

GUIDELINES

I. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

II. Review of Deans

III. Searches for Departmental Chairs

IV. Teaching Evaluation

Guidelines for Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

(Approved by the Medical School Council on 4/5/05)

(Revised by the Council on May 2008)

INTRODUCTION

The Miller School of Medicine University of Miami (hereafter called the School) has three full-time faculty tracks:

- (1) the **TENURE-EARNING or TENURE** track. The Faculty Manual refers to the faculty in this track as the regular faculty;
- (2) the **CLINICAL EDUCATOR** track;
- (3) the **RESEARCH** track;

As explained in the Faculty Manual, within the Tenure-Earning, Clinical or Research Tracks, three ranks are available:

- (1) **ASSISTANT PROFESSOR**
- (2) **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**
- (3) **PROFESSOR**

In the Clinical Educator Track, INITIAL appointments may also be made at the rank of Instructor.

For the progressive advancement of faculty within each track, evaluation of merit is undertaken at the Department, School and University level.

*A key is whether there has been significant and continuing **growth, productivity and excellence in the activities relevant to the candidate's track during the candidate's time at his/her present rank.***

To accomplish this evaluation, the candidate must provide updated curriculum vitae and suggest a minimum of three external referees to the Department Chairperson. These referees should be neutral to the candidate and should not be former mentors, preceptors, colleagues or collaborators. Rather, they should be leaders in the candidate's field who can fairly and accurately evaluate the candidate's performance and academic recognition. Candidates may also indicate to the chair individuals who the candidate believes is inappropriate as an external referee. Reasons should be given. For this belief the Chairperson may choose among the suggested and other referees and then solicit letters from a minimum of three referees.

Unless otherwise specified, these evaluators should hold a rank at least equal to which the candidate aspires, should never have been formally affiliated with the University, and should never have been explicitly responsible for the candidate's training.

Letters from former colleagues, mentors, sponsors, or former students may also be submitted to supplement the three external letters. The Chairperson must certify that **ALL** evaluation letters received are included in the candidate's file.

Documentation of teaching activities: particularly when teaching is a major portion of a candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure, deliberations may benefit from including an educator's portfolio with the candidate's CV. If submitted by a candidate, an educator's portfolio will be included with the candidate's CV as a means to assess teaching performance and other educational accomplishments as well as the candidate's commitment to teaching, and his/her efforts to improve teaching. A Guide to constructing a teaching portfolio is available at the UMSM educational development office or its website: <http://www.mededu.miami.edu/edo/>

The evaluation process requires the Chairperson to oversee a Department review and vote and then to provide the necessary documentation to the School's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee. **This documentation must include:**

- a) evaluation of teaching*
- b) an independent evaluation of the candidate and recommendation;*
- c) the results and explanation of the departmental vote;*
- d) all evaluation letters;*
- e) copies of the letters soliciting reviews from the external referees;*
- f) an explanation of the relationship of the referees to the candidate;*
- g) an assessment of the stature and qualifications of each referee;*

New appointments at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and/or new appointments with the award of tenure require review by the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (apt) committee before approval of this rank or tenure by the University. Promotions to these ranks and/or the award of tenure also require APT Committee Review. Therefore, during evaluation of a candidate for appointment or promotion on any track above the Assistant Professor level, the APT Committee serves an important advisory role to the Senior Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean. The following guidelines for appointment, promotion and the awarding of tenure were written and are practiced by the APT committee.

It should be emphasized that these guidelines provide only a basis for APT Committee evaluations. Final decisions result from the current experience and intentions of the faculty who comprise the APT committee as well as other considerations represented by the relevant administrators of the School and University. Also, each candidate's application is considered on an individual basis consistent with the Faculty Manual.

A. TENURE-EARNING (TENURE) TRACK:

Faculty members in this track should be those who demonstrate excellence in teaching and service and who strive to make **significant and original contributions to the body of knowledge in their medical specialties or scientific disciplines.**

Faculty members in this track may be considered for, and be awarded tenure, at any time after their appointment; but they must be considered for tenure no later than their **eighth year** of service in this track. The initial appointment as an Assistant Professor in this track must receive a through review by the sixth year, and if successful, be promoted to Associate Professor, if not, he/she will not be eligible for the additional years to achieve tenure.

Early consideration has no prejudicial effect on reconsideration through the eighth year of the 'probationary period'.

Untenured faculty in the tenure-earning track may seek a one-year extension of their probationary period for child care or other reasons as specified in the Faculty Manual.

Appointment to the tenure-earning track signifies that the candidate has demonstrated **excellence** through contributions to at least one of the three focus areas of academic achievement listed below, and **competence** in all assigned areas of responsibility including:

- a) teaching (pre- and/or postgraduate);
- b) research (basic and/or scientifically based clinical); and
- c) service (patient care, administration, committee duties).

In addition, other evidence of peer recognition may be presented.

A-1. TENURE TRACK:

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor or Appointment as Associate Professor and/or the Award of Tenure

Promotion or appointment at the Associate Professor level and/or the Award of Tenure generally requires a candidate to demonstrate national recognition in his/her field. In addition, there must be evidence of scholarship supported by publications or similar communications in at least one focus area.

A-1a. Teaching Activities (tenure track)

If teaching is a major portion of the candidate's application, evidence must be presented that the candidate has developed and/or conducted teaching programs of high quality. Three types of teaching may be distinguished;

- a) classroom teaching that includes lectures, seminars, laboratories, discussion sections, workshops, etc;
- b) graduate-student teaching including personal training, workshops, seminars and other graduate-program duties (e.g. directing a journal club); and
- c) clinical teaching that involves lectures, demonstrations, individual or group teaching in a clinical setting, and postgraduate education.

