

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MEDICAL SCHOOL

DEPARTMENT OF RADIATION ONCOLOGY

7.12 STATEMENT

Statements Required By Section 7.12 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

PART 1. MEDICAL SCHOOL PREAMBLE

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether candidates from the Medical School meet the general criteria for tenure in Section 7.11 and for promotion to professor in Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. All candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the Medical School are evaluated with the criteria and standards in this preamble. In addition, each department in the Medical School has its own 7.12 Statement (Part II of this document) that further delineates the criteria for promotion and/or tenure within that individual unit. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review Sections 7 and 9 in their entirety. Section 7.11 is printed in IV: Criteria for Tenure (see below); Section 9.2 is printed in V.C Promotion to Professor. This preamble contains Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Appointment
- B. Awarding of indefinite tenure
- C. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- D. The process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty

The criteria, standards, and procedures are applied without regard to race, religion, color, sex, national origin, handicap, age, veteran status or sexual orientation.

The Medical School issues annually to each department, for distribution and information to faculty members, a set of instructions, memoranda, and other documents, giving detailed information on the procedures to be followed in the preparation and consideration of each proposal for tenure and/or promotion in rank. The pertinent documents are identified as exhibits enclosed with a cover memorandum from the Dean.

The Medical School 7.12 and Departmental 7.12 Statements are reviewed and approved by the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost.

The relevant University documents regarding criteria for tenure and/or promotion and the procedures for implementing these criteria are:

- University of Minnesota Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*
- *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*

II. MISSION STATEMENT

Committed to innovation and diversity, the Medical School educates physicians, scientists, and health professionals; generates knowledge and treatments; and cares for patients and communities with compassion and respect.

The Medical School strongly encourages and values interdisciplinary work, including scholarship, public engagement, and teaching, as well as interprofessional collaboration in clinical sciences. Concordant with the position of the National Institutes of Health, the Medical School values Co-Principal Investigators and interdisciplinary collaboration on major funding proposals as well.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**A. APPOINTMENT**

1. Assistant Professor

In the Medical School the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. The minimal, general criteria for initial appointment at this rank include:

- a. Possession of a terminal degree (MD or equivalent, or Ph.D.)
- b. Board eligibility or certification (if applicable - clinical specialties)
- c. Demonstrated ability in teaching
- d. Demonstrated involvement in high-quality research which has been accepted for publication or is published in peer-reviewed national or international journals
- e. Documentation of competence in the skills of communication, including effective communication in teaching students and in oral and written presentations of research

Each department may add specialty-specific criteria for appointment, in their Departmental 7.12 Statement.

2. Associate Professor and Professor

- a. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for awarding of tenure.
- b. The criteria and standards for appointment at the rank of Professor are those stated for promotion to this rank.

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that for appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

3. Secondary Appointments

The appointment home for a faculty member is always in the primary department (the tenure home is the University of Minnesota). Joint and/or secondary appointment requests will be made by the secondary department with the support of the primary department in the form of a request letter(s) signed by both department heads, addressed to the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs in the Medical School. In the case that the appointment being requested is at the Associate Professor or Professor level, the secondary department may conduct a faculty vote by written ballot, based on the proposed collaborative activity in the secondary department for the faculty member. The results of the vote should be reported at the time of the request for appointment.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY

In fulfillment of Sections 7.11 and 7.12 and in accord with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; “the tenured faculty of each academic unit annually reviews the progress of each probationary faculty member toward satisfaction of the criteria for receiving tenure. The head of the unit prepares a written summary of that review and discusses the candidate’s progress with the candidate, giving a copy of the report to the candidate.”

All tenure-track faculty will undergo an annual review each academic year. An academic year is defined in Section 5.3 in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. Annual appraisals in the Medical School and its departments comply with the procedures described in *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. Each department will outline the specific process and criteria for annual appraisals, but at the very least will include a review by the tenured faculty of the department and an annual conference with the Department Head. These procedures are provided for by Sections 16.3, 7.4, and 7.61 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*.

The annual review of probationary faculty will be recorded on the *University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12* and will reflect the faculty member's performance relative to the 7.12 Statement. A record of the vote by the tenured faculty for continuation or recommendation for promotion and/or tenure will be included on the *UM Form 12*, if a vote was taken. (This vote on annual reviews is optional). Each department will determine, and so state in their departmental 7.12 Statement, whether or not such a vote will be taken. If such an annual vote is taken in any department, a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty is required for continuation of the probationary appointment. A motion for termination also requires a 2/3 majority of eligible voting faculty for action to be taken. A record of the vote, either for continuation or termination, must be included on the *UM Form 12*. If a faculty member has extended his or her probationary period according to Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, this must be noted on the *UM Form 12* during the annual review.

The department head will meet annually with each probationary faculty member to review his/her completed *UM Form 12*. The department head and faculty member will sign the completed *President's Form 12*. The *UM Form 12* is forwarded to the dean for review, comment, and signoff.

The *UM Form 12* is then forwarded to the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost (SVPP) for review, comment, and signoff. A copy is kept in the SVPP Office. The signed *UM Form 12* will be kept in the probationary faculty member's tenure file and will become a part of the dossier.

