

Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine (VTC SOM)

Faculty Affairs Guidelines Section Six – Promotion of Faculty in the Tenure Track

Administrator: Shari A. Whicker, EdD, (Interim) Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs

Original date: July 2021

Most Recent Revision: July 2025

1 Purpose

To ensure that all faculty promotions follow all requirements stipulated in the VTC SOM faculty bylaws and guidelines as well as the corresponding guidelines of the Virginia Tech faculty handbook.

2 Guidelines

I. Introduction and Description of University-Based Tenure

Tenure is the conferring of permanent appointment to Virginia Tech via appointment with the Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine. In accordance with their assignments and as outlined in the “Virginia Tech Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers” document available from the Provost’s office, candidates for tenure will be evaluated in the following categories: teaching, scholarship, clinical care (if applicable) and service. While candidates are not expected to have equal levels of commitment or equal responsibilities in all these areas, scholarship is expected of all tenure-track faculty to a degree and in a discipline appropriate for their assignment.

This document contains the guidelines and expectations for promotion and tenure at the Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine (“VTC SOM” or “school”). The promotion and tenure process will comply with the currently approved policies and procedures of Virginia Tech, as published in the Virginia Tech faculty handbook which is available on the website of the university Provost. Policies and procedures in the university faculty handbook will prevail over any conflicting guidelines in this document.

These guidelines and expectations reflect the minimal required for promotion in this track at the VTC SOM. Individual departments through their Appointment, Promotion, Retention and Tenure (APRT) committees may choose to set higher or more stringent expectations. Each department APRT committee is expected to develop and update as appropriate, and make available to the departmental faculty for review, explicit promotion and tenure guidelines and expectations documents relevant to disciplines or specialties applicable to the department. Alternatively, with the Dean’s approval, departments may maintain a set of guidelines that interpret the school-wide standards within the context of the department’s disciplines and traditions. All guidelines and revisions to any/all guidelines must be approved by the faculty through department and school level governance processes, the school level committee, the Dean and the Provost’s office; and must be made available online.

Promotion to a higher rank and appointment with tenure may be granted to faculty members who demonstrate outstanding accomplishments. Tenure is recognition by the university and VTC SOM of service to the school and accomplishment of the faculty member; it also represents the strong expectation of a continuing high level of accomplishment by the faculty member after the granting of tenure. Tenure is awarded in recognition of a body of outstanding accomplishment in teaching, clinical care (if applicable), research/scholarly activity and service to the missions of VTC SOM and the

university. As the criteria for tenure are virtually identical to criteria for promotion, tenure is most often awarded at the time of promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor.

The award of tenure is based on the achievement of distinction in designated areas of activity and the prediction of eminence throughout the individual's professional career. The documentation and evaluation must recognize significant impact of the candidate's contributions beyond the borders of the university. For example, if a primary area of progress is in teaching/instruction, there should be recognition that the candidate's pedagogical contributions have achieved influence beyond the immediate classroom; if in clinical care, there should be recognition of accomplishment at a high level and documentation that clinical care has been consistently provided such that learners have benefitted from this expertise in the clinical setting; if in scholarly activity/research, that there is a high degree of impression on colleagues nationally; if in service, that the influence of the contributions reaches beyond the immediate region of the VTCSOM.

VTCSOM values collaboration as critically important to academic work in all settings. To recognize and reward faculty members who assume collaborative roles and/or perform collaborative work across disciplines, colleges and/or fields of interest, VTCSOM invites evidence of collaboration as an important component of the promotion review process. Letters regarding potential promotion should feature documentation of collaborative activity undertaken by the faculty candidate.

Besides consideration of specific professional criteria, evaluation for promotion or tenure should consider the candidate's integrity, professional conduct, and ethics. To the extent that such considerations are significant factors in reaching a negative recommendation, they should be documented as part of the formal review process. This aspect of the promotion is most often addressed as part of the department chair recommendation.

In cases of tenure recommendation—in addition to evaluation of the candidate's professional abilities—consideration should be given, at all stages of evaluation and review, to future departmental program directions and concern for maintaining currency and flexibility by preserving opportunities to appoint new faculty members in the various sub-fields of the department.