Documentation of teaching activities must include:

- 1) a synopsis of teaching assignments including conferences, student teaching, laboratories, etc;
- 2) evidence of contributions to educational administration, curriculum planning and development, or analysis
- 3) department or other peer evaluation of teaching abilities. Examples of instructional materials such as handouts used in the candidate's teaching, authored textbooks, software, or audiovisual aides, are helpful and may be provided. A description of the application of new or improved teaching methods should be provided, if appropriate;

- 4) evaluations of teaching by medical and/or graduate students, house staff, and postdoctoral fellows, or evidence of teaching awards.

The chair must provide a summary of all teaching evaluations and include all comments written on individual evaluation forms which pertain to the candidate's teaching efforts. Individual evaluation forms must be available, if requested, but these may not be substituted for the summary statement.

A-1b. Research Activities (tenure track):

If research is a major component of the candidate's application, evidence must be presented that the candidate has had major involvement in a research program that is of high quality and significance, and is extramurally funded. **Documentation must include:**

- 1) a bibliography and statement that describes the research program, accomplishments to date, and future goals (maximum: 2 pages);
- 2) a record of independent funding as a principal investigator. This should be submitted as a chronology of research support listing its source, principal investigator, candidate's role, and annual and total direct costs;
- 3) three letters of evaluation of the research programs from recognized authorities in the candidate's field. These letters should assess the quality of the candidate's research. If other letters are provided attesting to the candidate's excellence in other activities (e.g. clinical service, teaching, committee service, etc) also comment on research productivity, they may provide the relevant documentation in the research category;
- 4) an evaluation of the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published, and the number of citations by others in the field;

A-1c. Service (tenure track):

(1) Clinical Activities:

If clinical activity is a major portion of the candidate's application, evidence must be presented describing the candidate's accomplishments in this and related activities, such as the number of clinics attended, type of patients seen, procedures performed inpatient responsibilities, and outreach activities including community service. Other areas of clinical activity may be considered. **Evidence of excellence in performing clinical responsibilities should include:**

- 1) evaluations of the candidate's clinical activities and performance by three recognized authorities in the candidate's field. Ideally, these letters should come from external evaluators, but at least one may come from a referee inside the University community. These evaluations should review whether the candidate has attained a national reputation and compare the candidate with other faculty of similar rank and experience. If it is impossible to obtain at least one outside letter, an explanation of the special-case status must be provided, and a letter from a colleague in another department within the School may suffice.
- 2) additional letters may be provided from colleagues whose primary appointment is in other University department, or from graduates of resident-physician training programs;
- 3) a scholarly approach to patient care as demonstrated by: a) knowledge and/or use of current concepts and techniques, or development of new programs; and b) national dissemination of this knowledge, as evidenced by the presentation of seminars or written materials [e.g. a continuing medical education (CME) syllabus] and a bibliography of publications. Copies of CME written materials and publications, which support a scholarly approach to patient care, should be included with the candidate's file;
- 4) documentation of clinical activities (e.g. yearly statistics describing referral numbers, clinics attended, procedures performed, number of private patients, etc).

(2) Committee Activities/Administrative Duties:

If professional service to the Department, School, hospital or University is an important aspect of the candidate's application, this **service should be documented as:**

- 1) major committee assignments with the candidate's role on the committee and time commitment;
- 2) administrative assignments or projects with end product, the candidate's role and time commitment;
- 3) professional administration and program development with end product, the candidate's role and time commitment. If supervision of a clinical or administrative unit is involved, this unit should be identified and its mission described together with the duties and responsibilities of the candidate and evidence of program growth that includes its regional and national reputation;
- 4) professional service to local, regional, state, or national associations or governmental units should be listed with the candidate's role and time commitment;
- 5) appointments or election to office in county, state or national medical and health-care societies and/or professional scientific societies;
- 6) for clinicians, service as an examiner for a specialty-certifying board.

At least three letters should be solicited from the beneficiaries of the services described above in order to document the significance of the candidate's contributions. In addition, evidence of the esteem in which the candidate is held by peers at local and national levels is helpful to the APT Committee. **Such evidence may include:**

- 1) positions of leadership or responsibly in organizations, agencies, and professional societies;
- 2) responsibilities as manuscript reviewer for scientific journals or appointments to editorial boards;
- 3) participation on study sections, consultant panels, and advisory boards or the equivalent, of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), National Science Foundation (NSF), Veterans Administration (VA), American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, etc;
- 4) visiting faculty appointments or invited lectureship presentations at other institutions.

2. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor or Appointment as Professor (tenure track):

Promotion or appointment as Professor with or without Tenure requires that the candidate has **continued to grow in stature and has exhibited further excellence and continued productivity** in at least one of the teaching, research or service areas since initial appointment or promotion to Associate Professor.

Professors must have attained widespread recognition in their major areas of success (teaching, research, service). The candidate's contribution to his/her field should include continued scholarly publications, and continued funding of peer-reviewed research.

Supporting evidence may include:

- 1) service as an invited speaker at national and international conferences;
- 2) service as visiting professor;
- 3) preparation of books, chapters, or reviews;
- 4) service on editorial boards;
- 5) service as officer of a national or international professional societies;
- 6) awards or honors;
- 7) appointments to government review and advisory panels and/or committees;
- 8) appointments to major committees of national and international professional societies;

9) other types of recognition.

B. CLINICAL EDUCATOR TRACK:

This track may be selected for full-time members of the faculty (physicians) whose primary professional activities are teaching and clinical service. However, a tangible contribution to academic scholarship is expected.

