educational enrichment programs for the public, youth services, public health outreach, and health education. The category of service includes clinical service, non-clinical/community service, and service to research. Service to research refers to the contribution of essential expertise to school of medicine research programs, such as the operation and directorship of core facilities.

I. Definitions of Excellence and Proficiency in Research

A. Excellence in research is defined by the following criteria:

1. The faculty member must have a major responsibility for an independent research program. ~~Preferred evidence of an independent research program is This includes current extramural funding, with federal funding as principal investigator, including principal investigator on a multi-principal investigator grant, preferred.~~ Alternatively, nationally peer-reviewed funding via multi-year significant grants as principal investigator may be acceptable (e.g., American Heart Association, American Diabetes Association).
 - a. ~~For award of tenure and for Periodic Career Review, if criterion 1 above is not met and there is prior funding within the last two years of review, then an exception will be considered if the department chair will assesses the likelihood of future funding by the faculty member, an exception to the requirement for current extramural funding as principal investigator can be made if there is documentation of such funding within the past two years of review and that there is evidence, as assessed and presented by the chair, of the likelihood of future funding.~~ This assessment should include, but is not limited to, reviews of recently submitted grant applications.
 - b. For promotion to the rank of Professor both current and sustained extramural funding meeting the above criteria (I.A.1) is required.
2. Regular publication (on average at least annually) of original research findings in nationally-recognized (e.g., included in PubMed) peer-reviewed journals for which the faculty member is a major author (defined as first, senior [i.e., the person who directed the research], or corresponding author) is expected. The quality of the journal and the impact of the publication on the field can be considered in the evaluation. For example, an exception to the expected annual rate of publication can be made if the publications during the review period are in exceptionally high-ranking journals of international acclaim (e.g., Science, Nature, Cell) and are of substantial content and impact. Published review articles, opinions or perspectives can augment, but not replace this requirement for peer-reviewed original research publications.
3. At the time of tenure review, the individual must have an emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of research expertise that should be evidenced in extramural letters.
4. At the time of review for professor, the individual must have national/international recognition in a focused area of research expertise that is demonstrated by evidence such as

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

leadership roles in national forums, consultations such as being an editor or reviewer, or invitations to speak. The national/international recognition should be evidenced in extramural letters.

5. Evidence of excellence in community-engaged research includes non-academic publications and presentations, recognition, citations and awards, and a description of involvement of partners/students in these outputs. Such evidence supplement requirements under I. A. 2. above but do not substitute for on average annual requirement for publication of original research findings in nationally recognized peer-reviewed journals.
6. The successful acquisition of patents can be considered evidence of excellence in research, however dissemination in peer-reviewed media is preferred and must constitute the majority of the documentation of peer acceptance.
7. A leadership role on federally funded entrepreneurial peer-reviewed grants or contracts for technology development linked to U of L, and of demonstrable value to the University, can be considered as contributing to excellence in research, but is not, alone, sufficient to meet these criteria.

B. Proficiency in research is defined by the following criteria:

1. Proficiency in research, including community-engaged research, is best evidenced by regular dissemination of original research findings that is commensurate with the work assignment, the majority of which should be through traditional peer-reviewed nationally recognized (e.g., listed in PubMed) publications. At least on average annual publication (as either primary or co-author) is expected of faculty with a 20% or greater work assignment. As described in section I.A.2 of this document, quality of publications can be considered. At least one peer-reviewed publication during the period under review is required for those with a research work assignment of less than 20%. Published review articles, opinions or perspectives can augment, but not replace this requirement for peer-reviewed publication of original research findings.
2. Reviews by collaborators, peers and external reviewers must also be obtained and should indicate satisfactory performance compared to others at this stage of the career.

II. Definition of Excellence and Proficiency in Teaching

Teaching is defined as any activity that fosters learning and critical thinking skills, including direct teaching and the creation of instructional materials to be used in one's own teaching. Examples of direct teaching include lectures, workshops, small group facilitation, role modeling in any setting (such as ward attending), precepting, demonstration of procedural skills, facilitation of online courses and providing formative feedback to learners. Administrative responsibility for an educational activity (e.g., residency director; course director, clerkship director, leadership in graduate student education, etc.) should be considered part of the teaching effort and evaluation.

A. Excellence in teaching is defined by the following criteria:

1. Excellence in teaching, including teaching associated with community-engaged teaching, is demonstrated by a documented substantial teaching assignment with a major responsibility for (i.e., leadership role in) a teaching program. Description of the faculty member's major responsibility for a teaching program, should include concise descriptions of the frequency and duration of the responsibility, outcomes, and evaluations of those outcomes.

