

SIU School of Medicine

GUIDELINES ON FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Table of Contents

| Section | | Page |
|------------|---|------|
| I. | Introduction | 1 |
| II. | Faculty Categories | 1 |
| III. | Process for Appointing Faculty | 5 |
| IV. | Process for Promoting Faculty | 6 |
| V. | Process for Awarding Tenure to Faculty | 8 |
| | | |
| Appendices | | |
| A. | Dossier Format | 10 |
| B. | Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure | 23 |
| C. | Teaching Activities and Evidence | 24 |
| D. | Research Activities and Evidence | 31 |
| E. | Service Activities and Evidence | 33 |
| F. | Compliance Infractions | 36 |
| G. | Moving to and from Tenure-Eligible Appointments | 37 |
| H. | Termination of Faculty Appointments | 38 |
| I. | Effective Dates of Guidelines Revisions | 39 |

I. Introduction

Appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty at Southern Illinois University School of Medicine (SIUSM) are **governed by the Southern Illinois University Carbondale Tenure Policies and Procedures at: <http://policies.siu.edu/personnel-policies/chapter3/ch3-faps/tenure.php>** and by the Southern Illinois University Carbondale Promotion Policies and Procedures at: <http://policies.siu.edu/personnel-policies/chapter3/ch3-faps/promotfa.php>

The guidelines that follow supplement them and may not be interpreted to conflict with them. Appendices are intended to clarify guidelines, and should not be interpreted to conflict with guidelines. The **SIUSM Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&TC)** plays an integral role in appointments, promotions and tenure decisions. Its operating paper can be found at: http://intranet.siumed.edu.libproxy.siumed.edu/fc/op_papers/TenureandPromotionOp_Paper.pdf.

II. Faculty Categories

A. Academic Ranks, with Minimum Credentials and Standards for Appointment, Promotion or Tenure

1. Assistant Instructor: The minimum credential is a bachelor's degree.

2. Instructor: The minimum credential is a master's degree.

3. Assistant Professor:

The minimum credential for an Assistant Professor is an earned doctorate or terminal degree. Faculty members holding the M.D./D.O. or equivalent degree and with clinical responsibilities shall have completed residency training necessary for board certification. Faculty members holding the Ph.D. or similar degree shall have completed at least 2 years of postdoctoral training appropriate to their area of specialization. The Chair may appeal this requirement, and with strong justification, the appeal may be upheld by the Dean after review and input from the P&TC. Faculty members holding other degrees shall be eligible for appointment with appropriate professional certification in their fields, if such is available and applicable.

4. Associate Professor

- a. An Associate Professor must meet not only the minimum qualifications for Assistant Professor enumerated above, but also the following: those holding the M.D./D.O. or equivalent degree and with clinical responsibilities shall have completed board certification in their specialty or subspecialty; those holding the Ph.D. or equivalent degrees shall be certified in their fields if such certification is available and applicable.
- b. For an initial appointment to Associate Professor, an individual must also have met certain performance standards in two of three areas of faculty performance: 1) education and teaching ("Teaching"), 2) research and creative activity ("Research"), and 3) service and professional contributions ("Service"). These areas of faculty performance, "Teaching," "Research," and "Service", are detailed in Appendices B, C, and D. For an initial faculty appointment as Associate Professor, an individual must have demonstrated effective (clearly acceptable) performance in one area and outstanding (clearly superior) performance in a second area.
- c. For promotion to Associate Professor, an individual must have demonstrated effective (clearly acceptable) performance in one area and outstanding (clearly superior) performance in a second area. A rating of "Not effective" in any area of the position description shall be a bar to promotion or tenure.
- d. Time in Rank and Required Ratings

For promotion to Associate Professor, rankings in the performance areas should inform the timing of requests for promotion. The faculty member may submit a dossier for promotion after the defined number of years in rank, which would result in promotion the year after the submission of the dossier.

The candidate's percentage time commitment to a specific performance area is defined as the percentage listed in the job description or the average percentage commitment since the last appointment, whichever is greater.

When, by this definition, a faculty member's position description calls for at least 10% effort in all three areas of activity:

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| .. and when performance has been rated in the 3 areas as: | Outstanding Effective Effective | Outstanding Outstanding Effective |
| ...the faculty member may submit a dossier for promotion to Associate Professor no earlier than at completion of: | 5 years | 4 years |

When, by this definition, a faculty member's position description calls for at least 10% effort in only two of the three areas of activity:

| | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| ...and when performance has been rated in the 2 areas as: | Outstanding Effective | Outstanding Outstanding |
| ...the faculty member may submit a dossier for promotion to Associate Professor no earlier than at completion of: | 5 years | 4 years |

5. Professor

- a. Must meet the minimum qualifications for both Assistant Professor and Associate Professor as enumerated above.
- b. For either an initial appointment or for promotion to Professor, an individual must have documented national or international stature in one or more areas of Research, Teaching, and/or Service and effectiveness in another; and a professional history that demonstrates a consistently high level of achievement and superior performance that is recognized nationally and/or internationally.
- c. Ratings are identical to those enumerated above for Associate Professor.
- d. There is no suggested time in rank for promotion to Professor.

B. Faculty Employment Categories

1. Full-Time Faculty Positions

Full-time faculty members have at least 0.50 FTE in SIUSM and have responsibilities in at least two of the major academic categories of Teaching, Research and Service.

2. Tenure-eligible positions distinguished from other full-time positions

- a. Definitions of “Tenure,” “continuing appointment,” and “term appointment” are provided in the SIU Carbondale Tenure Policies and Procedures referenced in Section I above. These documents distinguish tenure-eligible faculty members from other faculty members in several ways, including the following: the scope of responsibilities for tenure eligible and tenured faculty members is expected to encompass teaching, research, and service, while that expectation is not articulated for other faculty members; neither a probationary period nor a penalty for failure to earn tenure is applicable to faculty members in non-tenure-eligible positions; the procedural requirements for evaluation for tenure-eligible faculty members are more stringent than are procedural requirements for others; and the termination of tenured faculty members is accomplished by the university under a narrower set of circumstances than is the termination of other faculty. This is described in Section VI of the SIU Carbondale Tenure Policies and Procedures at: <http://policies.siu.edu/personnel-policies/chapter3/ch3-faps/tenure.php>
- b. Ranks eligible for tenure within the SIUSM are Associate Professor and Professor. One may not hold tenure as an Assistant Professor, Research Associate, Researcher, Lecturer, Assistant Instructor, Instructor, or in any position with the descriptors clinical, research, adjunct, or visiting.
- c. The locus of tenure in SIUSM and University is the tenure-granting Department in which the appointment resides. The tenure recommendation must be initiated by one of the following tenure-granting units approved by the Board of Trustees:

| Clinical Units | Non-Clinical Units |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Anesthesiology | Anatomy |
| Family and Community Medicine | Behavioral and Social Sciences |
| Internal Medicine | Information and Communication Sciences |
| Neurology | Biochemistry and Molecular Biology |
| Obstetrics and Gynecology | Medical Education |
| Pathology | Medical Humanities |
| Pediatrics | Medical Microbiology, Immunology and Cell Biology |
| Psychiatry | Pharmacology and Neuroscience |
| Radiology | Physiology |
| Surgery | |