Physicians are often appointed initially to the CE track even though they may have a significant commitment to research. Faculty on CE track may subsequently transfer to the tenure-earning track, with appropriate agreements and evaluations. Faculty on the CE track is given academic titles with the word 'Clinical' inserted before the name of the discipline (e.g. Assistant Professor of Clinical Pediatrics).

Promotions in the CE track are based on evaluation of the candidate's contributions toward advancement of clinical knowledge through scholarly endeavors, including published clinical reviews, reports of innovative treatment, case reports, outcome studies and authorship of reports by major commissions or committees on healthcare issues, etc.

Promotion in the CE track signifies that the candidate has made significant contributions in more than one area of academic life and a tangible contribution in the other. These areas include:

- 1) clinical and/or administrative service;
- 2) teaching; and
- 3) clinical research.

In general, promotion or appointment at the Associate Professor level requires a candidate to demonstrate recognition within his/her referral area (i.e. local, regional, state) whereas promotion or appointment to Professor requires a national reputation. Time-in-grade is a minor criterion for promotion in the CE track, and is not in itself a sufficient prerequisite.

B-1 CLINICAL EDUCATOR TRACK:

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor or Appointment as Associate Professor (CE Track)

B-1a. Clinical and Administrative Service (CE Track):

1) Clinical Activity:

If clinical activity is a major portion of the candidate's application, evidence must be presented describing the candidate's accomplishments in this and related activities, such as the number of clinics attended, type of patients seen, procedures performed inpatient responsibilities, and outreach activities including community service. Other areas of clinical activity may be considered. Evidence of excellence in performing clinical responsibilities should include:

- 1) evaluations of the candidate's clinical activities and performance by three recognized authorities in the candidate's field including at least one letter from outside the School. Ideally, these letters should review the candidate's regional reputation and compare the candidate with other faculty of similar rank and experience. If only one outside letter is provided, the writer must not have been responsible for any portion of the candidate's training. If it is not possible to obtain at least one outside letter, an explanation of the special-case status must be provided, and a letter from a colleague in another department within the School may suffice;
- 2) a scholarly approach to patient care as demonstrated by: a) knowledge and/or use of current concepts and techniques, or development of new diagnostic and/or treatment programs; and b) local and regional dissemination of this knowledge to students and/or patients, as evidenced by the presentation of seminars or written materials, CME programs, Department conferences, and a bibliography of publications. Copies of CME written materials and publications, which support a scholarly approach to patient care, should be included with the candidate's file;

- 3) documentation of clinical activities (e.g. yearly statistics describing referral numbers, clinics attended, procedures performed, number of private patients, etc).

2) Administrative Activity:

If present or past professional service to the Department, School, Hospital, University or community is an important aspect of the candidate's application, such service must be documented in one or more of the following areas:

- 1) major committee assignments with the candidate's role on the committee and time commitment;
- 2) administrative assignments or duties with end product, the candidate's role and time commitment;
- 3) professional administration and program development with end product, the candidate's role and time commitment. If supervising a clinical or administrative unit, this unit should be identified and its mission described together with the duties and responsibilities of the candidate and evidence of program growth including its regional and state reputation;
- 4) professional service to local, regional or governmental units should be listed with the candidate's role and time commitment;
- 5) appointment or election to office in city, county or state medical and health-care societies;
- 6) service as an examiner for a specialty certifying board.

Letters should be solicited from beneficiaries of the services described to document the significance of the candidate's contributions.

B-1b. Teaching Activities:

If teaching is a major portion of the candidate's application, evidence must be presented that the candidate has developed and/or conducted teaching programs of high quality. Two types of teaching may be distinguished; a) clinical teaching that involves lectures, demonstrations, individual and group teaching in a clinical setting, and postgraduate and continuing education; and b) classroom teaching that includes lectures, seminars, laboratories, discussion groups and workshops etc.

Documentation must include:

- 1) a synopsis of teaching assignments including conferences, student teaching, laboratories, etc;
- 2) Department and other peer evaluation of teaching abilities. Examples of instructional materials, such as handouts used in the candidate's teaching, are helpful and may be provided. A description of the application of new or improved teaching methods should be provided, if appropriate. In addition, copies of instructional textbooks, software, or audiovisual aides should be made available to the APT Committee;
- 3) evaluations of teaching by medical students, house staff, fellows and other health professionals. A summary of all teaching evaluations should be provided. Individual evaluations must be available, if requested, but these may not be used as a substitute for the summary statement.

B-2c. Clinical-Research Activities:

If clinical research is a major component of the candidate's application, evidence must be presented that the candidate has had major involvement in the research, and that the research is of high quality and significance. Even if research is not a major component, a tangible contribution to academic scholarship through research is expected.

Documentation must include:

- 1) a statement from the candidate that describes the research efforts, accomplishments to date, and future goals (maximum: 2 pages);

- 2) three letters of evaluation of the research programs from recognized authorities in the candidate's field, with at least one letter from outside the School. Letters should assess the quality and productivity of the candidate's research. If letters provided as documentation of excellence in other activities (clinical or administrative service, teaching, etc) include comments on research, they may suffice in this category;
- 3) a bibliography including case reports and clinical reviews resulting from this research;
- 4) chronology of research support listing source, the principal investigator, candidate's role and annual and total direct costs.

2. Promotion from Associate to Professor or Appointment as Clinical Professor (CE track)

Promotion or appointment as Professor requires that the candidate has continued to grow in stature and has remained productive with respect to service, teaching and clinical research.