2. Reviews by recipients of the teaching efforts (e.g., students, residents, local community organizations, etc.) must reflect excellent teaching effectiveness.
3. Peer and supervisory reviews should document an excellent teaching performance.
4. At the time of tenure review, the individual must have an emerging regional/national recognition in an area of teaching that should be evidenced in extramural letters.
5. Additional evidence of excellence in other areas of educator activity may be considered. For example, receiving an award for teaching, engaging in structured mentoring or advising activities, developing new instructional or curricular materials, evidence of learning and critical thinking skills and participation in interdisciplinary teaching efforts, and being an author on a book chapter may all be considered. Descriptions of the quantity and quality of these educator activities should demonstrate excellence.
6. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor based on excellence in teaching, extra-university recognition in teaching, curriculum development, advising/mentoring, educational leadership/administration, or learner assessment must be demonstrated. Examples include participation in extramural educational initiatives (examples: election or appointment to regional or national committees involved with teaching, curriculum development, advising/mentoring, educational leadership/administration, or learner assessment; invitations as a visiting professor for teaching activity; convening/chairing a national or regional conference focused on education; invitations to critically appraise or evaluate an educational activity at another institution; participation in subspecialty board review or test development committee; invitation to be an accreditation [ACGME or LCME] site visitor). Extra-university recognition should be evidenced in extramural letters.

B. Proficiency in teaching is defined by the following criteria:

1. Proficiency in teaching, including teaching associated with community-engaged teaching, is best demonstrated by a documented teaching assignment and satisfactory supervisory, peer, and learner (e.g., students, residents, local community organizations, etc.) reviews of the documented teaching activities. This evidence should include the number of evaluations collected and should summarize the results, including recipient comments when available. Description of the faculty member's teaching responsibility should include concise descriptions of the frequency and duration of the responsibility, outcomes, and evaluations of those outcomes.
2. Additional evidence of proficiency in other areas of educator activity may be considered, for example engaging in structured mentoring or advising activities, developing new instructional or curricular materials, evidence of learning and participation in interdisciplinary teaching efforts.

III. Definition of Excellence and Proficiency in Service

Service includes clinical, non-clinical/community service, and service to research. Clinical service activities refer to direct patient care activities. Non-clinical/community service activities are defined local (intramural or extramural), regional or national service. To be considered for non-clinical/community service activities, these must involve medical and or basic science expertise or community health related activities. Examples may include but are not limited to participation in hospital, department or university committees/task forces, mentoring activities, work in furtherance of identified missions of the university (eg. anti-racism activities, administrative assignments related to clinical work (i.e., work that does not involve direct patient care, although work may benefit patients), service to local community, state advisory boards or state organizations, national and/or international

committees or organizations, editorial board membership or leadership in research study sections, etc.). Service to Research Activities refer to activities which support a research program(s) through administrative roles, core services or other activities that are integral to the success of the program. ***All service activities including clinical service, non-clinical/community service and service to research can be combined to demonstrate excellence or proficiency in service.***

A. Excellence in clinical service activities is defined by the following criteria:

Excellence in clinical service is best demonstrated by a documented clinical assignment and a major responsibility for (i.e., leadership role in) a clinical program. The faculty member should have measurably and significantly improved the clinical program. Measures of improvement include but are not limited to obtaining funding support for the program through contracts, significantly increased clinical productivity; evidence of significantly increased clinical-service-related collaborative partnerships with the community; evidence of improved health care outcomes and/or equitable care, evidence of significantly increased cost effectiveness of the program (for example, improved clinic efficiencies); introduction of new technologies, methods or procedures that contribute to improved health care outcomes; or evidence of a significant contribution to improved public health.

B. Excellence in non-clinical/community service activities is defined by the following criteria:

1. Excellence in non-clinical/community service is best demonstrated by a documented non-clinical assignment and a major responsibility (i.e., leadership) for a non-clinical program role or multiple or consistent contributions key to programmatic success of non-clinical program(s). The individual should have measurably and significantly improved the non-clinical program. Measures of improvement include but are not limited to work in furtherance of identified missions of the university (e.g. development of anti-racism programs, successful revision of course materials and instructional methods to incorporate antiracism and social justice to content to transition curriculum to a post-racial framework and methodology, presentations for SOM social justice-antiracism forums), improved quality, quantity and/or outcomes of mentoring activities, improved community health care outcomes, documented improvements due to administrative assignments related to clinical work, development or implementation of policies or programs involving local, regional, national, and/or international organizations.
2. Significant non-departmental administrative assignments that serve a broader function in the School of Medicine or university (e.g., department chair, assistant, associate, or vice deans, etc.) should be included in the department promotion, tenure or periodic career review. Non-departmental administrative activities should be reviewed independently of the department review by the candidate's appropriate supervisor(s) and sent to the department for inclusion in its review.