Tenure candidates are evaluated according to the expectations and indicators in effect at the time of their appointment. Therefore, as expectations/indicators change, promotion guidelines should include the previous standards by which candidates were evaluated, along with the dates when the standards changed. Departments should keep historical documents to ensure that faculty are reviewed based on guidelines in place at the time of hire. University guidelines for submission of candidates' dossiers are available on the provost's website. Provost office guidelines shall supersede any department or college-level guidelines in any instances where they may conflict.

II. The VTCSOM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APT)

The Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee is responsible for the oversight of all faculty appointments; for promotion within the categories, tracks and ranks of faculty; and for overseeing the maintenance of appointment process (though the actual process is administered by the Office of Faculty Affairs). The Dean Advisor to the APT Committee is the dean of Faculty Affairs.

Further details concerning the composition of the APT Committee are contained in VTCSOM Faculty

Affairs policy on committee election and appointments. Only committee members who have been granted tenure by the university may vote on the tenure decision. Other committee members may participate in the discussion of a given case but cannot participate in the final vote.

III. Identification of Candidates

Promotion is based primarily on merit and not on time in rank; however, there is a specified time frame during which the granting of tenure must occur.

Each VTCSOM department will have a process for determining which candidates are to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. Promotion on the tenure track affects two ranks – Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate Professor, and Associate Professors seeking promotion to full Professor. Candidates for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor must demonstrate *significant progress* in all four domains of faculty activity as applicable. Candidates for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor must demonstrate *excellence* in an appropriate combination of activities from all four domains of faculty activity, consistent with the candidate's discipline and assignment. Departmental APRT committees will ensure that all university guidelines for preparation of the promotion dossier for faculty in the tenure track are followed; these guidelines are available on the website of the university Provost.

Initial consideration of promotion and/or tenure is made at the department level by both the department Chair and the department APRT committee. At all levels of review, an explanation of the concerns represented by dissenting votes is required and is often very helpful in subsequent reviews.

Regardless of the rank of the department Chair, the recommendation for promotion is made from the perspective of the Chair. Hence, a department Chair can complete a recommendation for promotion regardless of the track or rank of the candidate.

III.a. Promotion to Associate Professor

To be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure, in addition to demonstrating productivity as a scholar, a candidate must provide evidence that their scholarship has growing impact nationally or internationally and the potential for greater impact in the future.

Probationary period: The pre-tenure probationary period is a succession of regular, full- or part-time term (fixed period) appointments. The decision on granting of tenure, if not made earlier, is typically made in the final year of the probationary period. The final year of the probationary period is also called a mandatory year. The tenure clock may be extended beyond the sixth year under certain circumstances described in the VT faculty handbook.

Curriculum vita and promotion dossier: Every faculty member should maintain a current curriculum vitae in the school-specific format and available for ready access by the department and school. The curriculum vitae together with annual faculty activity reports, student evaluations, reprints of publications, reference letters, and other documents requested by the department and/or the school comprise a promotion dossier that is based on school and university guidelines and that furnish the principal basis for promotion and tenure decisions. VTCSOM guidelines for the promotion dossier are

maintained online at the VTCSOM Faculty Affairs web page.

Pre-tenure reviews of progress: candidates on the tenure track will undergo mandatory formal review at the end of year two and year four. Reviews are to be substantive and thorough. At a minimum, the departmental APRT Committee and the department chair must review the faculty member's total activities including peer review of teaching and an updated CV which illustrates accomplishments to date. These reviews are in addition to review of the promotion and request for tenure that is submitted during year six.

The reviews should analyze the faculty member's progress toward promotion and tenure and offer guidance regarding future activities and plans. The reviews should be prepared with the primary purpose of providing substantive feedback so that the faculty member gains insight into ways to improve performance. All reviews must be in writing, with the faculty member acknowledging receipt by signing and returning a copy for the departmental file. In addition, the departmental APRT committee and the department chair meet with the faculty member to discuss the review and recommendations. Individual faculty members are also encouraged to seek guidance and mentoring from senior colleagues and the department chair. Pre-tenured faculty members bear responsibility for understanding departmental, school and university expectations for promotion and tenure and for meeting those expectations.