- d. Non-tenure-eligible full-time faculty appointments can be either term or continuing appointments. These appointments are designated by the descriptors “Clinical,” “Research,” or “Education” preceding the faculty rank. The non-tenure eligible faculty ranks for those whose efforts are primarily directed to clinical service and clinical teaching follow this form: Instructor of Clinical (Department Name), Assistant Professor of Clinical (Department Name), Associate Professor of Clinical

(Department Name), and Professor of Clinical (Department Name). The non-tenure-eligible faculty ranks for those whose efforts are primarily directed toward research are Research Instructor, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor and Research Professor. The non-tenure-eligible ranks for those whose efforts are primarily directed toward education are Education Instructor, Education Assistant Professor, Education Associate Professor and Education Professor. Non-tenure eligible full-time faculty members may be promoted by the criteria delineated in Section II.A.4, Section IV and Appendices B, C, D and E.

3. Faculty Members who are not Full-Time

a. Definitions

Part-time faculty members are those faculty members who do not meet the definition of full-time faculty member in Section II.B.1. The categories for part-time faculty members are paid part-time faculty member and unpaid part-time faculty members.

b. Part-Time Paid Clinical Faculty Members

Part-time paid faculty members whose responsibilities are mainly clinical care and clinical teaching may be appointed to rank of Clinical Associate, Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor.

c. Adjunct Faculty Members

Part-time paid or unpaid faculty members whose responsibility is mainly research or education and part-time unpaid faculty members whose responsibility is mainly clinical teaching are members of the adjunct faculty and may be appointed at the rank of Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor. Unpaid faculty members whose responsibility is mainly clinical care or clinical teaching are members of the adjunct faculty and may be appointed to the rank of Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor.

d. Visiting Faculty Members

Visiting appointments can be made for up to a period of one year. The ranks available for such appointments are Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor.

e. Emeritus Faculty Members

Any faculty member who is retired is considered an emeritus faculty member. If an emeritus faculty member is re-hired by the School as a part-time faculty member, the appointment shall be a non-tenure eligible faculty member at the same rank held at retirement. When the faculty member leaves the payroll, emeritus status will be re-activated.

III. Process for Appointing Faculty Members

- A. The initial appointment of a faculty member will be recommended by the appropriate Department Chair. The recommendation of the Chair is then transmitted to the Dean and Provost

of SIUSM. The Dean and Provost forwards all requests for appointment to a faculty rank of Associate Professor and Professor to the P&TC for review and recommendation regarding the academic rank. The recommendation of the Dean and Provost is forwarded to the Chancellor of the University. Final approval is granted by the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University. Notification of appointment is made by the Board of Trustees, Southern Illinois University.

- B. Guidelines for the appointment of tenure-track faculty with affiliations in both tenure-granting departments and other SIUSM academic or administrative units are found at:
<https://www.siumed.edu/dean/faculty-affairs.html>

IV. Process for Promoting Full-Time Faculty Members

A. Preparation of the dossier

Faculty members appointed to either tenure-eligible or non-tenure-eligible positions can be considered for promotion in any year at the faculty member's request, but should be informed by the above guidelines for time in rank. In conjunction with the Chair, the candidate shall prepare a dossier using the template provided in the Appendix A. Agreement of the Chair and Dean is not necessary for submission of a dossier. Some departments may wish to include additional categories in the dossier.

- B. A dossier shall not be presented for any faculty member who is under investigation for alleged compliance infractions. A list of relevant compliance infractions is included as Appendix F. Any past confirmed infractions must be described in the dossier.

C. Letters of evaluation

Letters of evaluation from internal and external reviewers must accompany all dossiers submitted for tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member shall submit a list of internal and external reviewers, including contact information, to the Chair of the department or the chair of the departmental P&TC, whichever is required by departmental policy. The Chair of the department or departmental P&TC will request letters. The requestor shall select some reviewers from the list provided by the faculty member, and an approximately equal number who were not listed by the faculty member. For promotion to Associate Professor, a minimum of 3 letters must be from external reviewers; for promotion to Professor, a minimum of 6 letters must be from external reviewers. For promotion to ranks below Professor, reviewers should be asked to rank the applicant's performance in one or more areas specified by the position description (teaching, research, service), with justification, and assess the potential for future growth and accomplishment. Reviewers may not be asked whether the applicant would receive promotion or tenure at the reviewer's institution. For promotion to the rank of Professor, reviewers should be asked to address the national or international reputation of the applicant, as well as the potential for future growth and accomplishment.

- D. Evaluation within the department will be based on departmental promotion and tenure standards. A candidate may be evaluated only by faculty members who have at least the rank that the candidate is seeking. If the number of faculty members in the Department with appropriate rank is less than three, the Chair, in consultation with the Dean, shall appoint an ad hoc committee of at least three faculty members of the School of Medicine with appropriate rank. In consideration of time constraints on professors outside the department, efforts should be made to ensure that ad

hoc committees are appointed early.