For faculty members with joint and/or secondary appointments in another Medical School or University Department, annual reviews will be carried out according to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. For a candidate who has an appointment in more than one unit, the candidate's offer letter will specify how the candidate will be evaluated annually and at the time of the tenure and/or promotion decision, including which unit's 7.12 statement will be used as the basis for evaluation and which unit's votes of tenured faculty will be counted or reported for the second level of review in the Medical School. The primary unit will receive input from the secondary unit on performance of responsibilities specific to that unit prior to each annual review and decision on promotion and tenure.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* states:

7.11 General Criteria. What the University of Minnesota seeks above all in its faculty members is intellectual distinction and academic integrity. The basis for awarding indefinite tenure to the candidates possessing these qualities is the determination that each has established and is likely to continue to develop a distinguished record of academic achievement that is the foundation for a national or international reputation or both [FN 2]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 3]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision [FN 4]. Demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and teaching effectiveness must be given primary emphasis; service alone cannot qualify the candidate for tenure. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. The awarding of indefinite tenure presupposes that the candidate's record shows strong promise of his or her achieving promotion to professor.

[FN 2] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual campus.

[FN 3] The persons responsible and the process for making this determination are described in subsections 7.3 through 7.6.

"Scholarly research" must include significant publications and, as appropriate, the development and dissemination by other means of new knowledge, technology, or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society.

"Other creative work" refers to all forms of creative production across a wide range of disciplines, including, but not limited to, visual and performing arts, design, architecture of structures and environments, writing, media, and other modes of expression.

"Teaching" is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.

"Service" may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to the profession, to the University, or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to one's department or college, or the University. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

[FN 4] Indefinite tenure may be granted at any time the candidate has satisfied the requirements. A probationary appointment must be terminated when the appointee fails to satisfy the criteria in the last year of probationary service and may be terminated earlier if the appointee is not making satisfactory progress within that period toward meeting the criteria.

A recommendation for tenure is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the General Criteria for tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the standards stated by the Medical School and the department. Candidates must be evaluated for tenure during their mandatory decision year at the latest. The mandatory decision year occurs during the sixth probationary year for tenure-track faculty in the basic science departments, and in the ninth year for tenure-track faculty in clinical departments.

When distinction in research has greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in teaching. When distinction in teaching has the greater weight in the decision to award tenure, the candidate must also show, at a minimum, evidence of competence in research. Distinction in research requires documented evidence of high-level, independent scholarly effort. Distinction in teaching requires documented evidence of innovation and effectiveness in teaching, which have attracted national recognition.

Probationary faculty can extend their maximum period of probationary service, by one year for each occurrence of circumstances as described in Section 5.5 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. In the case of childbirth, adoption, or foster placement of a child, a probationary faculty member must notify the department head, the dean of the Medical School and the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost of this circumstance using University of Minnesota Form UM 1764 and the extension of the probationary period is automatic. In the case of caregiver responsibilities or personal illness or injury, the probationary faculty member must receive the approval of the senior vice president for academic affairs and provost using University of Minnesota Form UM 1765. No probationary period may be extended for more than three years. (See the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* for more details.)

A. TEACHING

Distinction in teaching for the granting of tenure must include scholarly work in education. Evidence of the generation of new methods of pedagogy with national recognition by peers (AAMC, ACE) and impact on educational programs nationally is required. Activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, including: didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, laboratories, case

discussions, grand rounds, hospital and clinic rounds, patient care, surgical and other procedures, and continuing education. Competence in teaching requires participation in appropriate courses with satisfactory learner evaluations.

Assessment of distinction in teaching and advising students is based upon:

1. Innovative contributions to the field of medical education which have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers as scholarly contributions.
2. Review of course(s) taught, directed, or developed; a list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic adviser.
3. Evidence of teaching excellence at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doctoral levels, evaluated by the written statements and/or compiled ratings of students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching and educational scholarship.
5. Accumulation of above forms of evidence on teaching competence and excellence over a sustained period of time.

Assessment of competence in teaching is based upon:

1. Learner and/or peer evaluations.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Assessment of distinction in research is based upon the following:

1. A review of the candidate's scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether focused on laboratory endeavors, clinical investigations, or analysis or synthesis of clinical observations and experience.
2. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence of independence or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:
 - a. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publication.
 - b. Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to a collaborative research project and/or to multi-authored publications.
 - c. Identification of the candidate as the principal investigator or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts
 - d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, editorial boards, etc.
3. External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies which sponsor programs in biomedical and other scientific research subject to peer review.
4. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine.

Assessment of competence in research is based upon:

1. Evidence of significant discipline-related publications, including reports of clinical investigations, identification through case reports of new syndromes or treatments, and descriptions of new techniques.
2. Participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures.
3. Letters from authorities in the candidate's clinical discipline assessing his/her contributions to the discipline.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE (if applicable)

Clinical Service expectations in decisions for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor include enjoying

an excellent reputation inside and outside the Twin Cities area as an authority in a clinical specialty, as demonstrated by patient referrals from outside the area, invited visiting lectureships, and memberships in professional societies.

D. SERVICE

In the Medical School service contributions are an integral part of the academic unit. Such service can be used to demonstrate an additional area of strength for the recommendation of tenure. Examples of service contributions include:

1. Participation in discipline-specific regional and national organizations.
2. Service to the Department, School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees.
3. Service to the community, State, and public engagement.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

In the Medical School, the entry level rank for faculty is at the Assistant Professor level. It is therefore anticipated that there will be no promotions to this rank.