If at the time of these reviews it is felt that the candidate has not made sufficient progress toward tenure, the faculty member is given a one-year notice of non-renewal (terminal appointment).

Service at other universities: up to three years of appropriate service at other accredited American four-year colleges and universities may be credited toward the six-year probationary period, as specified in the Virginia Tech faculty handbook.

III.a.1. Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation provide important perspective on the fulfillment of criteria for the candidate seeking promotion. Specifically, letters of evaluation should reflect on the teaching skills of the candidate; comment on the involvement in clinical care with learners present (if applicable), especially during the period for most recent appointment or promotion; address the extent of scholarly productivity; address the relevance of scholarly activity; comment on the leadership abilities and qualities, whether in a local, regional, national or international setting; reflect the local, regional, national and/or international reputation of the candidate; and provide perspectives on the character, skills, productivity, scholarly context, or other qualities of the candidate.

It is not expected for every letter of evaluation to address each aspect noted above, nor would the reflective commentator be able to do so. Consequently, it is necessary for the candidate to have several letters in evaluation of the candidacy for promotion.

Except for the summary letter from the chair of the departmental APRT Committee, members of a departmental APRT Committee may not write letters of evaluation for inclusion in promotion dossiers. Letters of evaluation are always solicited by the chair of the departmental APRT Committee, never by the candidate. Promotion candidates are not allowed to know the identity of persons who ultimately write internal or external review letters. There is to be no contact of any kind between the candidate and any person who writes internal or external review letters; contact between candidates and letter

writers may lead to disqualification of the candidate from further consideration until a future promotion cycle.

All letters of evaluation must address whether the candidate would meet requirements for promotion at VTCSOM. Letter writers should NOT state whether the candidate would meet requirements for the same desired rank/track at the institution of the letter writer. All letters received must be included in the promotion dossier, regardless of whether a given letter meets criteria.

University policy requires that the dossier of the candidate for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor on the tenure track must include at a minimum four external letters of evaluation. External letters must come from entities outside of Carilion Clinic, Virginia Tech and Radford University and, in some cases, the Salem VA Medical Center. Departmental APRT committees shall solicit the letters in accordance with university and VTCSOM guidelines for the solicitation of such letters, including furnishing the potential letter writers with key information concerning the promotion requirements. Guidelines for the processes of soliciting and preparing letters of evaluation are maintained by the VTCSOM Office of Faculty Affairs.

It is the intent of the university that all letters must be written by faculty members with a current faculty appointment at the rank of Professor from major research universities (peer institutions or other major research universities). These reviewers should be viewed as senior contributors to the appropriate related discipline(s) or area of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the departmental APRT committee and/or the department chair to solicit letters from external reviewers. In a parallel but independent process, the candidate is permitted to forward to the chair of the department APRT committee up to six names of external reviewers. Once the department's list is generated, the departmental APRT committee shall then reconcile the two lists and select the appropriate number of external reviewers to write letters. There may be instances when the committee and the candidate suggest the same outside reviewer. This is perfectly acceptable; however, candidates may not suggest all of the outside reviewers.

The final set of four external review letters must result from strict observance of university guidelines. At least three letters must come from those selected independently by the department committee/head/committee chair. Any deviation from this distribution should be explained in the dossier. If a candidate chooses not to submit a list of external reviewers, the dossier should note that the candidate was invited to provide a list but chose to allow the department to select the reviewers. The final list of outside reviewers should never be shared with the candidate. Reviewers should not be former advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, or coauthors on recent (within the preceding four years) publications, and should not have other relationships that may be perceived as being too close to the candidate. When possible, avoid selecting external reviewers from the candidate's doctoral granting institution or from universities at which the faculty member had a prior faculty position.

The dossier must contain all external letters received, not just selected letters. External letters which are overly ambiguous or do not address the requested information should not be contacted for clarification or revision; doing so can be viewed as coaching or shaping of the letter, or otherwise interfering with the independence of the review process.

In addition to the external letters, the candidate should consider including one or more local persons who would be able to comment from personal knowledge on the candidate's teaching, clinical and

service abilities. This internal letter is optional but often provides valuable insights.

III.b. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure requires evidence of ongoing or renewed productivity and the realization of a candidate's potential for greater impact nationally or internationally, including a description of how their scholarship has influenced their field.

