

5-12-15

Appendix A

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

The contents of this appendix cannot be changed without a positive vote of the executive faculty.

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 teaching, research, 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, 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. 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, 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.I) 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

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 scholarship includes non-academic publications and presentations, recognition, citations and awards, and a description of involvement of partners/students in these outputs.
6. The successful acquisition of patents can be considered evidence of peer acceptance, 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 scholarship, 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 annual publication (as either primary or co-author) is expected of faculty with a 20% or greater work assignment. As described in section 1.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.

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

1. Excellence in teaching, including teaching associated with community-engaged scholarship, 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 or residents) must reflect an excellent teaching effectiveness.
3. Internal peer reviews should document an excellent teaching performance.

4. 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.

5. 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 scholarship, is best demonstrated by a documented teaching assignment and satisfactory supervisory, peer, and learner (e.g., students, residents) 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

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

- I. 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 clinician should have measurably and significantly improved the clinical program. Measures of improvement include obtaining funding support for the program through contracts, significantly increased revenues, or new patient referrals; evidence of significantly increased clinical-service-related collaborative partnerships with the community; evidence of improved health care outcomes, 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.
2. Peer and supervisory reviews of the clinical service must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Reviews by the recipients of the service (for example colleagues,

referring physicians or collective reviews such as patient satisfaction inventories) must also support the rating of excellence.

3. At the time of tenure review, the individual must have emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of clinical expertise that should be evidenced in extramural letters.
4. Promotion to professor

For promotion to professor based on excellence in clinical service, extra-university leadership in clinical service must be demonstrated. Examples participation in extra-university clinical initiatives (examples: 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 participation in extra-university clinical initiatives. The candidate must have national/international recognition in a focused area of clinical expertise that is demonstrated by evidence such as leadership roles in national forums, or invitations to speak nationally or internationally. The national/international recognition should be evidenced in extramural letters. With respect to participation in clinical trials, there should be evidence of a leadership role.

- B. Proficiency in clinical service is defined by the following criteria:

Proficiency in clinical service requires a documented clinical assignment and satisfactory peer and supervisory reviews of the service. Reviews by the recipients of the service (referring physicians, collective reviews such as patient satisfaction inventories) must document proficiency.

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

1. 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 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.
2. Peer and supervisory reviews of the candidate's service to research must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Reviews by the recipients of the service (e.g., colleagues, principal and co-investigators of clinical or non-clinical research) must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence.

3. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to professor based on service to research, extra-university recognition in service to research must be demonstrated. Examples of how this could be demonstrated are via scholarship as described in this Appendix, Section IV. Also meeting this criteria are critical participation on funded multi-site (regional, national, international) funded projects and participation in national peer-review of research.

- D. Proficiency in service to research

Proficiency in service to research is best demonstrated by a documented service to research assignment and satisfactory peer and supervisory reviews of the service. Reviews by the

recipients of the service to research (e.g., colleagues, principal and co-investigators of clinical or non-clinical research) must also be obtained to document proficiency.

E. Proficiency in community and administrative service

Effort in community and administrative service is not ordinarily acceptable as the basis for faculty promotion at the departmental level. Therefore, no definition of excellence in these areas is provided. 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) should not be included in the department review. Non-departmental administrative activities should be reviewed independently of the department and unit review by the candidate's appropriate supervisor.

1. Proficiency in community service

Community service is defined as service to the department, university, region, commonwealth or nation. In order for the activities to be considered, they must involve medical and/or basic science expertise.

Proficiency in community service, including community-engaged service, is best demonstrated by documented service and satisfactory peer and supervisory reviews of the service. Reviews by the recipients of the service or colleagues with knowledge of the service must also be obtained to document proficiency. Community service is defined as service to the department, university, region, commonwealth or nation. In order for the activities to be considered, they must involve medical and/or basic science expertise. Evidence of significantly increased clinical-service-related collaborative partnerships with the community may be presented as a supplement to the activities in service in promotion, tenure, and periodic career review consideration.

2. Evaluation of departmental administrative activities

Administrative activities in the department should be considered in the area to which they apply. For example, administrative responsibility for an educational activity (e.g., residency director; course director; should be considered part of the teaching effort and evaluation. Administrative responsibility for a clinical activity (e.g., clinic director, clinical program director, chief of service) should be considered part of the clinical effort and evaluation. Administrative responsibility for a research activity (e.g., departmental vice chair for research, departmental research coordinator,) should be considered part of the research effort and evaluation.

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

I. Scholarship in research, including community engaged research/scholarship includes:

- a. innovations in research (discovery of new findings or application of existing findings in a new way) and documentation of peer acceptance of research scholarship through peer-review publications
- b. extramural research funding
- c. presentation of research findings, on average annually, at national forums
- d. for tenure review: an emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of research expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters
- e. 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 reviewer, or invitations to speak. The national/international recognition should be evidenced in extramural letters.

2. Scholarship in teaching includes:

- a. innovations in teaching (development of new methodologies or application of existing methodologies in a new way), 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. presentation of instructional innovations/findings, on average annually, at national forums
- d. for tenure review: an emerging regional/national recognition in a focused area of teaching expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters
- e. 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 clinical service includes:

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

- f. for promotion to professor: established national/international recognition in a focused area of clinical expertise that is evidenced in extramural letters
4. Scholarship in service to research includes:
- a. innovations in service to research (development of new protocols, new research programs, or the expansion of existing programs)
 - b. demonstration of peer acceptance through traditional peer-review publications documenting contributions to clinical initiatives or research efforts
 - c. presentations of research findings, on average, annually in a national forum
 - e. for tenure review: emerging regional/national recognition for expertise in a focused area of service to research that is evidenced in extramural letters
 - f. for promotion to professor: national/international recognition for expertise in a focused area of service to research 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, clinical, and/or research activities. These occur when faculty systematically design, implement, access or redesign educational, clinical, 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, education, or research

5. Intramural or extramural funding for a clinical 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