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The general criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are those stated for consideration of tenure (see IV above).

In addition, for clinically active faculty, it is expected that they will have achieved appropriate Board Certification in the specific field where they are practicing.

A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to tenure, as stated in Section 7.11, and the specific criteria and standards for promotion to Associate Professor as stated by the Medical School and the Department. It is also an expectation of the University and the Medical School that all faculty promoted to associate professor with tenure are on a trajectory that will result in them achieving the rank of full Professor.

C. TO PROFESSOR

A recommendation for promotion to Professor is based on criteria set by the Medical School and the Department in accord with Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*

9.2 Criteria for Promotion to Professor. *The basis for promotion to the rank of professor is the determination that each candidate has (1) demonstrated the intellectual distinction and academic integrity expected of all faculty members, (2) added substantially to an already distinguished record of academic achievement, and (3) established the national or international reputation (or both) ordinarily resulting from such distinction and achievement [FN 7]. This determination is reached through a qualitative evaluation of the candidate's record of scholarly research or other creative work, teaching, and service [FN 8]. The relative importance of these criteria may vary in different academic units, but each of the criteria must be considered in every decision. Interdisciplinary work, public engagement, international activities and initiatives, attention to questions of diversity, technology transfer, and other special kinds of professional activity by the candidate should be considered when applicable. But the primary emphasis must be on demonstrated scholarly or other creative achievement and on teaching effectiveness, and service alone cannot qualify the candidate for promotion.*

[FN 7] "Academic achievement" includes teaching as well as scholarly research and other creative work. The definition and relative weight of the factors may vary with the mission of the individual

campus. Not being promoted to the rank of professor will not in itself result in special post-tenure review of a tenured associate professor.

[FN 8] The persons responsible for this determination are the full professors in the unit who are eligible to vote. The outcome of the vote is either promotion to the rank of professor or continuation in rank as an associate professor. The procedures for voting are identical to those outlined in Section 7.4 for the granting of indefinite tenure, the nondisclosure of grounds for the decision (Section 7.5), and the review of recommendations (Section 7.6). In addition, a petition to the Judicial Committee for review of a recommendation of continuation in rank as an associate professor follows the procedures specified in Section 7.7 for decisions about promotion to associate professor and conferral of indefinite tenure.

Promotion to Professor is not based on time in rank, but on an increasing record of accomplishments. During the period as an Associate Professor, the candidate will have continued to develop his or her already distinguished record in teaching, research, and service and added substantially to the record that was the basis for the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. The candidate must have achieved a national and international reputation in her or his area of expertise and be recognized as a leader and a mentor.

The proposal of a candidate for Professor will present evidence of additional significant academic, scientific, scholarly, and professional achievements such as:

1. The establishment of a training program for pre- and/or post-doctoral fellows in a specific discipline.
2. Election to prestigious scientific and/or professional organizations which recognize excellence and significant academic contributions.
3. Letters from authorities attesting to the candidate's acknowledged national or international reputation and recognition of leadership in his/her field; letters from prominent senior faculty members at other universities assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
4. Nationally recognized leadership roles in the profession or the institution.
5. Evidence of effective mentoring of junior faculty, fellows, and M.D. and Ph.D. trainees.
6. Creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.
7. Ongoing record of peer-reviewed publications.
8. Ongoing record of funding for research or scholarship (if applicable).
9. Ongoing excellence in clinical activity (if applicable).

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

In accordance with Section 7a of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure and the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*, each Medical School department will annually conduct a review of each tenured faculty member. The specific Departmental process for annual review and review criteria (i.e. the goals and expectations for continued performance by tenured faculty) will be described in the Departmental 7.12 Statement Part 2.

The Medical School procedures for annual review of tenured faculty are provided in Part 3 of the document (Annual Review of Tenured Faculty).

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

- A. Promotion and tenure decisions in the Medical School require a positive vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members on the question to recommend affirmatively for promotion and/or tenure.

- B. Decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member also require a vote by two-thirds of all eligible voting faculty members in support of the motion to terminate the appointment.
- C. Tenured faculty are eligible to vote on the awarding of tenure to probationary faculty. Tenured faculty holding appropriate rank are eligible to vote on recommendations for promotion of candidates.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING THIS 7.12 STATEMENT

The Medical School will review its 7.12 Statement Preamble at least every five years, or more frequently as needed. Revisions will be made by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The revisions will be presented to the Faculty Advisory Council. All Medical School tenured and tenure-track faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, in conjunction with approval of their departmental criteria, with the approval date noted on the document.

History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):

Original Document: Date unknown

Revision: April 15, 1993

Revision: July 2, 2009

Revision Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012

PART 2. DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDUM**I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT**

This document describes the specific criteria and standards which will be used to evaluate whether faculty in the Department of Radiation Oncology, both in the basic and clinical sciences, meet the general criteria in Section 7.11 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, as defined for this Department. It also provides the specific criteria and standards that will be used to evaluate associate professors for promotion to professor according to Section 9.2 of the Faculty Tenure policy.