Documentation of further excellence since initial appointment or promotion must be provided. Promotion or appointment to Professor requires national recognition in the candidate's field and must include scholarly clinical publications. **Supporting evidence may include:**

- 1) service as a speaker at state, regional or national conferences;
- 2) promotion of relationships with Pan-American and/or other international professional medical societies;
- 3) service as a visiting professor;
- 4) preparation of books, chapters, or reviews;
- 5) service on editorial boards, or as officer of a national professional society;
- 6) awards or honors;
- 7) appointment to government-review panels or committees;
- 8) appointment to major committees of state or national professional societies;
- 9) other types of recognition;
- 10) documentation of funds raised by clinical service or clinical research;

C. RESEARCH TRACK:

Faculty members in this track should be those who devote virtually their entire effort to research.

1. Promotion from Research Assistant Professor to Research Associate Professor or Appointment as Research Associate Professor:

In general, promotion or appointment at the Research Associate Professor level requires demonstration of the national reputation of the candidate's research and a record of independent funding.

C-1a. Research Activities (Research Track):

Evidence must be presented that the candidate has had major involvement in an extramurally funded research program that is of high quality and significance. **Documentation must include:**

- 1) the candidate's description of the research program, accomplishments to date and future goals (maximum: 2 pages);
- 2) a record of independent funding as a Principal Investigator (PI) on a federal/national-level research grant. In some instances, this can be as a PI on a sub-project of a multi-investigator-initiated research program (e.g. Center Grant, Program Project);
- 3) three letters of evaluation of the candidate's research program from recognized authorities in the candidate's field from outside the School. Letters should assess the quality and productivity of the candidate's research;
- 4) a bibliography itemizing high-quality publications resulting from the candidate's research;

- 5) a detailed chronology of present and past research support describing the PI, role of the candidate and funding amounts.

C-1b. Committee Service/Administration: (Research Track)

Although committee and administrative service is not a major component of the duties in this faculty track, evidence of being a responsible citizen of the School is helpful such as through service on committees relevant to research endeavors (e.g. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee).

C-1c. Teaching Contribution (Research Track):

Although teaching is not a major component of the duties in this faculty track, evidence of participation in the School's teaching mission, either at the graduate/medical-school student or postgraduate-fellow level should be noted.

C-1d. Peer Recognition (Research Track):

Additional information that would be of assistance to the Committee relates to evidence of the esteem in which the candidate is held by peers at regional and national levels. Such evidence may include:

- 1) positions of leadership or responsibility in organizations, agencies, and professional societies;
- 2) responsibilities as manuscript reviewer for scientific journals, or appointments to their editorial boards;
- 3) participation on NIH or NSF study sections, consultant panels, and advisory boards, or the equivalent;
- 4) visiting faculty and/or the presentation of invited lectures.

2. Promotion from Research Associate Professor to Research Professor or Appointment as Research Professor:

Promotion or appointment to Research Professor requires that the candidate has continued to grow in stature and has gained international recognition for his/her research. Documentation of further excellence since initial appointment or promotion must be provided. Grant support from federal programs must have been essentially continuous through the present appointment, and evidence of continued productivity through the publication of high-quality reports must be provided. **Other supporting evidence may include:**

- 1) service as a speaker at national and international conferences;
- 2) service as a visiting Research Professor at other institutions;
- 3) preparation of books, chapters, or reviews;
- 4) service on editorial boards;
- 5) service as an officer in national or international professional societies;
- 6) awards or honors;
- 7) appointment to governmental review and advisory panels and/or committees;
- 8) appointment to major committees of national and international professional societies;
- 9) other types of recognition;
- 10) evidence of continued independent funding.

D. EDUCATOR TRACK:

Note: Appointments to this track are currently only approved in the Department of Cell Biology & Anatomy

Faculty members in this track are those (physicians or non-physicians) with a terminal degree, who devote virtually all of their effort to teaching. Members of the faculty may elect to be considered for promotion in the educator track at the School, following appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor.

Promotion in the educator track signifies that the candidate has performed outstanding service and/or teaching and has provided evidence of continued growth in the current position. In general, promotion or

appointment at the Associate Professor level requires local recognition, whereas promotion or appointment to Professor requires a regional reputation.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor or Appointment as Associate Professor on the educator track:

Evidence must be presented describing the candidate's accomplishments in his/her area of clinical or teaching activity. Evidence of excellence in performing clinical or teaching duties should include:

- 1) three letters of evaluation of the candidate's performance from individuals based either outside or within the School. Letters should compare the candidate with other faculty of similar rank and experience. As noted above, the Chairperson must specify the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate, provide the APT Committee with a brief description of the stature and qualifications of the evaluators and with a copy of the letter requesting the evaluations, and certify that all letters of evaluation received are included in the candidate's materials.

2. Promotion to Professor or Appointment as Professor on the educator track:

In addition to the documentation required for promotion or appointment to Educator Associate Professor, evidence must be presented that the candidate has continued to grow in stature in his/her teaching-activity area. Documentation of further excellence since the initial appointment or promotion must be provided.

II. REVIEW OF DEANS

This ad hoc committee, appointed jointly by the Faculty Council and the Dean , was formed to consider an evaluation process for all of the Executive, Deputy, Associate, and Assistant Deans of the Medical School. The School Council and the Dean are seeking ways to promote greater interaction and sense of community within the Miller School of Medicine. Many measures are being considered including those that apply to the academic administration. To this end, the roles and responsibilities of individuals with decanal titles should undergo regular review. The appearance of undue increasing separation of these individuals from the general medical faculty concerns us. Accordingly, we have endorsed the following proposals to be applied to all decanally titled persons:

1. *They must have a departmentally identifiable appointment as Full-time faculty of the School of Medicine.*
2. *They must have a significant and continuing teaching, research, and/or clinical responsibilities.*

These proposals are not meant to provide undue hardship for presently appointed individuals. A departure from these principles for future appointments requires formal approval by the Dean with a report to the School Council.