- E. After Departmental review, the Chair's letter shall be finalized, and the dossier and recommendation forwarded to the Dean and Provost.
- F. The Dean's office shall forward dossiers of full-time faculty to the P&TC for review and recommendation. Promotions of full-time faculty beyond the rank of Assistant Professor shall be reviewed by the P&TC.
- G. The P&TC shall review the dossier consistent with its operating paper and shall forward its recommendation to the Dean and Provost.
- H. The Dean and Provost will consider the recommendations of the P&TC. If the Dean and Provost disagrees with the recommendation of the P&TC, the reasons for doing so shall be documented.
- I. The recommendations of the Dean and Provost shall be forwarded to the Chancellor.
- J. Negative decisions
The Dean and Provost will convey in writing the detailed reasons for a negative promotion decision to the Department Chair. The Chair will present these findings to the candidate. The candidate may consult SIU grievance policy at:
<http://intranet.siumed.edu.libproxy.siumed.edu/fc/pdf/grievanceprocedure121911.pdf>

IV. Process for Promoting Faculty Members who are not Full-Time (Clinical and Adjunct)

- A. Appointment to and promotion for these Clinical and Adjunct ranks for faculty members who are not full-time shall be initiated by the Department Chair and recommended to the Dean and Provost. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will not review adjunct appointments and promotions unless requested to do so by the Dean and Provost.
- B. Promotion from Clinical or Adjunct Instructor to Clinical or Adjunct Assistant Professor should be considered for those individuals demonstrating continued excellence and commitment to the School's mission. Criteria for promotion should include 1) demonstration of outstanding performance in research, teaching or service in accordance with Department promotion standards, and 2) an established reputation of a commitment to excellence in one or more areas.
- C. Promotion from Clinical or Adjunct Assistant Professor to Clinical or Adjunct Associate Professor should be considered after 6 years in rank of Clinical or Adjunct Assistant Professor only for those individuals demonstrating continued excellence and commitment to the School's mission. Criteria for promotion should include 1) demonstration of outstanding performance in research, teaching or service in accord with Department promotion standards, and 2) an established reputation of a commitment to excellence in one or more areas.
- D. Promotion from Clinical or Adjunct Associate Professor to Clinical or Adjunct Professor should be considered after 6 years in rank of Adjunct Associate Professor only for those individuals demonstrating continued excellence and commitment to the School's mission. Criteria for promotion should include 1) demonstrated outstanding research, teaching and

service as judged by the Department Chair, and 2) recognition by the community, region, or peers of the individual's contributions to the academic programs of the School.

V. Process for Awarding Tenure to Faculty Members

A. All of the procedural requirements described above for review for promotion apply to the tenure process. In addition, the following procedural requirements must be met:

1. Probationary Period

- a. Computation of years of credit toward shall follow University Tenure Policies and Procedures at IV.F. http://policies.siu.edu/personnel_policies/chapter3/ch3-faps/tenure.html.
- b. Individuals hired at the Assistant Professor rank shall be notified in writing after a probationary period not to exceed 8 years and completion of the dossier review either that tenure has been awarded or that the appointment will not be renewed at the end of the next academic year. Individuals hired at the Associate Professor rank shall be notified in writing after a 4 year probationary period and completion of the dossier review either that tenure has been awarded or that the appointment will not be renewed at the end of the fifth year. Individuals hired at the Professor rank shall be notified in writing after a 2 year probationary period and completion of the dossier review either that tenure has been awarded or that the appointment will not be renewed at the end of the third year.
- c. Procedures for Extension of the Probationary period shall follow University Tenure Policies and Procedures at IV.E. http://policies.siu.edu/personnel_policies/chapter3/ch3-faps/tenure.php.
- d. If a tenure-eligible faculty member does not apply for tenure consistent with established timelines, tenure will not be granted. The faculty member will be allowed to continue until the end of the current year appointment, but will not be offered an additional one-year contract, as would be the case for denial of tenure.

2. Departmental Obligations

All of the departmental requirements described above for review for promotion apply. In addition, when a faculty member seeks tenure, the following departmental requirements must be met:

- a. All tenured faculty members in the Department who have attained the rank the candidate seeks shall have an opportunity to review the dossier and vote on a tenure decision. Only such tenured faculty shall vote on the decision. A negative tenure vote by a majority of these faculty members cannot be overruled except in cases of failure to observe the standard or of demonstrated discrimination.
- b. If the number of tenured faculty of sufficient rank in the Department (excluding the Chair) is less than three, the chair, in consultation with the Dean, shall appoint an ad hoc committee of at least three tenured faculty members of the School of Medicine who have

attained the rank the candidate seeks. The ad hoc committee of three does not include the Chair.

- c. The Chair is responsible for making an independent tenure recommendation, but the votes of the faculty review committee are to be forwarded with the Chair's recommendation in the dossier.

3. Board of Trustees Action

Final approval of the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University is required for the awarding of tenure.

B. Standards for Evaluation for Tenure

The standards for evaluation of tenure-eligible and tenured faculty members (outstanding performance, "effective" performance and "national or international" reputation or stature) are identical to standards for evaluation of faculty in non-tenure-eligible positions.

Appendix A
Dossier Format

Section I
CERTIFICATION OF CONTENTS
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

NAME:

RANK:

ACADEMIC TENURE UNIT:

This statement is to certify that I am aware of the entire contents of this dossier.

Signature of Candidate

Date

Section II
RECOMMENDATIONS

Name

Rank

Academic Unit

| Chair's recommendation | | | | |
|------------------------|--------|---|---------------------|-----------|
| IS | IS NOT | | Associate Professor | Professor |
| | | Recommended for promotion to the rank of: | | |
| | | Recommended for tenure | | |

Department Chair

Date

| Dean's recommendation | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------|---|---------------------|-----------|
| IS | IS NOT | | Associate Professor | Professor |
| | | Recommended for promotion to the rank of: | | |
| | | Recommended for tenure | | |

Dean

Date

Section III
TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Section I: | Certification Page |
| Section II: | Recommendations of Chair and Dean |
| Section III: | Table of Contents |
| Section IV: | Basic Information |
| Section V: | Dean's Letter of Recommendation |
| Section VI: | Department Chair's Letter of Recommendation |
| Section VII: | Departmental Assessment of Candidate |
| Section VIII: | Evidence and Evaluation of Quality of Education and Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Summary of Teaching ActivitiesB. Student Evaluation of TeachingC. Peer Evaluation of TeachingD. Other Education Activities, Exclusive of Externally Funded Educational ResearchE. Other Evidence |
| SECTION IX: | Evidence and Evaluation of Research and Other Creative Activity <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Research/Creative ActivitiesB. External Funding for Research or Other Scholarly ActivityC. Other Evidence |
| SECTION X: | Evidence and Evaluation of Service and Professional Contributions <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Basic Academic UnitB. College or SchoolC. UniversityD. Discipline-RelatedF. Partner OrganizationsG. Service-related External FundingG. Other Evidence |
| SECTION XI: | Other Supportive Materials, including internal and external letters of evaluation. |
| Section XII: | Curriculum Vitae |