This document contains the Department's Criteria and Standards pertaining to:

- A. Award of indefinite tenure
- B. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Professor
- C. The departmental process for the annual appraisal of probationary and tenured faculty
- D. The goals and expectations for the annual review of tenured faculty

II. MISSION STATEMENT

In harmony with the mission of the University of Minnesota Medical School, the mission of the Department of Radiation Oncology is to enhance the health of people through the education of skilled, compassionate, and socially responsible physicians and allied health personnel. The department is dedicated to preeminent specialty care via the use of radiation and application of radioactive materials, and innovative research and the creation of new knowledge using these modalities.

The function of the department is to foster the academic careers of the faculty members through all phases of their careers and to provide the necessary tools and resources to be successful. The department is committed to mentoring faculty and the long term goal is for faculty to become full professors. We stress the importance of interdisciplinary and interprofessional scholarship in education, research and clinical sciences. We value scholarship, teaching and service to the department, Medical School, Academic Health Center and University.

III. APPOINTMENT AND ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**A. APPOINTMENT OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

Tenured and tenure-track appointments require pre-approval by the Dean of the Medical School to initiate a search. Faculty hired with tenure are subject to approval by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the University of Minnesota. For recommendation for appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor, the candidate should have demonstrated ability in teaching and research. Although independent research will not always be evident, the individual should have demonstrated involvement in high quality research which has been accepted for publication, is published in peer-reviewed national or international journals or funded by extramural grants. There should be documentation of competence and growth in the candidate's skills of communication, including effective didactic lectures and in oral and written presentations of research.

B. ANNUAL APPRAISALS OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**1. Process**

The overall process for Annual Review of Probationary Faculty in the Department of Radiation Oncology is in compliance with Section 7.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*. The department shall assign mentors to probationary faculty. Probationary faculty members will be asked to submit a revised curriculum vitae, a summary of

accomplishments during the last year and how the past year's goals have been met, and a statement of goals for the next academic year. The assigned mentor will be asked to summarize the accomplishments of the probationary faculty member over the last year, any problems faced during the last year, and recommendations for the coming year. The Probationary Faculty will be reviewed by the department's P&T committee who will write a recommendation to the department head. The department head meets with each probationary faculty member to review the summaries and sign the University of Minnesota (UM) Form 12 (Annual Appraisal Form). The Form 12 is then sent to the Dean's Office and then to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review and approval.

2. Criteria

The criteria for satisfactory performance to be used for the annual review in the Department of Therapeutic Radiology are the same as with the appropriate criteria for rank, as defined in this 7.12 Statement.

IV. CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The Department of Radiation Oncology accepts and subscribes to the criteria and standards for tenure of faculty at the University of Minnesota Medical School, as described in Part 1. Medical School Preamble, with the following department-specific criteria.

A. RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP

For conferral of tenure, candidates must have demonstrated independence in research and scholarship through independent or significant interdisciplinary and collaborative activities and must be capable of directing and conducting research of high quality. Research and scholarship may be basic, translational or clinically applied.

Assessment of distinction in research may be based upon at least two of the following:

1. External support must be documented by external research funding through competitive grants. Sustained external peer-reviewed grant support from national agencies (such as National Institutes of Health, Center for Disease Control and Prevention, American Cancer Society, etc.), is required for faculty with primary focus on research; optimally this should be two or more research grants.. External funding from private corporations or pharmaceutical companies not subject to peer review is also valued but is of less importance in the decision process. Grants from vendors in the form of equipment, software or other means are also considered.
2. A review of the candidate's scientific publications, particularly those in national or international peer-reviewed journals. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, whether focused on laboratory endeavors, clinical investigations or analysis or synthesis of clinical observations and experience.

Journals that are particularly pertinent to Radiation Oncology include

- *Biology and Physics*
- *Blood*
- *Cancer*
- *Cancer Research*
- *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*
- *Journal of Clinical Oncology*
- *Lancet*
- *Medical Physics*

- *Nature*
 - *New England Journal of Medicine*
 - *Oncology*
 - *Physics in Medicine and Biology*
 - *Radiotherapy & Oncology*
 - *Science*
 - *Seminars of Oncology*
 - *Transplantation*
3. Independence of research accomplishments, or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. Evidence of independence or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research may include:
 - a. Naming of the candidate as the first or senior author on multi-authored journal articles and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions by the candidate to the collaborative project and publication.
 - b. Statements of peer evaluators on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions to a collaborative research project and/or to multi-authored publications.
 - c. Identification of the candidate as the principal investigator or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts.
 - d. Invitations/nominations to serve on study sections, national policy boards, medical physics task groups, editorial boards, etc.
 4. Significant original contributions based on clinical observations resulting in new therapies or techniques which impact the practice of medicine.
 5. Assessment of competence in research is based upon evidence of significant discipline-related publications, including reports of clinical investigations, identification through case reports of new syndromes or treatments, and descriptions of new techniques, participation in invited scientific and clinical symposia, meetings and lectures, and letters from authorities in the candidate's clinical discipline assessing his/her contributions to the discipline.

B. TEACHING

Teaching is not limited to classroom instruction. It includes resident education in accredited programs, clinical rotations, extension and outreach education, and other forms of communicating knowledge to both registered University students and persons in the extended community, as well as supervising, mentoring, and advising students.

Distinction in teaching for the granting of tenure must include scholarly work in education. Evidence of the generation of new methods of pedagogy with national recognition by peers (AAMC, ACE) and impact on educational programs nationally is required.