Curriculum vita and promotion dossier: every faculty member should maintain a current curriculum vitae, in the school-specific format and available for ready access by the department and school. The curriculum vitae together with annual faculty activity reports, student evaluations, reprints of publications, reference letters, and other documents requested by the department and/or the school comprise a promotion dossier that is based on school and university guidelines and that furnish the principal basis for promotion and tenure decisions. VTCSOM guidelines for the promotion dossier are maintained online at the VTCSOM Faculty Affairs web page.

Review of progress: at least one review of progress toward promotion to Professor should be conducted three to five years after promotion to Associate Professor and tenure are awarded. The review is to be substantive and thorough. At a minimum, the departmental APRT committee and the department chair must review the faculty member's total activities including an updated CV which illustrates accomplishments to date, along with relevant annual activity reports, peer evaluations of teaching, and authored materials since the last promotion.

The review should be developmental and focus on the faculty member's progress toward promotion to Professor. The developmental guidance should focus on recommended future activities and plans that will position the faculty member for promotion. All reviews must be in writing, with the faculty member acknowledging receipt by signing and returning a copy for departmental file. In addition, the faculty member will meet with the departmental APRT committee chair and the department chair to discuss the review and recommendations. Individual faculty members are also encouraged to seek guidance and mentoring from senior colleagues and the department head or chair.

Time in rank: there is no specification for minimum or maximum time of service in the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. Consideration for promotion to Professor may be requested by a faculty member at any time, even if the department chair or committee has not chosen to undertake such an evaluation. However, appeal of a negative promotion decision is provided only if the faculty member has been in rank for at least six years and if the faculty member has formally requested, in writing, consideration for promotion in a previous year. In such a case, for a member of the college faculty, or a member of the administrative and professional faculty seeking promotion in rank through an academic department, an appeal follows the same procedures as in the university faculty handbook.

III.b.1 Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation provide important perspective on the fulfillment of criteria for the candidate seeking promotion. Specifically, letters of evaluation should reflect on the teaching skills of the candidate; comment on the involvement in clinical care with learners present (if relevant), especially during the period for most recent appointment or promotion; address the extent of scholarly

productivity; address the relevance of scholarly activity; comment on the leadership abilities and qualities, whether in a local, regional, national or international setting; reflect the local, regional, national and/or international reputation of the candidate; and provide perspectives on the character, skills, productivity, scholarly context, or other qualities of the candidate.

It is not expected for every letter of evaluation to address each aspect noted above, nor would the reflective commentator be able to do so. Consequently, it is necessary for the candidate to have several letters in evaluation of the candidacy for promotion.

Except for the summary letter from the chair of the departmental APRT Committee, members of a departmental APRT Committee may not write letters of evaluation for inclusion in promotion dossiers.

Letters of evaluation are always solicited by the chair of the departmental APRT Committee, never by the candidate. Promotion candidates are not allowed to know the identity of persons who ultimately write internal or external review letters. There is to be no contact of any kind between the candidate and any person who writes internal or external review letters; contact between candidates and letter writers may lead to disqualification of the candidate from further consideration until a future promotion cycle.

All letters of evaluation must address whether the candidate would meet requirements for promotion at VTCSOM. Letter writers should NOT state whether the candidate would meet requirements for the same desired rank/track at the institution of the letter writer. All letters received must be included in the promotion dossier, regardless of whether a given letter meets criteria.

University policy requires that the dossier of the candidate for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor on the tenure track must include at a minimum four external letters of evaluation. External letters must come from entities outside of Carilion Clinic, Virginia Tech, and Radford University and, in some cases, the Salem VA Medical Center. Departmental APRT committees shall solicit the letters in accordance with university and VTCSOM guidelines for the solicitation of such letters, including furnishing the potential letter writers with key information concerning the promotion requirements. Guidelines for the processes of soliciting and preparing letters of evaluation are maintained on the VTCSOM Faculty Affairs web page.