Section IV
BASIC INFORMATION

- I. Information on Candidate at time of Employment
 - A. Date of Employment
 - B. Rank and Title
 - C. Highest Degree
 - D. Terminal Degree Required for this Position
 - E. Special Qualifications
 - F. Professional Experience
 - G. Changes Subsequent to Employment
 - 1. Degrees Completed (list institution, degree, and date conferred)
 - 2. Other Professional Changes in Status
 - 4. Change in Status to Tenure-Eligible or Tenure Ineligible
 - H. Compliance infractions: State none, or provide explanation.
 - I. Time in current rank (provide a clear explanation of how this was calculated)
 - J. Promotions Previously Granted
 - 1. from (rank) _____ To _____
on Date _____
 - 2. from (rank) _____ To _____
on Date _____
 - K. Include Signed Annual Position Descriptions for Each Year since Initial School of Medicine Appointment or Last Promotion, Whichever is Later

Section V
DEAN'S LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

Section VI
DEPARTMENT CHAIR'S LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

Section VII
 DEPARTMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATE
 (To be completed by Chair)

(Date)

Dear Dean/Promotion and Tenure Committee:

The Department of _____ (name) _____ recommends the promotion of _____ (name) _____ to the rank of _____ with tenure (if applicable).

The total number of voting faculty in the Department Review Committee was (number).

These individuals were: _____:

The vote of the Department Review Committee with regard to performance was as follows:

| | Number of Votes for Each Category of Performance | | |
|---|--|----------|---------|
| | Teaching | Research | Service |
| Average % effort per year since initial appointment of last promotion. | | | |
| Ranking** | | | |
| Outstanding | | | |
| Effective | | | |
| Not effective | | | |
| Not applicable** | | | |
| **Provide a rationale below for excluding any category deemed not applicable. | | | |
| | | | |

For candidates who are seeking promotion to the rank of Professor, the Department Review Committee discussed the dossier's documentation of the national/international reputation of the candidate. Among the [how many] committee members, [how many] voted that the dossier included sufficient evidence that the candidate had achieved a national/international reputation, and [how many] voted that the candidate's dossier did not include sufficient evidence that the candidate had achieved a national/international reputation.

Among the [how many] Committee members, [how many] voted in favor of promotion and/or tenure for the candidate, and [how many] voted to withhold promotion and/or tenure.

Sincerely,

(Department Chair)
 (Title)

Section VIII
EVIDENCE AND EVALUATION OF QUALITY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHING

Provide information and evidence relating to quality of teaching during the period with the program in this section.

A. Summary of Teaching Activities (add rows to table as necessary)

| For each academic year listed below, list the percent effort for teaching: | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Academic Year | % teaching effort in PD | Describe the teaching activity | Describe the teaching load, including effort and number of learners, as relevant |
| | | | |

B. Student Evaluation of Teaching

C. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

D. Other Education Activities, Exclusive of Externally Funded Educational Research

E. Other Evidence of Quality of the Education Activities Listed Above

Section IX
EVIDENCE AND EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITY

A. Research/Scholarly Activities (add additional lines under each category, as necessary).

| Categories (add rows as needed) | Authors (as ordered in publication) | Title | Citation, including year | Number of citations | Link | Journal impact factor, if relevant | Article H factor, if relevant |
|--|---|-------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Books authored or edited (specify) | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| Book chapters and reviews | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| Peer-reviewed original journal article | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| Published abstracts | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| Other abstracts | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| Other published scholarly work | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |

B. External Funding for Research or Other Scholarly Activity

| PI* | Grant Title | Funding period | Total direct costs | Total indirect costs | Funding Agency |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

List PI. Specify if co-PI. If applicant is not PI, also list applicant's role on project.

C. Other evidence of research and/or scholarly accomplishments and productivity.

1. Awards: bestowed by whom, when, and in recognition of what contribution
2. Intellectual property disclosures, patents, licenses, etc. Provide list, with relevant dates
3. Invited research presentations (internal and external): title, date of presentation, location of presentation, occasion of presentation (e.g., grand rounds, names lecture, etc.)
4. Service on grant review groups: list and provide dates of service
5. Other

Section X

EVIDENCE AND EVALUATION OF SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Information and evidence relating to service contributions are provided in this section. These contributions should be thoroughly described in any or all of the categories below as appropriate. In all cases, provide dates of service.

| Dates of service | Organization | Service role or contributions | Category* | Annual effort (% FTE if relevant) |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

* Categories of service are: 1) clinical, 2) administrative (if at departmental or school of medicine level, this may be listed as service only if there is no specific compensation), 3) institutional (university, school, department committees), 4) professional (e.g., professional societies and organizations), and 5) community.

Evidence of Quality of Service Activities

Additional details and/or other service contributions

Section XI
OTHER SUPPORTIVE MATERIAL
(including departmental tenure and promotion policies, annual position descriptions,
letters of evaluation)

Section XII
CURRICULUM VITAE

Appendix B

Scholarly Activities for Promotion and Tenure

The faculty at a school of medicine should have the pursuit of scholarly activities as its highest priority. Scholarship should be evident in the functions performed by the faculty member while he/she teaches, engages in research, or provides service. A useful taxonomy for scholarship has been prepared by Ernest Boyer (Boyer, Ernest L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco. JosseyBass).

Thus, scholarship is defined in the following ways:

The Scholarship of Discovery. This comes closest to what most of us mean when we use the term “*research*.” It involves contributing to the corpus of knowledge and is inextricably linked with the advancement of the particular field of study. Research is “central to the work of higher learning” and should be encouraged and strengthened at the School of Medicine.

The Scholarship of Teaching. This concept elevates the act of teaching above the mere transfer of knowledge from teacher to student. “As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows.” The transmittal of this information must involve a series of pedagogical procedures which are “carefully planned, continuously examined, and related directly to the subject taught.” In addition to transmitting knowledge, teaching involves transforming and extending it in the educational process.

The Scholarship of Integration. This reflects “the need for scholars who are giving meaning to isolated facts, putting them in perspective.” This activity involves making cross-disciplinary connections and situating knowledge within a wider discipline or context. An individual who pursues this form of scholarship would aspire to “serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.” It is closely related to the scholarship of discovery in that it involves doing research “at the boundaries where fields converge.”