Teaching activities may occur in a variety of educational settings and formats, including: didactic presentations, lectures, seminars, conferences, tutorials, laboratories, case discussions, grand rounds, hospital and clinic rounds, patient care, surgical and other procedures, and continuing education.

Assessment of effectiveness in teaching and advising students is based upon:

1. Innovative contributions to the field of medical education which have been adopted for use by other institutions and are recognized by peers as scholarly contributions.
2. Review of Radiation Oncology course(s) taught, directed, or developed; a list of students and degree candidates for whom the faculty member has served as academic adviser.
3. Evidence of teaching excellence for students at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or post-doctoral levels, evaluated by the written statements and/or compiled ratings of students.
4. Written statements by the Head of the Department of Radiation Oncology, academic peers, and others familiar with the candidate's performance in teaching.
5. Accumulation of above forms of evidence on teaching competence and excellence over a sustained period of time.
6. Successful mentoring of medical students, Radiation Oncology graduate students, Radiation Oncology residents or junior faculty as evidenced by the success of the mentees.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE

Excellence and innovation in clinical activity is expected, and may be demonstrated by significant accomplishment (commensurate with fraction of clinical time), supported by evidence such as the candidate introducing new or unique clinical services, approaches, or techniques.

Examples of a scholarly approach to clinical activity might include:

- Introduction of new clinical services, approaches, or techniques (e.g. stereotactic spine irradiation, image guided brachytherapy, fractionated GammaKnife, innovative immobilization and repositioning techniques).
- Establishment or implementation of a novel clinical technique that has demonstrated improved, safer or more efficient patient care.
- Advancement of a subspecialty or particular facet of patient care in the candidate's field of expertise.
- Promotion of clinical trials or translational techniques that advance the frontier of care.
- Development of new patient care clinic, such as combined modality care clinic, or pediatric radiation clinic.

Evidence of excellence or significant accomplishment in clinical activity might include:

- Statement by the candidate describing his/her clinical activities (e.g. number of patients treated, procedures performed, or clinical responsibilities), what makes their service unique/outstanding, and how they have followed a scholarly approach.
- CME written materials and publications that support a scholarly approach to patient care.
- Two outside letters of evaluation supporting the candidate's clinical achievements.

D. SERVICE

Service may be professional or institutional. Professional service, based on one's academic expertise, is that provided to the profession or to the local, state, national, or international community. Institutional service may be administrative, committee, and related contributions to the Department of Radiation Oncology, the Medical School, or the University. All faculty members in the Department of Radiation Oncology are expected to engage in service activities, but only modest institutional service should be expected of probationary faculty.

In the Department of Radiation Oncology, service contributions are an integral part of the academic unit. Such service can be used to demonstrate an additional area of strength for the recommendation of tenure. Assessment of significant discipline-related service contributions is based upon:

1. Roles in discipline-specific regional and national organizations (ASTRO, RSNA, ABR, AAPM, ACMP) or participation in major committees in their respective organizations.
2. Service to the Department of Radiation Oncology, Medical School, or University on governance-related or policy making committees such as the admissions committee, IRB, or radiation protection committee.

Public engagement must include scholarly products such as peer-reviewed publications, national peer recognition, dissemination and broad impact on the community. It may also involve additional forms of documentation, each of which is also evaluated for originality, independence, coherence, impact and collaborative skills, e.g.:

- Description of teaching programs that address needs of the radiation oncology community and beyond and take advantage of individual skills of members in the community.
- Description of teaching programs that address oncology aspects of public health issues in the community and involve elements of the community.

Additional documentation for public engagement may be different than for traditional disciplinary scholarship, but evaluation of these products is not held to lower standards than traditional disciplinary activities. Determining whether certain products (such as on-line media or CD-ROMs) meet these evaluation criteria, may require efforts by tenured faculty to determine the standards of quality in unfamiliar areas and to locate peer reviewers who can evaluate these products by the best contemporary standards.

V. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN FACULTY RANK

Promotion decisions in the Department of Radiation Oncology require a positive vote by two-thirds of all faculty members eligible to vote on the question to affirmatively recommend for promotion. Eligible members include faculty at the proposed rank and above voting for promotion; and faculty with tenure voting for tenure.

If a faculty member has a joint appointment in another department and is being considered for promotion, the Department of Radiation Oncology will contact the other department(s) to obtain their assessment and record of vote on the proposed promotion. (See the Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty for details on the evaluation of faculty with joint appointments.)

A. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Not applicable in the Medical School (Entry level rank is Assistant Professor)

B. TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The criteria and standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Radiation Oncology are those stated for consideration of Tenure (see IV above). A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor is made when an eligible faculty member has fulfilled the general criteria applicable to Tenure.

C. TO PROFESSOR

The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* require that the tenured faculty of departments review and provide feedback to tenured

associate professors every four years regarding their progress toward promotion to the rank of professor.