C. Excellence in service to research is defined by the following criteria:

Excellence in service to research is best demonstrated by a documented service-to-research assignment and a major responsibility for (i.e., leadership role) in a clinical or non-clinical research program. The individual should have measurably and significantly improved the research program. Measures of improvement include but are not limited to a significant participation in obtaining funding for the program through contracts or grants, development of new research programs, or increased research productivity of the program including scientific presentations and nationally recognized (e.g., included in PubMed) peer-reviewed publications

D. Peer and supervisory reviews of the candidate's service must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Examples of recipients of the service include but are not limited to

referring physicians, patients, community organizations, local, regional, or national organizations, mentees, research colleagues and collaborators.

- E. At the time of tenure review, the individual must have emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of service that should be evidenced in extramural letters.

F. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor based on excellence in service, extra-university leadership must be demonstrated. Extra-university leadership can include regional, state and/or national leadership activities. The candidate must have extra-university recognition in a focused area of service that should be evidenced in extramural letters. *All service activities including clinical service, non-clinical/community service and service to research can be combined to demonstrate extra-university service.*

Examples of extra-university leadership in clinical and/or non-clinical/community service include but are not limited to: election to national committees, invitations as a visiting professor for clinical activity, participation in subspecialty board review or test development committee, invitation to be an accreditation [ACGME or LCME] site visitor or leadership in extra-university clinical or non-clinical/community initiatives, leadership roles in national forums, or invitations to speak nationally or internationally. With respect to participation in clinical trials, there should be evidence of an extra-university leadership role.

Examples of extra-university leadership in service to research include but are not limited to: leadership or critical participation on funded multi-site projects (regional, national, international), and participation in national grant reviews, study sections or editorial boards.

G. Proficiency in service is defined by the following criteria:

1. Proficiency in service requires a documented service assignment (clinical, non-clinical/community and/or service to research) and satisfactory peer and supervisory reviews of the service. Reviews by the recipients of the service must be obtained and document proficiency.
2. Significant non-departmental administrative assignments that serve a broader function in the School of Medicine or university (e.g., department chair, assistant, associate, or vice deans, etc.) should be included in the department promotion, tenure or periodic career review. Non-departmental administrative activities should be reviewed independently of the department review by the candidate's appropriate supervisor(s) and sent to the department for inclusion in its review
3. Examples or recipients of the service include but not limited to referring physicians, patients, community organizations, local, regional or national organizations, mentees, research colleagues.

IV. Definitions of Scholarship in the Areas of Research, Teaching and Service

A. Introduction

Scholarship is required of all probationary (pre-tenure) and tenured faculty for promotion in rank. Scholarship is defined herein as the creation of new knowledge and the dissemination and acceptance of it by peers. Tenure is awarded to those who have an independent, focused, self-sustaining program of scholarship or a leadership role in a focused, self-sustaining program of collaborative scholarship. In any given area, the requirements for scholarship exceed those for proficiency in that the scholar plays a pivotal role in the creation of new knowledge and assumes primary responsibility for its dissemination.

Scholarship need only be demonstrated in one area for tenure and/or promotion on tenure track.

B. Definitions of scholarship

1. Scholarship in research, including community-engaged scholarship, requires:
 - a. innovations in research including community-engaged scholarship (discovery of new findings or application of existing findings in a new way);
 - b. documentation of peer acceptance of research scholarship through peer-reviewed publications;
 - c. extramural research funding;
 - d. presentation of research findings, on average annually, at national forums;
 - e. for tenure review: an emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of research expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters; and
 - f. for promotion to professor: a national/international recognition in a focused area of research expertise that is demonstrated by such evidence as leadership roles in national forums, consultations such as being an editor or invitations to speak. The national/international recognition should be evidenced in extramural letters.
2. Scholarship in teaching requires:
 - a. innovations in teaching (development of new methodologies or application of existing methodologies in a new way which may include community-engaged teaching innovations, curriculum, student advising/mentoring, leadership/administration, or student assessment);
 - b. documentation of peer acceptance of scholarship through peer-review publications in the area of scholarship of teaching and adult learning;
 - c. intramural or extramural funding for teaching initiatives or extramural funding for research efforts;
 - d. presentation of instructional innovations/findings, on average annually, at national forums;
 - e. for tenure review: an emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of teaching expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters; and

f. for promotion to professor: a national/international recognition in a focused area of

teaching expertise that is demonstrated by such evidence as leadership roles in national forums, consultations such as being an editor or reviewer, or invitations to speak. The national/international recognition should be evidenced in extramural letters.