Adhering to these principles will protect and legitimize individuals who serve in decanate offices with the expectation that he/she will eventually return to the faculty at large, with only a finite term as dean. This will promote freshness of perspective and outlook, which are important to all decanal positions.

As a policy of the Miller School of Medicine, the evaluation process will expand in scope to anyone with a decanal title. They will be reviewed quadrennially and formally by an appropriately identified constituency in the way that chairs and deans are currently evaluated as defined in the Faculty Manual (9/1/94), #A12.3, 12.4, pg 13, (See appendix 1)

We have asked the Faculty Senate to serve the same administrative function as it already does for the Dean and the Chairs. It is understood that this request does not imply any explicit or implicit burden on other schools of the University to evaluate Associate or Assistants Deans. One fourth of the Deans will be evaluated each year.

The Evaluation form, already in use for the Dean and the Chairs, will be used for evaluation of these additional Deans. (See appendix 2)

The positions of Assistant Deans for Homeless Education, V.A. Research Administration, and Financial Assistance, have not been included below. It is the feeling of this committee that these three positions as defined at present should be titled in a different manner.

It is also the position of this committee that the regular review process be extended to others, possible including recognized Division Directors in large departments. Other individuals who might be reviewed regularly include senior administrators of the Medical School.

Constituencies: The eligible evaluating faculty members, by the nature of the individual position and functions, will consist of the following individuals:

For all Deans:

1. All Chairs
2. All School Council members *

The following include special constituencies for each Dean:

1. **(A) Executive Dean for Clinical Affairs**
(B) Senior Associate Dean for Clinical Affairs
Division chiefs
Clinical center directors
UMMG governing board members *
2. **(A) Senior Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs**
(B) Associate Dean for Faculty Diversity and Development
Members of Promotion/Tenure Committee
Members of Faculty Development Committee
Division chiefs
Center directors
3. **(A) Senior Associate Dean, Medical Education**
(B) Executive Dean for Education
Course coordinators
Members of the Executive Promotions Committee *
Members of the Admissions Committee *
Members of the Curriculum Committee *
Division chiefs
4. **Senior Associate Dean, Veterans Affairs**
All Veterans Administration faculty who held an appointment at the VA for a minimum of one year over the previous four years
5. **Executive Dean for Research**
Members of the Scientific Review Committee *
Members of the Research Advisory Committee *
Veterinary faculty
Members of IACUC Committee *
Division chiefs

Heads of centers

Principal investigators of grants or contracts \$ \$100,000

- 6. Associate Dean, Admissions and Enrollment**
Members of the Admissions Committee
- 7. Associate Dean, Community Health Affairs**
Faculty of the Department of Family Medicine
Faculty participating in Generalist initiative
- 8. Associate Dean, Graduate Studies**
All faculty with Graduate Faculty appointments
- 9. Associate Dean, Minority Affairs**
Members of the Admissions Committee *
Members of the Executive Promotions Committee *
- 10. Associate Dean, Student Affairs**
Members of the Admission Committee *
Members of the Curriculum Committee *
Members of the Executive Promotions Committee *
Faculty who serve on the Student counseling service
- 11. Assistant Dean, Medical Curriculum**
Assistant Dean, Medical Curriculum
Members of the Curriculum Committee *
Course coordinators
- 12. Assistant Dean for Financial Assistance**

** All members who have served any time over the previous four years*

2000 Evaluation Form

Part I General Comments

These comments will be forwarded to the School Faculty Council. **Note:** If certain comments could reveal your identity, please include them on a separate sheet. These additional comments will be summarized and forwarded to the Provost, the Dean, and a member of the General Welfare Committee.

Please **type or print** your answers to each of the following questions:

1. **What are the key strengths of the _____?**

2. **What are the key weaknesses of the _____?**

3. **What are the main accomplishments of the _____ over the past four years?**

4. **How could this _____ improve her/his overall effectiveness?**

2000 Evaluation:

Part II

Main Ballot

A tabulation of the votes on each question will be transmitted to the Dean and the School Faculty Council.

5. **Overall, the performance of the _____ should be rated as:**

_____Excellent

_____Good

_____Fair

_____Poor

6. **In your opinion, the interests of your Department, College/School, profession, and the University would best be served by:**

_____Retention of the _____

_____Replacement of the _____

III. Guidelines for Searches for Department Chairs (and Formal Leadership Positions of Other Academic Units) at the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine

The selection of leadership for a Department in the Miller School of Medicine (or for one of its principal academic units) is an important event in the history of the institution, often significantly affecting for some years not only the educational, research and clinical activities of the Department and its faculty but also the programs of other Departments, the School and the University.

The principles governing the Search for Chairs should include the following:

- (a) The opportunity to select new leadership should be made use of to assess the strengths, weaknesses, future directions and needs of the Department.
- (b) The Search should be guided by this assessment and by the goals defined and the resources made available by the Dean.
- (c) Every effort should be made to assure the participation of Department faculty in the assessment and Search process and to keep faculty members regularly informed of the status of the Search.
- (d) The interests in the outcome of the Search of other Departments, of closely affiliated institutions and of the community should be recognized.
- (e) The goal of the Search should be to identify the most highly qualified candidate or candidates by a process that is timely, thorough, fair, sensitive to the potential for effective leadership in a diverse pool of candidates and as open as discretion permits; it is also important that the search process reflect well on the School. To achieve these ends, defined procedures should be followed whenever possible, tempered by flexibility where appropriate.
- (f) The outcome of the Search process should provide the Dean, as the appointing authority, with one or more recommendations that will, in the most desirable circumstance, have the support of the Department faculty, as well as of other interested constituencies, so as to provide vigorous, effective and collegial leadership for the Department and the School in the pursuit of academic excellence in the years that follow.
- (g) The Search process should conform with the written provisions and the intent of the University of Miami Faculty Manual.