A recommendation for promotion to Professor is based on criteria set by the Medical School and the department in accord with Section 9.2 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*. A recommendation for promotion to Professor assumes that the candidate has made significant contributions beyond the criteria for tenure and is based on the following required criteria:

1. National and international recognition as a leader in this or her field by virtue of having attained one or more of the following categories of scholarly achievement, with the recognition that both teaching and research are the basis of every decision concerning promotion to the rank of professor.
 - a. Significant achievements in research, including educational research and publicly engaged scholarship. Serving as principal investigator or significant collaborator (e.g. co-P.I. or site-P.I) on major research projects, including interdisciplinary projects, acquisition of major research grants and/or contracts, participation and leadership in regional national and/or international research organizations; and scholarly publications in major professional journals.
 - b. The establishment of a training program for pre- and/or post-doctoral Fellows in a specific discipline.
 - c. Election to prestigious scientific and/or professional organizations which recognize excellence and significant academic contributions.
 - d. Letters from authorities attesting to the candidate's acknowledged national and international reputation and recognition of leadership in his/her specific field; letters from prominent, senior faculty members at other universities assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion to the rank of Professor.
 - e. Nationally recognized leadership roles in the profession or the institution such as serving as officers in national societies (ASTRO, RSNA, ABR, AAPM, ACMP) or as Chairs of major committees in their respective organizations.
 - f. Contributions of effective mentoring of junior faculty and trainees.
 - g. Attention to creating and sustaining a culture that fosters diversity.

VI. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

All faculty members will submit a summary of activities for the past year on the department's personnel review form. This report will take into account activities related to teaching, research and scholarly activity, professional service and institutional service. The reviewer will provide a rating for each area in which the faculty member has been active. The review will assess each faculty member's activities for consistency with departmental, Medical School and University goals and priorities. For performance below expectations, the reviewer must provide specific written comments which will be shared with the person being reviewed, the Department Head and the Dean of the Medical School. The rating in each activity area will take into account the stated goals and objectives of the faculty member as well as the goals and priorities of the department, the Medical School, the Academic Health Center and the University. Faculty will be reviewed by the Department of Radiation Oncology's Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The reviewers will use this 7.12 Statement as one of the guidelines for the performance review. Other guidelines, which are very important, will be the goals set in the previous year between Department Head and the faculty member.

The Section Head, Department Head, or designee will meet individually with faculty members to discuss the results of their review and to discuss the goals for the coming year. The goals and primary reviewer's recommendations will be recorded on the personnel review form.

The specific criteria for performance evaluation in the Department include:

Criteria For performance evaluation of tenured faculty in the Department include three levels of performance.

Outstanding

- High threshold
- Leadership in the University community
- Acquisition of major or renewal research grants

Meets expectations

- Significant contributions in service and education
- Maintenance of individual research program

Below expectations

- Sub-par contribution to teaching and service
- Sub-par performance in an individual's research program

A. TEACHING

Consistent with its mission tenured faculty are expected to remain effective teachers and to be actively engaged in communicating knowledge and in supervising, mentoring, or advising students, in compliance with collegiate and University policies.

Outstanding

- National Leadership in shaping the curriculum within a discipline
- Author or editor of new education medical (textbook, video, computer software) that are distributed nationally.
- Establishment of a training program for pre- and/or postdoctoral fellows in a specific discipline that has resulted in the placing of trainees in academic positions.
- Educational program leadership and curriculum innovation
- Outstanding teaching as defined by course evaluations by students and peers

Meets expectations

- Teaching medical residents and fellows, professional students, including students in the M.D. curriculum and other professional educational programs with satisfactory performance based on course evaluations by students and peers.
- Faculty advisor to medical students, post-M.D. residents (Medical Fellows), post-residency clinical fellows, graduate students, postdoctoral research associates, visiting foreign postdoctoral fellows and faculty.

- Practical and didactic education of colleagues and community physicians.
- Member of examination committees
- Member of committees that impact education at the University.

Unsatisfactory

- Activity does not meet at least two of the above criteria under either of the above categories each year.

B. RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP

Tenured faculty are expected to pursue an active agenda of research in their area(s) of academic specialization including evidence of grant submissions to support research efforts (NIH) in addition to foundation grants, clinical trials and industry awards.

Outstanding

- Multiple first or senior author scientific publications: substantial contribution to high impact journals as well as first ranked journals in subspecialty areas.
- Principal Investigator, on new and continuous grants, co-investigator from a national or regional granting agency which customarily utilizes scientific peer review as the primary basis for awards. Examples of granting agencies include, but are not necessarily limited to, an institute of the National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, or other similar federal agency or national foundation.
- Delivery of a plenary talk or named lectureship at a prominent national or international meeting

Meets expectations

- Publications in monographs, reviews and other books: publications through these modalities are part of the scholarly activities of a faculty member, Service as an editor or member of the editorial board of a reputable journal or monograph in a biomedical discipline.
- Invited participation in symposia, meetings and seminars: participation as invited faculty to a scientific symposium, meeting, or lecture, demonstrating recognition of expertise in a particular scientific field. Appropriate examples are the following: visiting professorships at major universities, invited lectureships to professional organizations, and honorary lectureships at universities or professional societies.
- Organize a local symposium
- Service as a member of a peer review committee of competitive sponsored research support agency such as an institute of the National Institute of Health, Public Health Service, or other similar funding agency.

Unsatisfactory

- Does not meet at least two of the above criteria under either of the above categories each year.