It is the intent of the university that all letters must be written by faculty members at the rank of Professor and come from major research universities (peer institutions or other major research universities). These reviewers should be viewed as senior contributors to the appropriate related discipline(s) or area of scholarship. It is the responsibility of the departmental APRT Committee and/or the department chair to solicit letters from external reviewers. In a parallel but independent process, the candidate is permitted to forward to the chair of the departmental APRT committee up to six names of external reviewers. Once the department's list is generated, the departmental APRT committee shall then reconcile the two lists and select the appropriate number of external reviewers to write letters. There may be instances when the committee and the candidate suggest the same outside reviewer. This is perfectly acceptable; however, candidates may not suggest all of the outside reviewers.

The final set of four external review letters must result from strict observance of university guidelines. At least three letters must come from those selected independently by the department committee/head/committee chair. Any deviation from this distribution should be explained in the

dossier. If a candidate chooses not to submit a list of external reviewers, the dossier should note that the candidate was invited to provide a list but chose to allow the department to select the reviewers. The final list of outside reviewers should never be shared with the candidate. Reviewers should not be former advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, co-investigators on grants, or coauthors on recent (within the preceding four years) publications, and should not have other relationships that may be perceived as being too close to the candidate. When possible, avoid selecting external reviewers from the candidate's Ph.D. granting institution or from universities at which the faculty member had a prior faculty position.

The dossier must contain all external letters received, not just selected letters. External letters which are overly ambiguous or do not address the requested information should not be contacted for clarification or revision; doing so can be viewed as coaching or shaping of the letter, or otherwise interfering with the independence of the review process.

In addition to the external letters, the candidate should consider including one or more local persons who would be able to comment from personal knowledge on the candidate's teaching, clinical and service abilities. This internal letter is optional but often provides valuable insights.

III. c. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer observation of teaching is a time-honored tradition of Virginia Tech. All candidates for promotion in the tenure track must undergo a process of peer evaluation of teaching. This process involves working with a faculty peer observer selected by the candidate. Peer observation is offered by the TEACH program; or the candidate may choose an observer within one's own academic department. A key component of the process is the provision of feedback on how teaching performance can be improved. Candidates for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor on the tenure track are required to undergo this process at least twice during the pre-tenure probationary period, and to document participation in this process in the promotion dossier. The two peer observations would ideally take place at spaced intervals (e.g., years two and five) that allow for the observation of growth in teaching ability. Candidates for promotion to full Professor on the tenure track are also required to undergo this process twice prior to being considered for the promotion.

IV. Expectations and Indicators for Promotion with Tenure

It is required that the VTCSOM faculty member seeking promotion with tenure will demonstrate significant progress or excellence in all four domains of academic activity: teaching, clinical care (if relevant), scholarly activity/research, and service. For the clinician candidate, significant progress or excellence must be evident in all four of these domains; for the non-clinician candidate, significant progress or excellence must be evident in all three domains excluding clinical care.

Significant progress in all four domains of faculty activity is required for candidates seeking promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. In general, significant progress is shown by a record of ongoing accomplishment, a potential for further growth and an increasing regional, national and/or international reputation in one's discipline.

Excellence in an appropriate combination of activities from all four domains of faculty activity consistent with the candidate's discipline and assignment is required for candidates seeking promotion from Associate to full Professor. Promotion to the rank of full Professor requires a record of distinguished professional achievement well beyond that achieved at the time of promotion to Associate Professor. This rank also requires demonstration of national and/or international prominence in one's discipline and a commitment to ongoing levels of academic activity.

Teaching is a core expectation of all VTCSOM faculty and is highly relevant to faculty in the tenure track. Each candidate must demonstrate an overall record of laudatory teaching ability sustained over time. Both the quality and quantity of the candidate's achievements in teaching and advising/mentoring should be considered. Faculty must demonstrate the ability to evaluate scholarship applicable to their field and effectively teach their discipline to learners.

For the clinician candidate, there must be documentation of Clinical Care in the presence of learners. The candidate must show evidence of considerable clinical teaching time over an extended period, as well as evidence of leadership in areas of clinical practice activity, clinical techniques or operations, and/or patient advocacy. Metrics of clinical abilities such as surveys, questionnaires, and "scorecards" are helpful for a broad picture, but clinical care is not relevant to promotion without occurring as an attending physician in the presence of learners. The quality and effectiveness of health care delivery must also be documented.