3. Scholarship in service requires:
 - a. innovations in service (development of new protocols, new clinical, non-clinical/community or service to research programs or the expansion of existing programs);
 - b. documentation of peer acceptance of scholarship through peer-review publications in any area of service;
 - c. extramurally funded clinical initiatives, non-clinical/community initiatives, or service to research efforts;
 - d. presentation of innovations/findings, on average annually, in a national forums;
 - e. for tenure review: emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of service expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters; and
 - f. for promotion to professor: established national/international recognition in a focused area of service expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters

V. Definitions of Scholarly Activity

A. Introduction

Scholarly activity must be demonstrated regularly (i.e., on average annually) for a satisfactory periodic career review for tenured faculty and is also required for promotion of non-tenurable faculty to the rank of associate professor or professor. Scholarly activity is defined herein as those activities in which faculty take a scholarly approach to education, service, and/or research activities. These occur when faculty systematically design, implement, assess or redesign educational, service, or research activities, drawing from the scientific literature and “best practices” in the field. Documentation describes how the activity was informed by the literature and/or best practices.

Scholarly activities that occur over more than a single year (12-month period) may be counted more than once if there is significant on-going or new effort that takes place in each year (e.g., development of a curriculum in one year, analysis of outcomes/impact data in another). Repeating the same lecture or set of lectures without documentation of on-going evidence or evaluation-based revision would not be considered a multi-year scholarly activity.

Multiple faculty members with involvement in a single scholarly activity may receive credit for the activity provided the individual faculty member can provide documentation of substantial contribution to the activity.

B. Examples of scholarly activity include but are not limited to the following:

1. Scholarship as defined in Appendix A.IV
2. Substantial contribution to a local or national clinical trial (patient recruitments, data collection, other documentable contributions that are important but do not result in authorship)
3. Service as a board reviewer or writing board review questions
4. Active service on a regional or national committee or a board related to clinical care, non-clinical/community service, education, or research
5. Intramural or extramural funding for a clinical, non-clinical/community or educational project
6. Leadership role in a local, regional, or national conference or in a multidisciplinary intramural conference on education or clinical care
7. Evidence-based development or revision of organizational policy
8. Poster or oral presentation at a local, regional, or national meeting
9. Incorporation of new teaching technology or an evidence-based educational module into a curriculum
10. Leadership or substantial role in a quality improvement project that documents effectiveness or leads to improved processes, clinical care, or outcomes
11. Leadership role in the development or revision of evidence-based clinical practice procedures, guidelines, or treatment algorithms (e.g., order sets)
12. Evidence-based consultation to public officials at community, regional, state, or national venues
13. Leadership or substantial contribution to diversity, equity, inclusion initiatives related to healthcare education, healthcare access or improved healthcare outcomes, development of curricula, programs, or policies within the university or community organizations.

Approved by School of Medicine Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Committee: April 19, 2000
Approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 10, 2000
Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 28, 2000
Approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: November 14, 2001
Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 23, 2002
Reviewed by Faculty Senate Redbook Committee: February 23, 2002
Approved by the Board of Trustees: April 22, 2002
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 16, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: April 24, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 14, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: May 21, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: August 7, 2008
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: December 17, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: February 16, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: April 13, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: April 21, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 27, 2011
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: October 6, 2011
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: October 13, 2011
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty: May 11, 2015
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate March 2, 2016
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: September 22, 2016
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 15, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 13, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: May 15, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 15, 2015
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: March 2, 2016
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: September 15, 2017
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 6, 2022
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: May 4, 2022
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: June 23, 2022

Appendix B

Procedures for Tenure, Promotion, and Periodic Career Review

(These procedures are subject to the *Redbook* and in the event of any discrepancy, *the Redbook* supersedes)

I. Access to Documentation

In all considerations of appointment, promotion, tenure and periodic career reviews, the personnel documents pertaining to the faculty member under consideration including a current curriculum vitae, personal statement, letters of recommendation, teaching evaluations, reprints of articles, and documentation of other forms of scholarship when appropriate, must be available for review by the voting faculty at least 48 hours preceding the vote on the personnel action.

II. Procedures Regarding Probationary Faculty Members

A. Mid-tenure Review

1. In addition to the annual review, each probationary faculty member shall receive an evaluation in writing at the mid-point of his or her probationary period. This mid-tenure review summarizes achievement in the areas of their work assignments and indicates whether or not progress toward tenure is satisfactory.
2. The mid-tenure review shall be conducted at the same level of rigor and by the same process as in a tenure review, except that extramural evaluations shall not be required. The results of the departmental mid-tenure review shall be forwarded to the dean for approval.
3. These evaluations shall be made available to the Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Committee at the time when the faculty member is being reviewed for tenure.

B. Requests for Early Tenure

Only one request for evaluation for early tenure may be made.