The following procedures and practices are recommended in support of these principles:

1. In recognition of the importance to the School of Chair Searches; of the desirability of an orderly, efficient and generally uniform Search process that reflects well on the School; of the advantage to making use of institutional experience over time with the Search process; and of the considerable administrative burden generated by a Search carried out so as to achieve these goals, a staff individual should be appointed by the Dean to serve as continuing Coordinator for Searches for the School.

2. As soon as possible after a Chair becomes vacant, decisions should be made and announced by the Dean to the Department and the School concerning plans for interim leadership and for a Search. Prolonged tenure of Interim (Acting) Chairs is not in the best interests of the Department and the School and such appointments should rarely exceed two years. If such an appointment is to be extended, the Dean should convey the basis for this decision before the end of the second year both to the faculty of the Department (in a meeting convened for an exchange of views on the matter) and to the School Faculty Council.
3. The announcement of a change in Chair should promptly initiate a thoughtful Departmentally-based assessment of the academic and administrative strengths, weaknesses, future directions and needs of the Department in the context of the status of its discipline nationally and of local considerations. A tenured member of the Department faculty should be chosen by the Department to lead this assessment effort, which should include the participation of faculty of various ranks and interests. The assessment may involve consultation with others in the local and national academic communities and should be concluded within three months. A written report of the assessment and of recommendations based on it should be circulated to Department faculty for comment. The final Assessment Report, revised if appropriate and appending additional views as necessary, should be made available to Department faculty, to the Dean, to the subsequently constituted Search Committee and, at some point in the Search process, to Chair candidates. A meeting of the Dean with the Department faculty should be held for the purpose of exchanging views on the final Assessment Report.
4. A Chair Search Committee should be appointed by the Dean within four months of announcement of a Chair becoming vacant. The composition of the Committee should reflect the major interactions and academic and institutional partnerships of the Department and should include at least two Department members chosen by vote of the Department faculty (one, in the case of Departments with fewer than 20 faculty). For clinical departments, the Committee should include at least one representative from the Miami VA Medical Center for those Departments having services at that facility; at least one community-based physician who is a member of the Voluntary Faculty (preferably a graduate of the School or of its programs); and a senior administrator of Jackson Memorial Medical Center for those Chairs who will also serve as Chiefs of Service there. The Committee should include representation of women and minorities. At least one member of the Committee shall be a member of the School Faculty Council whose responsibility it will be to keep the Council regularly informed of the status of the Search. All members of the Committee must be members of the faculty, with the exception of administrators at JMMC. The Chair of the Committee will be designated by the Dean and must be a full-time member of the faculty.
5. The Dean will personally convey a Charge to the Committee at one of its initial meetings, including projected goals for the future development of the Department, views of the type of leadership needed and information as specific as possible about the resources to be made available to the new Chair. The Dean's views on the Department's Assessment Report should be made known. The purpose of the Charge is to guide the Committee and provide an appropriate context for the Search. The time-frame envisioned for the Search should be discussed; rarely should this extend beyond one year.

6. At its early meetings, the Committee will:

- (a) review the Dean's charge
- (b) review these Guidelines
- (c) review the Department's Assessment Report, other pertinent background and resource information and the views of Committee members concerning the Department's strengths, weaknesses, directions and needs
- (d) hear invited presentations from within (and outside) the Department
- (e) decide on the desirability of outside consultation and proceed with relevant arrangements, if appropriate
- (f) agree on means to identify the appropriate candidate pool (academic leaders and organizations to be contacted concerning potential candidates, professional journal advertising, etc.)
- (g) agree on specific means to assure active solicitation of women and minorities as potential candidates and their inclusion in the candidate pool (including contacting appropriate local and national individuals and organizations)
- (h) review and approve drafts prepared by the Committee Chair of the advertisement of the position; of letters soliciting potential candidates, including a letter to School and Department faculty soliciting their nominations and a letter inviting Department faculty to indicate willingness themselves to be considered for the position; and of letters acknowledging receipt of suggestions of candidates
- (i) attempt to formulate the characteristics of desirable candidates based on (a), (c), (d) and (e)
- (j) under the supervision of the Chair (and with the support of the Coordinator), establish a confidential file regularly available to all Committee members on each candidate proposed, to include background material, correspondence and written documentation of telephone discussions and other contacts pertinent to the candidate
- (k) assure compliance with University and School regulations for recruitment and selection through early coordination (as soon as (h) is completed) with the Offices of Faculty Affairs and Affirmative Action
- (l) make provision for a written but confidential record to be kept of each of the Committee's meetings, to include an accounting of date, time and those present and of procedural and substantive actions reported on and taken (but not of opinions or evaluations expressed or conveyed by Committee members or others)

7. At subsequent meetings, the Committee will:

- (a) review and assign preliminary ratings to candidates proposed
- (b) decide, based on these ratings, on candidates concerning whom additional information will be sought
- (c) solicit at least three letters of recommendation for each of these candidates
- (d) agree on appropriate informal telephone contacts concerning such candidates (with the understanding that written records will be made of contacts for inclusion in candidate files)
- (e) assure that women and minority candidates have been actively solicited and, if appropriate, included among candidates to be further considered
- (f) determine that potential candidates from within the Department have responded to the Committee's invitation to declare their willingness to be considered

