DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE
Guidelines for Faculty Review

BACKGROUND

In order to nurture career development of the faculty and to assure the attention to each faculty member that is essential to his/her progress, the Department has established a policy for ongoing evaluation of faculty performance. The policy is based on the written policy of the School of Medicine, but is tailored to the special needs of the department. The policy establishes minimum requirements for a faculty review that will provide information to the faculty member relevant to his or her advancement and provide documentation of each faculty member's performance and progress.

GENERAL POLICY

- The Chair or Chair’s designee shall conduct a periodic professional development review with each faculty member who holds primary appointment in the department.

- The Chair or Chair’s designee will prepare a written summary of the review and a written professional development plan for the faculty member on which the faculty member and the Chair or Chair’s designee concur. A copy of this review will be retained in the faculty member’s personnel file in the Department of Medicine office.

- The review shall be based on performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

- The purposes of the review will be to document performance and to serve as a tool for mentoring faculty in their career development.

TIMING

Following is the minimum number of reviews and associated timing recommended by rank:

1. **Associates, Senior Associates**
   
   It is recognized that faculty holding these ranks may be either: 1) promising, but as yet unproven; or, 2) important contributors to the program, but not expected to advance in rank. The review process and frequency will be different for these different kinds of junior faculty. It is important to establish realistic expectations with the faculty member early in his or her appointment. Subsequent review will be tailored as appropriate. Review should be:
   - At the discretion of the Chair or Chair’s designee;
   - Requested by the Faculty Member.

2. **Instructors, Tenure Track**
   
   The tenure clock starts with appointment at the Instructor level. These young faculty are presumed destined for eventual tenure. An annual review should enable rapid progression to the Assistant Professor level. Review should be:
   - At the end of the first full academic year;
   - Annually thereafter.
3. **Instructors, Research, Clinical and Medical Educator Service (MEST) Tracks**

Since there is no time clock for promotion in these non-tenure tracks, it is likely that there will be a spectrum of rates at which faculty progress to promotion. Review may not be essential at more than three year intervals following the first year after appointment. However, individuals with the apparent ability to progress rapidly should receive more frequent input regarding career advancement from the Division Director. Minimum review should be:

- At the end of the first full academic year;
- At three year intervals thereafter.

4. **Assistant Professors, Tenure, Clinical, Research, MEST Tracks**

Faculty at this level are in a critical phase of their career and need special attention to ensure their progress. For those on tenure track, the 9-year tenure clock starts with appointment at this level. (Note: If a new faculty member is appointed at the level of Instructor, Tenure Track, then the tenure clock begins at that time.)

Upon appointment to Assistant Professor, each faculty member will have a mentoring committee appointed that will serve to review progress and provide advice regarding career advancement. The committee will consist of approximately 3 senior faculty with expertise relevant to the faculty member’s focus. Committee members need not be all from the Department of Medicine.

Regardless of track, at least an annual review is essential to assure that the pace of the faculty member’s progress is appropriate and to provide feedback about realistic expectations for advancement. Review should be:

- At the end of the first full academic year;
- Annually thereafter.

5. **Associate Professors, Tenure, Clinical, Research, MEST Track**

Promotion to Associate Professor on the tenure track usually confers tenure. Associate Professors in all tracks have reached a major milestone in their career advancement. Review at this point can be less frequent. However, reviews continue to be important, especially for those faculty expecting eventual promotion to rank of Professor. Review should be at least:

- Annually until promotion to Professor.

6. **Professors**

Having been promoted to this level, it is presumed that the faculty member has developed a mature career. Review at this point can be less frequent. However, periodic review is still important so that continued productivity can be assured and any difficulties identified and addressed. Review should be at least:

- At intervals of three (3) years after promotion/appointment to the rank of Professor and reviews may be requested as needed.