C. Evaluation for Tenure

1. Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated by the School of Medicine Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Committee before the end of twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure unless an extension of probationary status has been previously granted.
2. Faculty members on probationary status shall be affected by any amendments to or change in the criteria for tenure subsequent to their appointment. In such evaluation, appropriate consideration must be given to the amount of time remaining in their probationary period when the change becomes effective.
3. Evaluation shall originate in the department in which the faculty member has primary appointment. The recommendations of the faculty and of the chair shall be forwarded to the School of Medicine Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Committee for its recommendation to the dean, who shall make a recommendation to the provost. For faculty with joint appointments, the recommendations of the non-primary appointment faculty and chair shall also be forwarded to the SOM PAT committee.

III. Protocols for Promotion and Tenure Processes at the Departmental Level

A. Consideration by the Departmental Faculty

1. All recommendations for new appointments, promotions, tenure, or periodic career review shall originate in the department and require appropriate consideration by the appropriate executive faculty of the department. Deliberations may occur either (a) within a departmental committee comprised of eligible executive faculty or (b) by all of the department's eligible executive faculty. Eligible executive faculty may vote as follows:
 - a. Tenured faculty members of the department shall make recommendations on matters of tenure.
 - b. Tenured and non-tenured professors of the department shall make recommendations on promotions to professor and periodic career review of professors.
 - c. Tenured and non-tenured professors and associate professors of the department shall make recommendations for promotion to associate professor and periodic career review of associate professors.
 - d. The entire executive faculty of the department shall make recommendations for new appointments of probationary and tenured faculty members, and for promotions of Instructors to Assistant Professors, and for faculty who are being considered for a change from term track to probationary track appointments.
2. The decision of the appropriate committee as specified above, made by anonymous secret ballot, shall be the departmental recommendation. Similar consideration shall be sought from other departmental executive faculty with their opinion also obtained by anonymous secret ballot. If vote not taken by ballots collected at departmental meeting, an electronic ballot or anonymous mail ballot may be used with responses collected over a minimum of one week.
3. The department chair (or designee) shall be responsible for making all essential arrangements for meetings of such committees. These arrangements shall include:
 - a. Notifying the candidate of the nature of the materials to be assembled and furnished to the committee and of the date when the documentation is required. The notification shall include the statement that candidates for promotion or tenure may add information or documents for reconsideration by previous levels of evaluation before the file is forwarded to the Office of the Provost and may examine any substantive material in the file at any time prior to receipt by the Office of the Provost, but shall not be informed of the identity of the evaluators.
 - b. Compiling all annual work assignments and annual evaluations for the file.
 - c. Requesting and receiving all intramural or extramural reviews for promotion and/or tenure and preparing a copy of each for use by the candidate after deletion of all identifying items.
 - d. Notifying members of the appropriate committee of the date, time and place of the meeting, with provision of at least 48 hours for all members to study the documents in the candidate's file.
 - e. Providing to the committee the criteria by which candidates are to be evaluated.
 - f. Assembling the committee at the proper time for confidential discussion of the

candidate's qualifications, which shall include any evidence concerning professionalism as well as any supporting materials that the candidate cares to submit.

- g. Ensuring that the voting records of each meeting are maintained by the department and shall include the names of faculty eligible to vote, the names of those voting and the results of the vote.

B. Consideration by the Chair

The chair shall prepare a separate evaluation and recommendation that shall be included in the candidate's promotion file. This letter must include comments on extramural evaluations.

C. Compilation of the Promotion/Tenure File

1. The promotion/tenure file shall include all documentary materials employed in the evaluation of the candidate including a copy of the criteria used for evaluation, the recommendations of the department and the chair, and the annual work plans for the candidate covering the period under review. The file shall be compiled with the cooperation of the faculty member.
2. The contents of the promotion/tenure file are the basis for evaluation at all succeeding levels of review and must be considered confidential.
3. Recommendations and any other material added shall become part of the file, as will annual work plans and reviews and the mid-tenure review, if applicable. The faculty member may examine any substantive material in the tenure file but shall not be informed of the identity of evaluators.
4. The faculty member may add newly available material evidence for reconsideration by the previous evaluators or rebuttals before the file is forwarded to the provost. The evidence in this file shall be reviewed according to the procedures specified in *The Redbook* in the Minimum Guidelines and this personnel document.

IV. Protocols for Consideration by the SOM Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Committee

A. Responsibilities of the SOM PAT Committee

1. All recommendations for appointment or promotion to associate professor or professor, tenure, or periodic career review transmitted to the dean are forwarded to the SOM Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Committee for review and recommendation.
2. It is the responsibility of this committee to examine each recommendation for consistency with departmental guidelines and current School of Medicine policies on promotion, appointment, tenure and periodic career review.