Each candidate must show evidence of Scholarly Activity/Research; the dossier must reflect scholarship that is sustained, and preferably increasing, over time and with increasing evidence of expertise in the area(s) of focus. There must also be evidence of more than one type of scholarship.

Each candidate must also show evidence of Service to the university, school, health system and/or research institutes, as well as to the broader medical community and the community at large. Faculty are expected to use their knowledge, creativity and expertise to improve the human condition and engage the communities of which they are a part. Candidates must demonstrate their contributions to the governance, development, and vitality of the university, their academic professions and other relevant communities at the local, state, national and/or international level. Service must be related to some aspect of the mission and activities of VTCSOM; service by the faculty member in an otherwise laudable activity that is not congruent with the mission and activities of VTCSOM is not relevant to the academic promotion process.

The following tables one through four provide detailed expectations for each performance category, as well as the performance indicators used to assess readiness for promotion.

Table 1. Expectations and Performance Indicators for Teaching (Includes Advising and Mentoring of Learners and Junior Faculty)

(Note: not all Performance Indicators may apply)

| Expected Performance | Performance Indicators Used to Assess Readiness for Promotion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documentation of teaching ability and effectiveness in transmission of knowledge/skills at levels appropriate for various learners ● Documentation of teaching activities with various types of learners (e.g., medical students, residents, fellows, graduate students, others) ● Documentation of required peer teaching observations and any changes made as a result ● Participation in faculty development related to teaching skills ● Indication that candidate is effective in teaching and committed to the VTCsOM teaching mission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strongly positive feedback data from learners on candidate's teaching ○ Requests from learners for additional teaching contact ○ Professional development/efforts to improve teaching abilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Learner evaluations of instruction, all learners (representative sample from at least three most recent years) ● Number of different courses, sections and/or rotations taught per block, year and/or other time period ● Distance learning courses taught (asynchronous vs. synchronous vs. hybrid) ● Development of new courses and/or curricula ● Development of new degree programs, majors, concentrations and/or minors ● Development of, or improvements to, course/lab materials or to instructional lab facilities ● Development of and/or delivery of continuing education courses or teaching sessions ● Innovative teaching methods utilized, including adoption of technology in courses ● Adoption of best evidence teaching methods/practices or materials from one's discipline and/or the academic community ● Awards/recognition for teaching ● List of all learners advised/mentored ● Post-doctoral researchers and research faculty supervised/advised/mentored ● Participation as a Thesis or Dissertation committee member ● Publication record of students, post- doctoral researchers, and research faculty advised/supervised ● Awards/recognition for advising |

Table 2. Expectations and Performance Indicators for Clinical Care

(Note: not all Performance Indicators may apply)

| Expected Performance | Performance Indicators Used to Assess Readiness for Promotion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement of the scope of clinical practice and evidence of ongoing growth in clinical performance • Maintenance of board certification including requirements for licensing and continuing education • Maintenance of clinical credentialing including all requirements related to clinical privileges • Documented provision of clinical care activities in the presence of learners (e.g., medical students, residents, fellows, other health professions students) • Evidence of considerable teaching time in the clinical setting over an extended period • Evidence of expertise in a clinical discipline and contributions to clinical practice that are of high quality and significance • Evidence of leadership in clinical practice activity and/or administrative operations (e.g., medical director, similar roles) • Advancing state-of-the-practice through disseminating knowledge to colleagues in other academic medical centers, industry and/or government | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics related to clinical abilities (e.g., innovation in clinical care and/or improved practice techniques) • Development of models of person-centered, multi-disciplinary care that emphasize value and improving the health of communities served • Leadership of/participation in the development of nationally/internationally recognized clinical care guidelines • Data or statement concerning practice referral patterns • RVU scorecard or similar data pertaining to clinical productivity • Patient satisfaction/quality of care metrics/data • Involvement in and/or leadership regarding patient advocacy and/or access to care • Participation in local/regional/national programs that measurably improve patient and/or health system outcomes (e.g., QA/QI, maintenance of board certification process) • Participation in programs contributing to translation of research findings to patient care processes • Leadership of/participation in clinical trials • Invitations to participate in clinical activities at other medical schools/hospitals • Other recognition for clinical expertise (e.g., consulting, participation in clinically oriented task force/panel) |