The Scholarship of Application. This in some ways reflects what we have labeled as “*service*” in our traditional understanding of position descriptions at the School of Medicine. However, the scholarship of application involves more than providing a professional service or obtaining a fee for it; it involves obtaining new knowledge in the act of performing a service as well as the translation of new knowledge into the service activity itself. According to Boyer (1990), “to be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of this professional activity.”

Appendix C Teaching Activities and Evidence

Teaching medical students, undergraduate and graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, clinical residents and fellows is any activity that fosters learning, including direct teaching and creation of associated instructional materials. 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 formative feedback. Instructional materials are included in the teaching category when they are developed to specifically enhance instructors' own presentations, such as media, handouts, or interactive materials. Development of a longitudinal set of educational activities would fall into the curriculum development category.

Scholarly Approach: Faculty take a scholarly approach when they systematically design, implement, assess and redesign an educational activity, drawing from the literature and “best practices” in the field. Documentation describes how the activity was informed by the literature and/or best practices.

Educational Scholarship: Faculty engage in educational scholarship by both drawing upon resources and best practices in the field and by contributing resources to it. Documentation begins by demonstrating that an educational activity product is publicly available to the education community in a form that others can build upon. The product may be available at the local level -- in the department, medical school, or university -- or at the regional, national, or international level. Once a product is publicly accessible, peers can gauge its value to the scientific community, applying accepted criteria.

Educators seeking academic promotion may present evidence focused on a single educational activity category, such as teaching, or in multiple categories, such as curriculum, learner assessment, and/or leadership. The types and forms of evidence may vary by category, but documentation should be both quantitative and qualitative and concisely presented using common terminology, and displayed in easy-to-read formats using tables, figures, or graphs. In this context, quantity is demonstrated by the amount of teaching that is done. Quality refers to the excellence or superiority of the teaching performed by the individual.

Scholarship in teaching, when documented by publications or presentations at professional meetings, shall be evaluated as part of a faculty member's commitment to research.

Educator Activity Categories, Criteria, and Evidence

Teaching

1. Quantity

Multiple sources and types of data should be used to demonstrate teaching excellence. Include comparative data of peer-group performance using the same source and method whenever possible. Summarize narrative comments using qualitative analysis methods. Data sources might include:

- a. Learners' confidential evaluations of instructors' teaching using standardized forms with open-ended comments.
- b. Peer evaluation of teaching using a standardized format and process adds an important

dimension that complements student evaluation.

- c. A list of teaching awards and honors accompanied by descriptions of their selection process and criteria are additional forms of teaching excellence documentation.
- d. Evidence of learning, the key outcome of teaching, is a strong indicator of excellence. An array of local learner data may be available including pre- and post-teaching assessment of learner performance, self-reported learning outcomes, ratings of educational objective achievement, or analysis of narrative data, such as learning portfolios or critical incidents.

2. Quality

The methods that demonstrate and document the value of one's own instructional materials are similar to those used for curriculum development (see next section). Multiple data sources and types should be provided when possible, including:

- a. Learner evaluations using standard rating scales or narrative comments, including comparative evaluation to peers.
- b. Peer review by members of a teacher's division, department, or institutional committee can help document the accuracy and educational value of the content, with an eye toward objectives, format, organization, and innovation.

3. Engagement with the Education Community

A scholarly approach requires that instructors apply the principles and findings from the education literature (e.g., competency-based education, deliberate practice) to their teaching, along with development of associated instructional materials. Evidence of engagement with the larger education community can be documented through:

- a. Descriptions of how teachers' approaches or uses of instructional materials were informed by the literature or best practice.
- b. Graphical presentation of a comparative analysis of teachers' own materials with 'best practices' in the field, documenting relative strengths and weaknesses.
- c. Instructors' reflections on their own teaching or on critiques by others, and the effect of those reflections on subsequent teaching activities.
- d. Other examples of efforts to improve teaching by engagement with the education community include formal course work in education, attendance at educational conferences, workshops, or seminars.

Evidence of scholarship in teaching, as in all categories, requires that educators make products publicly available for peer review so that their contributions to the educational community can be evaluated. Public presentation and peer review may be internal through a division, department, academy or education committee, or external through such forums as the Association of American Medical Colleges' (AAMC) annual or regional meetings, AAMC's MedEdPORTAL, the Health Education Assets Library, Family Medicine Digital Resource Library, or other peer-reviewed repository. Interactive learning exercises (either Web-based or face-to-face), PowerPoint presentations with speaker notes, problem-based learning or other clinical cases, and new models and strategies for teaching — all are examples of teaching products that contribute to the educational community. Documentation of these contributions include:

- e. Inclusion of the product in a peer-reviewed venue or repository.
- f. Evaluations from a conference presentation, teaching awards, or recognition with annotations regarding selection process and criteria.
- g. Data demonstrating adoption by other faculty.
- h. References or citations to the product in other peer-reviewed materials.
- i. Descriptions of how others have built on or adapted the product for their own use.

Curriculum

Curriculum is defined as a longitudinal set (i.e., more than one teaching session or presentation) of designed educational activities that includes evaluation. Curriculum contributions may occur at any training level — medical student, resident, graduate student, or continuing medical education; in various educational venues — course, clerkship, rotation, theme-threaded cross years, faculty development, or community program; and may be delivered face-to-face or electronically.

To include an activity in the curriculum category, educators must answer four questions:

- 1) What is the educational purpose (i.e., goals, objectives) of the activity?
- 2) Which learning experiences are most useful in achieving those purposes?
- 3) How are those learning experiences organized and longitudinally sequenced for effective instruction?
- 4) How is the curriculum's effectiveness evaluated?

1. Quantity

For each curricular piece authored, documentation should include a cogent description of its purpose, intended audience, duration, design, and evaluation. If the curriculum was coauthored, each entry should document the candidate's role, content contributed, and expertise provided, such as curriculum, technology, or assessment.

2. Quality

Documentation of a curriculum activity and associated evidence of outcomes and quality should include:

- a. Learner reactions and ratings
- b. Outcomes, including the impact on learning (e.g., course examinations, NBME subject scores, in-service examination scores, or observation of learner performance)
- c. Graphic displays of improvement over time (e.g., its relation to previous curriculum offerings).

3. Engagement with the Education Community

A scholarly approach to curriculum development requires demonstration that the design was informed by the literature and best practices. The curriculum authors must note how it was influenced by relevant literature or other educators. Positive and negative results should be presented to advance educational knowledge and build on the authors' experiences.