B. Response to Disagreements Between Levels of Review

1. When any disagreement concerning promotion, tenure, or periodic career review occurs between the recommendations of the departmental faculty and the department chair; the SOM PAT Committee and/or the departmental faculty and the department chair; and the SOM PAT Committee and the dean; the succeeding review authority (i.e., the department chair; PAT Committee; and dean; respectively) must send a written statement of the reasons for this differing recommendation to the faculty member and to the prior reviewing authority (i.e., departmental faculty; departmental faculty and/or the department chair; and Promotion, Appointment, and Tenure Committee; respectively), each of whom shall have opportunity within 30 days of notification to comment in writing prior to the forwarding of any

recommendation to the succeeding level of review. The SOM PAT Committee may also allow the department chair to attend a subsequent committee meeting to address an unsatisfactory recommendation at the next scheduled PAT committee meeting.

2. The committee's recommendation is transmitted to the dean who is responsible for preparing the unit recommendation. A requires notification of faculty by certified mail of a negative recommendation on promotion or tenure by the appropriate vice president, dean or department chair, to allow the candidate to request a hearing before a grievance committee. In tenure cases, if the dean or chair makes a negative recommendation, the faculty member under review has ten days following notification by certified mail within which to file with the appropriate grievance committee.

C. Termination of a Review for Promotion or Early Award of Tenure

Once initiated at the departmental level, the process of review for promotion or early award of tenure shall proceed through the levels described unless the candidate requests in writing that the proceedings be halted.

V. Extramural and Intramural Evaluations

A. Required Evaluations

1. Four extramural evaluations are required for each promotion and/or tenure review of probationary faculty.
2. For promotion to associate professor of term track clinical faculty (i.e., those whose work assignment is primarily clinical service or teaching) four intramural letters may take their place.
3. ~~Because evaluations during periodic career review are restricted to the School of Medicine, and these review files do not proceed through university wide offices, extramural letters of reference will not be required in the personnel file; intramural letters may take their place. Letters of reference are not required for periodic career reviews.~~

Formatted: Highlight

B. Qualifications of Acceptable Evaluators

1. The relationship of external evaluators to the university and the candidate must be clearly stated in the chair's evaluation along with certification of the professional expertise and objectivity. Unacceptable as evaluators are those with collaborative relationships with the faculty member being reviewed within the past five years and former mentors (graduate or post-graduate supervisors). Additional letters from mentors may be included in the file if clearly indicated as such. Former U of L faculty members must have been absent from the University for a period of five years to be acceptable as extramural evaluators.
2. Each candidate will be given the opportunity to suggest names of extramural and intramural evaluators. The candidate will suggest to the chair of the department a list of six M.D., Ph.D., Ed.D., D.D.S. or J.D. (or equivalent terminal degree) evaluators. For tenure reviews or promotions of tenured faculty, the evaluators must hold faculty appointments at other universities at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered or be in an equivalent non-academic position. The evaluators must be well established in the candidate's field and qualified to assess the quality of the candidate's contributions to the field. The department chair will review the appropriateness of the evaluators. The department chair may utilize these evaluators or strike names for cause (must be provided in writing and included in the promotion file) and enlist evaluators of his/her own choosing. The candidate will have the right to strike names from the chair's list for cause (must be provided in

writing). To ensure impartiality, disputes arising from this process will be decided by the dean.

C. Communication with Evaluators

1. The chair will solicit letters of evaluation and will collect them. Requests for evaluations shall specify the average annual work plan for the time period under review and specify that the areas in the work plan (research, scholarship, service and/or teaching) are the area(s) to be reviewed.
2. Comments regarding the quality of the work under review shall be solicited (*Redbook's* Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews). Evaluators will be asked to comment on whether excellence has been demonstrated in the major or designated area of the work plan and proficiency has been demonstrated in all other assigned areas of the work plan. In the case of tenure reviews and promotion to professor of tenured faculty, they will be asked to comment on the quality of the candidate's scholarship.
3. The candidate's CV, personal statement, teaching evaluations, clinical evaluations and if applicable, copies of the published peer-reviewed journal articles designated by the candidate as the most significant publications during his/her period of review will be provided to the evaluators.
4. The candidate shall be provided an opportunity to respond in writing to the evaluation(s), and this response must be included in the review materials prior to consideration of the evaluation by any reviewing body, including the departmental committee.