C. CLINICAL SERVICE (if applicable)

Active clinical service, although not the sole criterion for successful post-tenure review, will be taken into consideration. Clinical service includes high quality patient care in a clinically productive practice. Professional and high clinical standards should be evident. Specific goals can include:

Outstanding

- Leadership in quality improvement efforts for the departments.
- Leadership positions in the practice plan.
- Development of new and unique clinical programs.

Meets expectations

- Ongoing development of unique clinical programs.
- Ongoing clinical mentorship to faculty.
- Exemplary professionalism in the provision of clinical care.
- Ongoing provision of unique clinical expertise.
- Leadership and development of nationally distinguished clinical programs

Unsatisfactory

- Does not meet at least two of the above criteria under either of the above categories each year.

D. SERVICE

Tenured faculty are expected to perform service within the department, the college and university, and in their scholarly disciplines. This includes but is not limited to public service, professional practice, University administrative service, and University of Minnesota Physicians service. Evidence of the strength and quality for these activities should be provided by the individual faculty member as part of the annual review of activities.

Outstanding

- Election as to prestigious scientific and/or professional organizations which recognize excellence and significant academic contributions;
- Membership on editorial boards,
- Membership on a national review panels;
- Holding of offices in national and international societies.
- Member of NIH study section or national committee
- Chair of a major committee (University, Medical School, UMPhysicians)
- Director of graduate program
- Director of a post-graduate medical education program or subspecialty fellowship program
- Medical Director of a clinic or service line

Meets expectations

- Member of special committees and councils that develop policies and practices for graduate education and research at the University.

- Member of Medical School and/or Academic Health Center Committees.
- Member of departmental committees
- Member of UMPHysicians board committee

Unsatisfactory

- Activity does not meet at least two of the above criteria under wither of the above categories each year.

VII. VOTING PROCEDURES

A. VOTE

1. A vote will be taken for decisions to recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.
2. A vote will be taken for all decisions to terminate the contract of a probationary faculty member. Such a vote will require a 2/3 majority for the motion to pass.

VIII. PROCESS FOR UPDATING 7.12 STATEMENT

The Radiation Oncology 7.12 Statement will be reviewed and voted on at a minimum every five years. Revisions will be made by the Department of Radiation Oncology Promotions and Tenure Committee. All departmental tenured and tenure-track faculty will be invited to review and give input on the statement, and approval will be obtained through a majority vote by the Department of Radiation Oncology faculty, with the approval date noted on the document.

History:

Approved by Radiation Oncology Faculty: March 6, 2013

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: March 7, 2013

PART 3. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

A. ANNUAL REVIEW

All tenured faculty must undergo an annual review each year. This process is key in allowing the faculty member and the department to assess individual progress. It also helps to protect the faculty member, the department, and the School, in case of any misunderstanding or conflict that may arise. For any questions about this process, please call the Office of Faculty Affairs and/or the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs.

1. During the spring of each academic year, all department heads will schedule an annual review conference with each tenured faculty member. This responsibility may be delegated to Division Chiefs, Departmental Review Committee, Center Directors or other designee. All reviews must receive final approval and signature from the Department Head.
2. Prior to this conference the individual faculty member will provide the requisite information, as well as an updated curriculum vitae, following the department's annual review reporting format.
3. Annual reviews may be carried out in the format preferred by each department but must, at a minimum, be compliant with the rules detailed in the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, Section 7a, and the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty*.
4. The annual review documentation should include:
 - a. Accomplishments of the previous year, particularly in relation to goals set for the year.
 - b. Detailed accomplishments in each domain relevant to the faculty member (as applicable: teaching, research and/or scholarship, service, and clinical activity (if applicable)):
 - i. Evaluation of quality and quantity of teaching, attitude towards learners, knowledge of subject matter, and specific contributions to continuing education.
 - ii. Evaluation of research and/or scholarly activity including current projects, grants applied for or funded, publications, and papers presented or submitted.
 - iii. Evaluation of service.
 - iv. Evaluation of clinical activity (when applicable), including volume of patients served, breadth of referrals, incorporation of patient care into teaching program, activity in local and national professional organizations.
 - c. Percentage of effort in each domain, to be updated annually.
 - d. Agreed upon goals for the upcoming year.
 - e. Plans for subsequent years with specific recognition of outstanding accomplishments and plans to maintain high performance level.
5. The Annual Review conference should emphasize frank discussion concerning the faculty member's past and present performance in given areas of responsibility, noting progress in achieving previously established goals and objectives. In particular, it is important to frame the evaluation in the context of the proposed distribution of responsibilities in the four domains of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, Service, and Clinical Activity (if applicable). If the faculty member is working towards promotion, the Department Head and the faculty member should ensure that year-by-year progress, consistent with the Departmental 7.12 Statement, has been appropriate to date and specific goals for the coming year should be agreed upon.

Pursuant to the *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty*, each department's tenured faculty shall review their tenured associate professors at a

minimum of every four years regarding their progress toward achieving the rank of professor. This review is based upon the criteria for promotion to professor in the department 7.12 statement. This four-year progress review can be part of the annual review process.