Educational scholarship in curriculum requires making it public in a form that others can use, such as course syllabi, learner assessment tools, or instructor guides, and includes:

- a. Peer review by local experts, the institution's curriculum committee, or accreditation reviewers.
- b. Invitations to present curriculum work at meetings, supplemented by documentation of the presentation's quality.
- c. Peer-reviewed or invited presentation at regional, national, or international meetings.
- d. Acceptant of curriculum material to a peer-reviewed repository such as AAMC's MedEdPORTAL.
- e. List of institutions where the curriculum has been adopted, including the author's home institution.

- f. Invitations for curriculum consultation from other department or schools, including tracking of the consultations' use.
- g. Number of citations in other instructors' curricula.

Advising and Mentoring

Educators frequently serve as advisors and mentors in the professional development of learners and colleagues. These activities can have a profound impact on advisees' careers and, in turn, on the profession. Advising and mentoring are developmental relationships encompassing a spectrum of activities, in which educators help learners or colleagues accomplish their goals. More specifically, mentoring implies a sustained, committed relationship from which both parties obtain reciprocal benefits. Advising is a more limited relationship that usually occurs over a limited period, with the advisor serving as a guide.

Documentation of mentoring and advising activities must effectively describe the nature of the relationships and their effectiveness in helping advisees meet their goals, using quantitative and qualitative data.

1. Quantity

Quantitative data should include the number of learners and colleagues mentored or advised, and when appropriate, the names and positions or status, and an estimate of time invested in each relationship (e.g., duration, frequency of contact, and total hours).

2. Quality

Educators' effectiveness as mentors and advisors is demonstrated through advisees' goal achievement. Evidence of productive relationships may be documented by:

- a. Evaluations of advising and mentoring effectiveness from advisees using standardized forms with comparative ratings.
- b. A listing of advisees' significant accomplishments, including publications, and presentations, and the development of tangible educational products, recognitions, and awards.
- c. Narrative comments from advisees may also provide evidence of a relationship's effectiveness in facilitating goal achievement. When available, comparative data in the form of historical or discipline-based standards should be presented.

3. Engagement with the Education Community

Evidence of scholarly engagement in this category, as in all others, can be demonstrated by:

- a. Participating in professional development activities to enhance skills in mentoring and advising.
- b. Adopting effective mentoring strategies with documented links to the literature.
- c. Writing an institutional guide informed by the literature and best practices.
- d. Designing an effective program guided by current evidence.
- e. Leading initiatives that improve institutional mentoring and advising practices.

Scholarship related to mentoring and advising may be demonstrated by:

- f. Receiving invitations to critically appraise mentoring programs, and providing documentation of the results and the appraisal's impact.
- g. Posing investigational questions about mentoring/advising, selecting methods to answer them, collecting and analyzing data, making the results public, and obtaining peer review.
- h. Securing program development funding through a peer-reviewed process.
- i. Conducting skill enhancement training sessions at professional meetings.

- j. Publishing peer-reviewed materials in print or electronic formats, such as institutional mentoring guides.
- k. Convening scholarly conferences on mentoring, serving as a mentoring consultant to professional organizations, being invited to serve as a peer reviewer of mentoring or advising works, receiving mentoring or advising awards, and having success in competitive funding for innovative mentoring-related projects.

Educational Administration/Leadership

Exceptional educational administrators and leaders achieve results through others, transforming organizations through their vigorous pursuit of excellence. Key features that educational administrators or leaders should document to demonstrate their work's value for promotion consideration include:

- a. active and continuous pursuit of excellence;
- b. ongoing evaluations;
- c. dissemination of results; and
- d. maximization of resources

1. Quantity

The nature of leadership projects and their duration and quantity should be described in an easy-to-read, concise format along with the roles leaders played.

2. Quality

The pursuit of excellence should be the core of all administrative and leadership actions; effective leaders challenge, advance, and transform the field. They create a sense of urgency, develop coalitions, communicate vision, develop plans, evaluate achievements, garner resources, and inspire others in the pursuit of common goals. Effective administrators and leaders manage resources efficiently, and must collaborate with and mentor others to achieve change.

Documentation of quality in leadership includes a concise description of projects, including:

- a. Leadership role and project dates.
- b. The context where the change occurred, as well as the process, including problems identified, goals established, and actions taken.
- c. Evaluation including delineation of outcomes.
- d. Financial and human resources, both new and existing, as change requires leaders and administrators to deploy resources to achieve desired goals.

3. Engagement with the Education Community

When administrators' resource management or leaders' organizational transformation is informed by the literature and best practices, they have made the transition to active engagement with the larger educational community.

A scholarly approach to leadership and administration is demonstrated by:

- a. Making changes based on the literature and best practices.
- b. Creatively designing and evaluating improvements, and making revisions based on local feedback or in light of theoretical frameworks, prior research, best practices, and external peer review.
- c. Using pre- and post-assessment or other designs (e.g., cohort performance on licensing, in-service training, board certification examinations, accreditation surveys) or newly developed

tools to measure outcomes.

- d. Demonstrating attainment of objectives or benchmarks associated with successful change (e.g., AAMC Graduation Questionnaire and learner ratings of teachers; courses/rotation enrollments and evaluation).
- e. Documenting ongoing quality improvement, drawing from the knowledge and resources of the educational community.
- f. Evaluating leaders' effectiveness using 360-degree evaluation with peer comparisons, benchmarking, or external peer review.
- g. Employing self-reflection informed by the literature or best practices in the field.

The scholarship of educational leadership is evidenced by sharing innovations with the educational community through materials, documents, or presentation, and through others' recognition of the work's value. Dissemination of findings makes innovations visible to the community, creating a public forum for discussing them and advancing the field.

Documentation of educational scholarship would include:

- h. List of invited and peer-reviewed presentations at local, regional, national, and international professional meetings, along with visiting professorship presentations.
- i. Quantity and quality of publications.
- j. Awards received with annotations regarding selection criteria and process.
- k. List of institutions that have adopted an innovation.
- l. Acceptance of a new curriculum model to AAMC's MedEd PORTAL, with impact inferred from the number of hits the site received and the number of schools that have adopted the curriculum.
- m. List of resources obtained by source (foundations, grants, internal awards, etc.) as evidence that others have judged the innovation worthy of investment.