8. After reviewing information obtained from (6), the Committee will agree on inviting suitable candidates for one or more visits to the Medical Center. Careful plans will be made for the content and structure of these visits. Among pertinent considerations are:
 - (a) the importance of careful attention to the convenience, comfort, hospitality and impressions conveyed to candidates, not only in the context of the Search, but also in view of the significance of such visits as expressions of the standards of the Medical Center beyond the outcomes of the Search
 - (b) the need to provide for meaningful interactions between candidates and current leadership at the Medical Center, as well as with Committee members individually or in small groups
 - (c) the desirability of providing (usually at the time of a second visit) for meaningful interactions between candidates and individuals or groups of Department faculty, including faculty of various ranks and interests; and of assuring that, at some time before a final recommendation on candidates is made by the Committee, arrangements are made for each candidate to meet with the Department as a whole for purposes of a presentation by, and exchange of views with the candidate in an open forum
 - (d) the requirement to solicit written (but confidential) impressions by all who interact with a candidate, such opinions to be included in the candidate's file that is accessible to Committee members. (The Committee will consider the desirability of requesting structured responses by means of forms made available to those whose opinions are solicited, using models kept on file by the Coordinator)
 - (e) the need to assure that candidates that are being considered from within the Department are accorded the same opportunities for interaction as those invited to visit from other institution
 - (f) the requirement for an extended meeting of the entire Committee with each candidate, preferably near the end of the visit
9. The Committee will meet regularly during this ongoing process of visits and evaluations to review and discuss impressions of the candidates. At its discretion and judgment, the Committee will continue this process until a consensus is reached that it is prepared to recommend with enthusiasm at least one and preferably two or more candidates for the position to the Dean. Before making such recommendations, the Committee will undertake to confirm discreetly but with confidence the experience and credentials listed by candidates being considered for recommendation. Once the Committee has agreed on a roster of candidates to be recommended to the Dean, a formal but confidential poll of Committee members will take place to provide a ranking of those candidates being recommended. The results of this poll will not be made known to the Committee but will be conveyed in a written report to the Dean by the Committee Chair and maintained by the Dean in the School records of the Search process. As soon as possible after receiving the list (and ranking) of recommended candidates, the Dean will meet with the entire Committee for an exchange of views concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates recommended.
10. While not bound by the Search Committee's recommendations, the Dean, as the appointing authority, will ordinarily proceed to negotiate conditions of appointment with one or more of the recommended candidates. At some time before a final decision and formal offer of appointment are made by the Dean, and preferably as early in this process

as possible, the Dean will obtain a formal but confidential vote of the Department faculty (acting as the 'Consultative Committee' prescribed in the Faculty Manual) concerning the appointment of a candidate, as mandated by the Faculty Charter. The poll of Department faculty for this purpose will be carried out by the Speaker of the School Faculty Council (or a designee, if deemed appropriate), with the result conveyed in confidence to the Dean. The Dean is advised to take this vote into serious consideration before making a final decision to proceed with an offer of appointment.

11. As a matter of collegiality and courtesy, it is anticipated that the Dean will meet with the Department faculty to announce the outcome of the Search before this decision is made public. The Dean will consider the desirability of describing at this time the basis for the decision, especially if it deviates from the recommendations of the Search Committee or of the Department faculty.

While these guidelines are not intended to have the binding effect of formal regulation, it is expected that the basis for any significant deviation from the practices and procedures recommended will be made clear to those involved.

Approved by the Faculty Council and the Dean of the School of Medicine
March 1999
And Revised on May 2008

IV. FACULTY TEACHING EVALUATION FORM:

1. TAL Teaching Activities Log (FORM #1)

- completed by *individual faculty member*
- documents teaching hours on annual basis
- reflects different teaching roles and responsibilities (single lecture vs. Course Coordinator)
- reflects the *quantity* of teaching responsibilities (some faculty teach more than others, and basic science faculty have many hours of mentoring in bench research that should receive credit)

2. TES -Teaching Evaluations Summary (FORM #2)

- completed by *Department* annually (beginning 1999-00, with 5 year summary for APT in 2003-04)
- summarizes the *quantity* of teaching in each area of teaching responsibility (using a scale of] -5)
- for major teaching responsibilities (i.e. "lectures to MD students") where there is quantitative documentation (i.e. on the TAL form, FORM#1), there should be a corresponding score, from 1-5 on this form (as shown in the examples that follow, in the "Instructions to Departments -Standardized Procedures")
- can be an important element for faculty development on Departmental level

3. SFEF Student/Fellow Evaluation of Faculty Form (FORM #3)

- completed by *students/fellows* for individual faculty member
- completed for areas that are applicable for the faculty member
- forms the basis of the *quality* of the teaching, above in item #2 (TES Form, FORM #2).
- can be an important element for faculty development on Departmental level

4. PEF. Peer Evaluation } Form (FORM #4)

- completed by *Peer* for one or more of the areas noted on *TAL*, FORM #1 (the peer should be at the same rank or above)
- can also be summarized by Chair for annual review or APT review
- also for on-going faculty evaluation and development by the Chair, especially for junior faculty members

Summary:

Through the use of these 4 forms, more definitive data will be available regarding both the *quantity* and *quality* of teaching performed by the faculty within the SOM.

Documentation of the quality of teaching will incorporate both student and peer reviews of teaching performed, which can then be verbally summarized as an overall assessment. This information, including both quantitative and qualitative components, will assist the individual faculty member in their own self-assessment, a critical component in the Teaching Portfolio. It will also assist the Department Chair in assessing individual faculty development and evaluation for the annual review and for APT recommendations.

These forms can be downloaded and readily adapted for individual departments, according to their needs (i.e. basic science departments can omit or delete sections not applicable, such as "Residents/Fellows" section, or "CME" section).