6. Following the Annual Review conference, the Department Head or designee will complete the Medical School Annual Review Form, summarizing the conference and stating the agreed upon goals for the upcoming year. The Medical School Annual Review Form must be signed by the faculty member, the evaluator (if applicable), and the Department Head.
7. For faculty members who have met the goals and expectations for tenured faculty for the department, according to the department 7.12 statement, the signed Medical School Annual Review Form is sent to office of Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who signs on behalf of the Dean. The review form will be handled confidentially by the Dean and the Associate Dean and will assist them in supporting recommendations for promotion, special recognition, or salary adjustments.
8. If the department head or designee finds that the tenured faculty member's performance is below that of the goals and expectations of the department as specified in the 7.12 statement, then the case is referred to a committee of elected, tenured faculty members in the department. If that committee concurs with the judgment of the department head, then both the department head and the committee formulate a detailed written Faculty Improvement Plan for the faculty member. The letter from the department head and the elected committee must identify the ending date for the period of performance improvement and must request that the faculty member provide a report at that time describing his or her progress towards meeting the goals and expectations of the department.

The department head and the committee chair should make reasonable efforts to meet with the faculty member to discuss the plan for meeting the goals and expectations of the unit. The faculty member may request modification of the plan from the department head and the committee but may not at this stage file a complaint with the Senate Judicial Committee.

At the end of the time period specified for performance improvement, the faculty member under review must provide a report describing his or her progress toward meeting the goals and expectations of the department. The department head and the elected committee of tenured faculty will then review the progress that the faculty member has made regarding the recommendations as specified in the report from the faculty member.

This process above may be repeated for a second year if the faculty member has failed to complete the initial plan.

B. SPECIAL PEER REVIEW

1. Initiation
In compliance with Section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, a Special Peer Review may be requested by the department head and the departmental review committee of elected, tenured faculty members following the unsuccessful completion of a Faculty Improvement Plan as described in Section A.8 above.
2. The Medical School Dean will be notified and asked to initiate a Special Review. The Dean must first review the file independently to determine that the faculty member falls below the department's goals and expectations and has not successfully completed the Faculty Improvement Plan. S/he determines that

special peer review is warranted.

3. The *Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty* describe details of the process for the special peer review. Some of these are highlighted below but the reader is referred to the *Procedures* and the *Faculty Tenure* policy for a complete perspective. All of the steps in the *Procedures* and subsection 7a.3 of the *Faculty Tenure* policy must be followed even if they are not described in this document.
4. Review Panel
 - A Special Review Panel composed of tenured members at the same rank or above the rank of the faculty member under review:
 - i. Members are elected independently for each Special Review, by the tenured faculty of the department.
 - ii. Members (5) include:
 1. 1 member appointed by the faculty member being reviewed.
 2. 4 members elected from a slate of candidates nominated by department head and the tenured faculty.
 - iii. Members may be in the department or outside, if appropriate – case by case. If the faculty member has a secondary appointment in another department, that department should be represented on the committee.
 - iv. Members should not be the same as any previous review committee for that faculty member
5. Special Review materials include:
 - a. Department head and previous Review Committee statement(s) requesting Special Review.
 - b. Annual review with goals and effort distribution (at least 5 years if available).
 - c. Previous recommendations for faculty development and outcomes (Performance Improvement Plans).
 - d. Personal statement by the faculty member.
 - e. Current annotated curriculum vitae.
 - f. Teaching evaluations.
 - g. Reprints.
 - h. Supporting documentation, including, but not limited to, letters of acceptance for articles in press, and acknowledgement by journal or funding agency of manuscript or proposal receipt.
 - i. Any other relevant documentation.
6. Review Criteria and Methodology
 - a. The main focuses of the Special Review are the area(s) of deficiency identified in previous review(s).
 - b. Due process procedures, as defined in University documents, will be applied to address disagreements at different levels of the review and to offer protection for academic freedom.
 - c. Faculty members undergoing review may examine any material in their file at any time in the review process
 - d. Faculty member's performance will be evaluated as either:
 - i. Satisfactory: meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
 - ii. Unsatisfactory: not meeting department and/or Medical School goals and expectations for tenured faculty members.
 - e. The actions that the Panel may recommend, listed in section 7a.3 of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*, include:

- i. Terminate review if the Panel finds that the faculty member's performance meets the goals and expectations of the department.
 - ii. Alter allocation of effort if the Panel determines that the faculty member's strengths are not being fully utilized: it might suggest that the allocation of effort between teaching, research, and service be altered so as to maximize the faculty member's contributions to the University.
 - iii. Suggested improvements: if the faculty member's performance is likely to be improved by specific steps, and that process can adequately be monitored by further regular Annual Reviews, the Panel may suggest that those steps be taken and remit the case to the Annual Review process.
 - iv. Salary reduction if the faculty member's performance has declined in such a way as no longer to warrant the base salary that is attached to the position, the Panel may recommend a reduction in base salary of up to 10% (see Board of Regents Policy: *Tenure Faculty* for complete details).
 - v. Dismissal: if the faculty member's performance has fallen below the standard of the Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure* Section 10.21(a), "sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately," the Panel can recommend the commencement of proceedings for termination of appointment, or involuntary leave of absence (see details below).
 - vi. The Panel may also recommend a combination of these measures.
- f. The recommendations of the Panel will be implemented by the Department, the Dean's Office or other administrative body, as appropriate, depending on the specific recommendation.

History of Revisions (approved by vote of the Faculty):

Original Document: Date unknown

Approved by Medical School Faculty: June 21, 2012

Approved by Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost: June 22, 2012