Learner Assessment

Learner assessment is defined as all activities associated with measuring learners' knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and must include at least one of four assessment activities:

- 1) Development: Identifying and creating assessment processes and tools.
- 2) Implementation: Collecting data using processes and tools.
- 3) Analysis: Comparing data with correct answer key or performance standards.
- 4) Synthesis and presentation: Interpreting and reporting data to learners, faculty, and curriculum leaders.

1. Quantity

Documenting an assessment activity's size and scope should begin with a brief description of the event using jargon-free language understandable to Tenure and Promotion Committee members. This description should include information about faculty's role in each assessment component along with the size and nature of the learner population being assessed, the size of the assessment, and the intended uses of the information.

2. Quality and Engagement with the Educational Community

Documenting quality in learner assessment should provide evidence that the evaluation meets established reliability and validity standards, summarized in quantitative and narrative formats. When data from learner assessments are used in "high stakes" decisions such as grades or promotion, the assessment must be well-grounded in the existing knowledge base drawn from

the educational measurement field.

Glassick, et al. (1997)* offered six criteria for a systematic, scholarly approach to determining the quality of assessment contributions:

- 1) Goals: A clear statement of assessment goals and the educator's particular contributions to the assessment process.
- 2) Adequate preparation: Description of the author's prior experience or literature upon which the assessment was based.
- 3) Appropriate methods: Details of how each design phase's methods match known best practices.
- 4) Significant results: Information about the quality of results according to reliability and validity standards.
- 5) Effective presentation: A succinct and effective summary of the results and lessons learned to stakeholder groups (e.g., learners, administrators, peers, and the assessment community).
- 6) Reflective critique: Plans for improving similar assessment in the future.

Scholarship in learner assessment must include documentation that activities were peer reviewed and that processes or tools involved have been shared with the educational community to enhance best practices. Faculty involved in any design phase may present documentation associated with:

- a. Presentations on the assessment process or outcomes to local audiences, such as curriculum committees or internal reviews in preparation for an RRC visit.
- b. Peer-reviewed presentations and workshops at professional meetings, or invited presentations.
- c. Acceptance of the assessment tool in a peer-reviewed repository.
- d. Assessment research presented at national meetings or published in peer-reviewed journals.

* Glassick, Charles E., Huber, Mary T. and Maeroff, Gene I. (1997). *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix D

Research Activities and Evidence

A. Research & Scholarly Activities

The term “research” can refer to scholarly activity in one or more of the following disciplinary areas: basic sciences, behavioral and social sciences, clinical sciences, education, and humanities. The general criteria for evaluation of research during the process of tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are demonstration of the ability to: 1) develop and maintain scholarly activity/research effort; and 2) disseminate the results of these scholarly activities. Furthermore, the research efforts should be recognized as positive contributions by experts, and can be achieved independently or as a member of a team. The pattern of scholarly achievement should increase over time and hold promise for continued growth and evolution.

The following are examples of scholarship in research that should be documented and considered for tenure and promotion.

1. Common research-associated contributions in the School of Medicine include:
 - a. Contributions to the basic sciences.
 - 1) Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge related to basic science disciplines
 - 2) Development, dissemination, and acceptance of new ideas and concepts leading to further investigation
 - 3) Development, dissemination, and acceptance of a new or improved method of ensuring replicability of laboratory measurements
 - b. Contributions to the clinical sciences.
 - 1) Development, dissemination, and acceptance of a new method for assessing patient status
 - 2) Development, dissemination, and acceptance of a new method for diagnosis or interpreting diagnostic criteria
 - 3) Development, dissemination, and acceptance of an improved method of therapy
 - 4) Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge related to pathophysiologic processes or disease manifestation
 - 5) Active participation in multi-center studies that develop improved methods of therapy
 - 6) Outcomes-oriented and other applied research
 - c. Contributions to the behavioral, informational, and social sciences and humanities.
 - 1) Discovery and dissemination of new knowledge related to the behavioral, informational, and social sciences and humanities disciplines
 - 2) Development, dissemination, and acceptance of new ideas and directions for further investigation
2. Examples of appropriate documentation of achievements in research:
 - a. Publications in peer-reviewed journals in area of expertise
 - b. Presentation and publication of peer-reviewed abstracts
 - c. Presentation of peer-reviewed or juried papers at national or international meetings
 - d. Significant citation by other workers in the field of published papers
 - e. Published reviews, book chapters, and books
 - f. Invitations to speak about one’s research at scientific meetings and at other universities

- g. Submission of research proposals to national agencies or foundations
 - h. Grant and/or contract awards from national agencies or foundations
 - i. Funding awards for research from commercial vendors
 - j. Awards for outstanding research accomplishments
 - k. Evidence of refereeing of manuscripts for journals in area of expertise
 - l. Evidence of refereeing of paper proposals for meetings of national associations
 - m. Review of grant applications to local, state, national, and governmental agencies
 - n. Appointment to national committees to review research proposals or results
 - o. Intellectual property holdings for the School (i.e., patents, copyrights, trade secrets, etc.) with associated licensing or development agreements, as appropriate
3. Examples of documentation of independent or collaborative research (note: for purposes of promotion, collaborative research must be conducted after the faculty member obtains the terminal degree and completes postdoctoral training)
- a. Primary funding of the research program derived from funds generated by the applicant as Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, or Investigator
 - b. Principal author on papers in early phase of career
 - c. Evidence of active research program at the School of Medicine
 - d. Research director for graduate students, residents, post-doctoral students, and fellows
 - e. Mentoring of students at all phases of educational experience
 - f. Advisor of postdoctoral fellows, residents, or junior faculty
 - g. Publications co-authored with trainees
4. Examples of documentation of national or international recognition include:
- a. Consistent external funding over entire career
 - b. Constant publication record over entire career
 - c. Invitations to speak at national/international scientific meetings
 - d. Membership on national grant review panels
 - e. Member of editorial board of journals in area of expertise
 - f. Chair/organizer of national/international meetings
 - g. Author/editor of monographs or books
 - h. Invitations to contribute chapters to books
 - i. Election to societies or awards of honors by societies requiring outstanding contributions associated with research

Appendix E
Service Activities and Evidence

A. Activities

1. Clinical Service

1) Related to clinical practice

Documentation of how the faculty member has built/expanded the practice (e.g., by offering new services or re-establishing a service after the departure of a clinician)

Number of patients seen per year

Percentage of patients seen by the candidate out of the total for his/her division

2) Related to patient care

Number of referrals from physicians in another specialty/subspecialty

Number of referrals from physicians in the same specialty

Ratings from residents and peers on components of knowledge, clinical skills, professional behavior (there are some existing rating scales we can use or modify as needed)

Ratings from patients on satisfaction with their medical care

Information on patient outcomes; quality metrics

3) Administrative functions for hospitals and other clinical entities

2. Professional

a. Governmental or specialty advisory committees

b. State, regional and national organizations

Membership

Offices held

c. State, regional and national agencies

Consultant/Reviewer

Representation/Liaison

d. Boards and Review Committees

Contribution to Specialty Boards

Examiner in Subspecialty Boards

Contribution to Review Panels and/or Study Sections

e. Honors/Acknowledgment for service

3. Institutional (University/School)

a. Administration

1) University and school committees including offices held. This service can be documented with a letter of recommendation or a checklist completed by the chairs or staff of the committees to comment on attendance, participation and contributions to the work of the committee.