Table 3. Expectations and Performance Indicators for Scholarly Activity/Research

(Note: not all Performance Indicators may apply)

| Expected Performance | Performance Indicators Used to Assess Readiness for Promotion |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● National/international reputation and recognition for scholarship ● Dissemination of research by publishing in high-quality journals, peer-review conference proceedings, and/or books/book chapters ● Demonstration of independence and leadership in scholarship ● Demonstration of both recent and sustained excellence and creativity in scholarship ● Dissemination of research by presenting at professional conferences and meetings ● Leadership/participation in research informed by industry / government / societal needs and aligned with the land-grant mission ● Principal investigator role / demonstration of research independence and leadership in externally funded research ● Securing sustained assistance for learners advised and/or supervised on research projects (health professions, undergraduate, graduate, post-doctoral) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Refereed journal publications, conference papers and/or book chapters/books ● Leadership in publications (e.g., first authorship by candidate and by candidate's advisees or others supervised in research setting) ● Quality and impact of journal and conference proceedings (e.g., journal impact factor, journal's relative subject area ranking, acceptance rate) ● Impact of body of work (e.g., citation indices, significance, or novelty of work) ● Technical reports to sponsors / agencies ● Invited lectures or presentations at professional meetings ● Adoption of research/scholarship within the academic and/or professional communities (e.g., inclusion of work in text/reference books, downloads of data sets or software, dissemination to industry practice) ● Awards/recognition for scholarly activity/research ● Editor and/or reviewer roles with publications of various types ● Participant in research proposal review processes ● ● Funding levels (total and by funding category; total and PI share) ● Number, diversity and competitiveness of funding sources (e.g., acceptance rate, prestige of program) ● Leadership in projects, including in large multi-investigator and/or multi-university projects ● Development of sustained internal and external research collaborations, including internationally ● Improvements in research laboratory facilities (e.g., equipment and capabilities) ● Number and level of learners advised/mentored (medical students, residents/fellows, Master's, PhD, post-doctoral fellows, other health professions students) ● Number and type of research personnel hosted (e.g., students, visiting scholars, faculty on sabbatical) ● Economic contributions and entrepreneurship: start-up business, commercialization of discoveries ● Development of patents, other forms of intellectual property |

Table 4. Expectations and Performance Indicators for Service*(Note: not all Performance Indicators may apply)*

| Expected Performance | Performance Indicators Used to Assess Readiness for Promotion |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Engagement in faculty governance via committee service within the department, school, and/or university ● Provision of formal and informal mentoring to faculty and staff ● Exhibiting positive citizenship (e.g., attending faculty meetings/retreats, department, school, student events) ● Engagement with one's external professional community ● Advancement of the profession / discipline through service roles ● Demonstrate leadership within the profession ● ● Engage with the community in meaningful service activity that relates to the school's mission | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Membership/leadership in department, school, health system and/or university service roles and/or committees. ● Outcomes from department, school, and/or university service efforts ● Awards for department, school and/or university service ● Membership/leadership in professional committees, councils, and commissions, including national/international ● Conference organizing roles (e.g., program leadership, conference proceedings editor, track/session chair), including international conferences ● Membership/leadership roles in academic and professional associations and societies ● Recognition and/or awards for external professional outreach/service/community engagement ● Advising/sponsoring student organizations ● Service on local, regional, and state boards, commissions, and/or committees ● Participation in department, school and/or university outreach programs (e.g., science fairs, career days) ● Non-scholarly outreach or service publications (e.g., trade journals, newsletters, websites, journals, multimedia) ● Presentations in area of expertise to community and civic organizations, including schools and alumni groups ● Expert witness/testimony ● Consulting that is consistent with university/department priorities |

V. Candidate Notification Processes

All candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall be notified in writing of the decision at each level of the review process, in accordance with processes identified in the VT faculty handbook. Further information in this regard is available through the VTCSOM Office of Faculty Affairs.

VI. Procedures for Appeal of Negative Promotion Recommendations

All faculty have access to a well-defined process of appeal regarding negative recommendations rendered on a given promotion. Further information in this regard is available in the university faculty handbook and through the VTCSOM Office of Faculty Affairs.