As recommended by School of Medicine Medical Council: November 20, 2000
As recommended by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: February 14, 2001
As recommended by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: July 30, 2001
As recommended by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: November 14, 2001
Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 23, 2002
Reviewed by Faculty Senate Redbook Committee: February 28, 2002
Approved by the Board of Trustees: April 22, 2002
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 16, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: April 24, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 14, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: May 21, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: August 7, 2008
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: December 17, 2008
Revisions approved by School of Medicine PAT Committee: April 15, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 13, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Rules Policies Credentials Committee: May 15, 2015
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: June 15, 2015
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: March 2, 2016
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: September 15, 2017
Revisions approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 6, 2022
Revisions approved by Faculty Senate: May 4, 2022
Revisions approved by the Board of Trustees: June 23, 2022

Appendix C
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE POLICY FOR FACULTY
ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

- A. Annual reviews aim to enhance the quality of the faculty by recognizing and rewarding performance in terms of the department's and the unit's goals and objectives. Annual performance reviews should reflect the same values as promotional and other career reviews, if applicable. They should document yearly progress toward promotion and/or tenure or satisfactory periodic career review. Annual Performance Reviews shall be part of a promotion, tenure or periodic career reviews, but do not make up the entirety of requirements for a successful promotion or tenure review, or a satisfactory periodic career review (SOM Personnel Document III.A.2).
- B. Annual reviews shall provide qualitative and quantitative feedback on performance in each category (teaching, research and service) of the work assignment for the year under review. This document establishes the processes for awarding salary increases based on annual performance and for appealing an annual review and shall be consistent with the Redbook.

1. Each faculty member, in conjunction with the departmental chair or his/her designee, shall develop an appropriate Annual Work Plan for the upcoming calendar year. The written Annual Work Plan must be approved by the chair and the Dean of the School of Medicine. These work plans shall specify the work assignment, percentage efforts, and requirements in each category (teaching, research and service) and provide a basis for the subsequent annual performance evaluations.

The Annual Work Plan for probationary (pre-tenure) faculty must contain provisions for demonstrating broad proficiency in all three categories (teaching, research and service) and demonstrating excellence in the category of major work assignment. The Annual Work Plan must provide at least 20% work assignment in research for probationary appointments.

2. Any revisions of this document which have final approval from the university by December 31 may be used as the basis for faculty performance evaluations for the next year.
3. Department chairs or designee(s) will perform the annual performance review in accordance with the Redbook.
 - a) At the beginning of each year, each faculty member will be provided an opportunity to present documentation of performance and effort relative to their Annual Work Plan of the preceding calendar year.
 - b) The performance evaluation shall characterize an individual faculty member's performance and should be based on the Annual Work Plan and meeting requirements described in the Annual Work Plan on a sliding scale defined by the following terms: outstanding, exceeds requirements, meets requirements, or unsatisfactory in each category of the work assignment (service, research, and teaching). The definition of each term is defined below. Rating scores can be given in half point intervals (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3). At the discretion of the chair, quantitative measures may be used to determine performance evaluation ratings.

Performance Evaluation Term	Rating Score	Definition
Outstanding	3	The faculty member not only exceeds requirements, but also provides evidence of performing in a way that distinguishes them from their colleagues. In order to earn this level of performance the faculty member must show evidence of exceptional performance in areas of the work assignment that warrant the highest level of evaluation. This level of evaluation is reserved for the highest performing faculty.
Exceeds Requirements	2	The faculty member not only meets but exceeds requirements defined in the expectation section of the annual work plan. In order to receive this level of performance the faculty member must show evidence of going above and beyond the requirements in that category of the annual work plan.
Meets Requirements	1	Meets all requirements as defined in the expectation section of the annual work plan.
Unsatisfactory	< 1	An unsatisfactory performance rating indicates that the faculty member has not met the minimum requirements assigned in that category of work assignment.

- c) The department chairperson is responsible for reviewing and approving the performance evaluations made by the departmental review body. Each faculty member employed on December 31st of the review year in the School of Medicine will receive an annual written performance evaluation including recommendations for improvement, if necessary, from the departmental chair by March 1. Receipt of the evaluation is considered the date sent via university email.
- d) The annual performance review must indicate the area of excellence for promotion and how the faculty member is performing to meet a satisfactory promotion, tenure or periodic career review
- e) In calculating the final composite evaluation score, the percentage efforts on the Annual Work Plan must be taken into consideration (i.e., used as a weighting factor).