2) Leadership positions and role on university and school committees

b. Student Affairs

1) Screening student applicants

2) Advising student organizations

3) Special counseling

4) Assistance in selection/obtaining of electives and residencies

4. Department/Division
 - a. Administration
 - 1) Departmental committees
 - 2) Career counseling for faculty, residents and fellows
 - 3) Assistance in career development
 - 4) Assistance to administrative/business staff
 - 5) Assistance in faculty and other staff recruitment
 - b. Student Affairs
 - 1) Academic advising outside of teaching responsibilities
 - 2) Clerkship mentor
 - 3) Clinical skills, exam evaluation
 - 4) Assistance to clerkship directors in designing and conducting evaluations, tests/exams
 - 5) Coordinating/directing clerkship and elective rotations for division/service
 - 6) Providing research, presentation and publication experience to students
 - c. Residents and Fellows
 - 1) Screening/interviewing applicants
 - 2) Clinical competence examinations
 - 3) Coordinating/directing resident rotations for division/service
 - 4) Coordinating/directing fellowship programs for division/service
 - 5) Providing research, presentation and publication experience to residents and fellows
 - 6) Career counseling
 - 7) Assistance in obtaining fellowships/faculty positions/practice positions
 - d. Post-Doctoral and Graduate Students
 - 1) Screening/interviewing applicants
 - 2) Career counseling for graduate students and post-doctoral fellows
 - 3) Assistance in submitting fellowship applications
 - 4) Assistance in preparing presentations and/or publications.
5. Community
 - a. Hospitals
 - 1) Committees — membership and offices
 - 2) Contracts for service
 - 3) Consultant/advisor
 - 4) Committees for free clinics
 - b. Referring Physicians
 - 1) Type of service provided
 - 2) Usefulness and uniqueness of service provided
 - 3) Feedback and education provided to referring physicians
 - c. Local Groups — Organizations
 - 1) Presentations to lay groups
 - 2) Discussions/write ups in local newspapers
 - 3) Discussions/advice on local radio station

- 4) Local TV appearances and presentations
 - 5) Volunteer work for free clinics
 - 6) Organizing community programs on health care issues
- B. Evidence
Evidence of activities should be provided in the dossier
- C. The Dossier must be prepared using the standard format that is provided as an appendix to this document. The same dossier is used for both promotion and/or tenure, regardless of rank.

Appendix F **Compliance Infractions**

Confirmed compliance infractions that require reporting either to external or internal entities must be reported in the promotion/tenure dossier. These include, but are not limited to: infractions investigated by the Springfield Committee on Research in Human Subjects (SCRIHS), the Laboratory Animal Care and Use Committee (LACUC), Radiation Safety, the Infection Control and Safety Committee (ICSC), the Conflict of Interest Committee (COI), the Misconduct in Science Committee (MISC) and Human Resources (HR). Investigations that determine there was no infraction need not be reported.

Appendix G
Moving to and from Tenure-Eligible Appointments

1. From non-tenure-eligible to a tenure-eligible appointment
 - a. Movement from a non-tenure-eligible to a tenure-eligible position can occur only after a tenure-eligible position is declared open and a search conducted. A faculty member in a non-tenure-eligible rank may request in writing that his/her application for the tenure eligible position be considered and apply for the position using the same mechanisms as external applicants. A non-tenure eligible faculty member must be selected for the tenure eligible position through a *bona fide* competitive search process.
 - b. A non-tenure-eligible faculty member wishing to move to a tenure eligible rank shall meet all criteria for the rank. Individuals at the level of assistant or associate professor may request a transfer to a position one rank higher than his/her non-tenure eligible rank appointment, but the transfer shall not automatically confer tenure. In all cases, a faculty member who moves into a tenure-eligible position shall be treated as a new hire for the purposes of tenure and promotion, and shall meet the required probationary standards.

2. From a tenure-eligible to a non-tenure-eligible appointment
 - a. A faculty member in a tenure-eligible rank may request in writing that the Department Chair consider his/her movement to a non-tenure eligible faculty rank. The request must be made at or before the end of the 5th probationary year.
 - b. The Chair will discuss the request with the Dean, the Chair of the P&TC, and the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs. The Dean will make the final decision.
 - c. An individual receiving transfer to a non-tenure eligible rank shall remain in his/her present rank in the non-tenure eligible position until such time that the criteria for promotion have been fulfilled in the areas defined in his/her position description.
 - d. All moves from a tenure-eligible appointment to a non-tenure eligible appointment shall be final. A faculty member may not request to move at a later time back to a tenure eligible rank.

Appendix H
Termination of Faculty Appointments

The conditions under which tenured faculty appointments may be terminated are found in SIU Tenure Policies and Procedures at VI and Board of Trustees Policy at 2.C.1.f. http://siusystem.edu/board-of-trustees/legislation/board-legislation-policies.shtml#N_1

The conditions under which non-tenured and non-tenure-eligible faculty appointments may be terminated are found in SIU Tenure Policies and Procedures at II. A-C and Board of Trustees Policy 2.C.1.f. http://siusystem.edu/board-of-trustees/legislation/board-legislation-policies.shtml#N_1

Appendix I
Effective Dates of Guideline Revisions

Revisions to these guidelines will periodically occur. The revised promotion and tenure guidelines will apply to all faculty members appointed on or after October 1, 2018. Faculty members appointed before October 1, 2018 are subject to the guidelines in either the 2010 or the 2018 document, whichever is to the faculty member's advantage.

Approved December 1996;
Revisions approved December 13, 2001;
Revisions approved March 1, 2010;
Revisions approved October 2018