An example calculation for a “Faculty X” with 30% Teaching, 50% Research and 20% Service assignment may be as:

Annual Work Plan Category	Annual Work Plan Assignment %	Rating	Composite Evaluation Score
Teaching	30	2	60
Research	50	2.5	125
Service	20	1	20
		TOTAL	205

The Composite Score calculation will equate to the Overall Performance Rating for the annual evaluation:

Composite Evaluation Score	Overall Performance Rating
250 - 300	Outstanding
175 - 249	Exceeds Requirements
100 - 174	Meets Requirements
0 - 99	Unsatisfactory

- f) An “Unsatisfactory” in any one area of the annual performance review or an “Unsatisfactory” overall performance rating will require a performance improvement plan addressing the area(s) of concern, thus giving the faculty member an opportunity to improve to a “Meets Requirements” rating or higher on the next annual performance review. Should a faculty member fail to improve to a “Meets Requirements” rating or higher in the same area of the work plan or in the overall performance rating, such faculty member may be subject to further review or disciplinary action up to and including termination as defined by the Redbook.
4. There are three levels of appeals of an annual performance evaluation possible including:
- a) Each faculty member shall be given opportunity to respond to their performance evaluation so that adjustments may be made before the evaluation is finalized and submitted to the Dean’s office (See SOM Annual Performance Review Calendar)
 - b) After the evaluation is finalized by the chair and submitted to the Dean’s office, an appeal may be made to the School of Medicine Performance Criteria and Policy Committee who will make recommendations to the Dean.

c) Throughout this process, a faculty member retains the right to pursue a grievance through The Redbook.

5. On behalf of the unit, the chair of the department shall be responsible for maintaining copies of the annual reviews. Individual faculty members shall be responsible for maintaining the documentary evidence supporting each annual review through the next tenure, promotion or periodic career review.

6. Annual Performance Reviews shall be part of a promotion, tenure or periodic career reviews, but do not make up the entirety of requirements for a successful promotion or tenure review, or a satisfactory periodic career review. However, the annual performance review should make note on how the faculty are performing to meet requirements for their next promotion, tenure or periodic career review.

C. Decisions regarding amount and distribution of performance-based salary increases, when available, will be made by the Dean or designee, and the following additional rules should apply:

1. An overall performance rating of “Unsatisfactory” indicates that the faculty member has not met the minimum departmental criteria in their work assignment and will not be eligible for a performance-based salary increase that year.
2. For those faculty eligible for performance based salary increases, the annual performance evaluation will be used along with the previous two annual evaluations for an average of a three-year time period of performance evaluations (or the time period the individual has been a faculty member of the University if less than three years) as the basis for the award of performance-based salary increases, unless the most recent annual review had an overall performance rating of unsatisfactory (See Section C.1 of this document).
3. Based on criteria set forth in this document, only the faculty whose overall performance is judged to be meets requirements or above may receive a performance-based salary increase.
4. The Dean shall report annually to the faculty and to the Executive Vice President and University Provost the frequency distribution of the percentage performance-based salary increases received by all faculty members in the unit and a description of the evaluation system used to arrive at such performance-based salary increases.

D. This document supersedes any and all previous documents regarding the subject matter described herein in the School of Medicine, including but not limited to any and all departmental or divisional documents. Additionally, this document is intended to comply with The Redbook and incorporates by reference applicable provisions. In the event of any inconsistency, the applicable provision of The Redbook shall control.

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE CALENDAR
FOR ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

The schedule of annual performance evaluations is as follows:

Work assignments will be for the calendar year January 1 through December 31, although significant changes can result in modified assignments mid-year. Performance evaluations are for the calendar year January 1 through December 31.

January 15	Performance data from faculty for the previous calendar year are provided by the faculty member to the department.
March 1	Performance evaluations of all faculty will be completed by the Department and provided to each faculty member by the Chair.
March 8	Any disputes with the evaluation must be forwarded by faculty in writing to the Chair.
April 1	The Chair must evaluate all disputes and notify faculty member of their decision. All final performance evaluations are sent to the Dean or designee. If needed, a Performance Improvement Plan is developed and given to the faculty member.
April 15	If the faculty member is not satisfied and wants to pursue further review, they may forward their concerns to the Faculty Affairs office and request a review by the School of Medicine Performance Criteria and Policy Committee.
May 15 or as soon as practical	The SOM Performance Criteria and Policy Committee will review all disputes requested by faculty member(s) and make a recommendation to the Dean.
May 31 or as soon as practical	Dean makes a final decision regarding recommendations received from the School of Medicine Performance Criteria and Policy committee and notifies faculty member and chair of final decision.

Approved by School of Medicine PCEW* Committee: June 21, 2001

Approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: June 12, 2002

Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: November 20, 2002

Recommended Changes by Faculty Senate Redbook Committee: February 25, 2003

Approved by School of Medicine PCEW Committee: April 21, 2003

Approved by School of Medicine Faculty Forum: May 14, 2003

Approved by the Board of Trustees: September 11, 2003

Approved by School of Medicine Executive Faculty: January 6, 2022

Approved by Faculty Senate: May 4, 2022

Approved by the Board of Trustees: June 23, 2022

*Promotion Criteria and Economic Welfare (PCEW) Committee