Standardized Procedures for the Administration of Forms to Evaluate Faculty Teaching (SFEF - FORM #3)

1. The evaluation should be conducted as soon as possible after a teaching session or series of sessions is over, preferably the same day or the next day.
2. The forms should be distributed and collected by someone other than the faculty member to be evaluated (ex. teaching assistant, course coordinator, or one of the students/fellows themselves).
3. The teacher who is evaluated must not be present during the administration of the form.
4. The rating forms will be filled out by students anonymously.
5. Forms should be collected once completed and brought to the Department Office for tabulation.
6. To evaluate a teacher's instructional effectiveness for a promotion decision, a minimum number of students -two-thirds -taking a Course must complete an evaluation form.

7. TABULATION:

a) for each of the 14 items on the SFEF , FORM #3 (or for each item used, if not all applicable), two calculations are needed:

1) frequency count

Ex. Count all items for each response category = total # of student forms submitted (52 in this example)

5 - 12
4 - 20
3 - 10
2 - 5
1 - 5

2) summary tabulation -get mean + range score for each item

Ex. (As above): Multiply the items, as shown:

5 - 12	60
4 - 20	80
3 - 10	30
2 - 5	10
1 - 5	5

Sum= $185/52 = 3.56$, range = 1-5, with 62% in the 4-5 range

This will allow for a mean score, a range score, and an indication of the majority of students' evaluation of this item.

- 3) Repeat for each item that is applicable
- 4) Tabulate Overall Score -mean of each item, divided by the # of items that are applicable

Ex. 3.56, 4.25, 5.0, 5.0, 4.2, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 5.0, 5.0 (10 items)

Sum total = 46.01/10 = 4.6 Overall Score

- 5). Finally, summarize the Comments on the bottom of the page, written in by the students

Ex. "The best teacher I have ever had" - 10 students
"Really cares about the student's learning" - 15 students
"Could have better, clearer slides" - 3 students

- 6). Completed Results:

Submit 1 copy to Department Chair (for faculty evaluation and development) and 1 copy to the Faculty member

FORM #1 Teaching Activities Log -(TAL) -AY
(Hours per Month *Quantity* -Recorded by faculty member)

Faculty Member: _____

Department: _____

Category of Students/Month	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
Medical Students Classroom lectures Clerkship lectures Course. Coordinator Preceptorships Teaching rounds Laboratories Clinical one-on-one Formal student advising Preparation time for teaching Total hours												
Graduate Student Classroom teaching Graduate Seminars Course coordinator Laboratories Advising Thesis Advising Preparation time for teaching Total hours												
Residents/Clin&Research Fcllows Formal lectures Conferences Teaching rounds Laboratory one-on-one Clinical one-on-one Total hours												
Cont. Education-(CME-taught) Formal lectures GrandRounds Total hours												
Other Presentations Community presentation Prof/Scientific presentations Other: Total hours												

(Each year should include the summarized student evaluation results [Scale 1-5] for each appropriate category - done by the Department -phase in, beginning AY 1999-00)

Faculty Member: _____

Department: _____

Category of Students/Year	yr1	yr2	yr3	yr4	yr5	5 yr Summ.
Medical Students Classroom Lectures Clerkship lectures Course Coordinator Preceptorships Teaching rounds Laboratories Clinical one-on-one Formal student advising						
Graduate Students Classroom teaching Course Coordinator Graduate seminars Laboratories Advising Thesis Advising						
Residents/ Clin & Research Fellows Formal lectures Conferences Teaching rounds Laboratory one-on-one Clinical one-on-one						
Cont. Education (CME - taught) Formal lectures Grand Rounds						
Other Presentations Community presentations Prof/Scientific presentations Other:						

FORM #3 Student/fellow Evaluation of Faculty Form -(SFEF)

(To be completed by Students/Fellows)

Faculty Member: _____
Course / Service: _____

Department: _____
Date: _____

(Circle one) MS1 MS2 MSJ MS4 Resident Fellow Graduate Student

Number and Type or Teaching sessions _____

Evaluate the faculty member in each of the following categories using this scale:

5 = Excellent / Outstanding

2 = Below average

4 = Better than average

1 = Poor / Unacceptable

3 = Average / Acceptable

NA = Not applicable or did not occur

A. General Qualities of the Instructor (applies to all teaching venues)

1. Clarity and organization of presentations	NA	1	2	3	4	5
2. Enthusiasm for the subject	NA	1	2	3	4	5
3. Skill in communicating ideas	NA	1	2	3	4	5
4. Interaction/rapport with learners	NA	1	2	3	4	5
5. Ability to serve as a role model	NA	1	2	3	4	5

B. Small-group Conferences/Seminars/Ward Rounds & Clinics (where applicable)

6. Skill in facilitating discussions	NA	1	2	3	4	5
7. Capacity to get learners to think for themselves	NA	1	2	3	4	5
8. Skill in providing feedback to learners	NA	1	2	3	4	5
9. Interaction/rapport with patients	NA	1	2	3	4	5
10. Ability to foster collaboration among members of group/medical team	NA	1	2	3	4	5

C. Research Teaching Activities (where applicable)

11. Skill in facilitating research discussion	NA	1	2	3	4	5
12. Ability to fosters critical thinking	NA	1	2	3	4	5
13. Mentors the development of career	NA	1	2	3	4	5

D. Overall assessment of faculty teaching	NA	1	2	3	4	5
---	----	---	---	---	---	---

FORM #4 – Peer Teaching Evaluation Form – (PEF)

Faculty Member: _____
Department: _____
Course / Service: _____
Date: _____

Type of Observation. (Circle one or more) of the following -Should relate to one or more of the areas identified on the Quantity (TAL)/Quality (TES)Forms -FORM # 1 and #2; or may use more than one Peer Evaluation Form for each observation, if different modes are observed)

- Lecture Laboratory Seminar Conference Grand Rounds
 Clerkship Teaching Rounds One-on-One CME Course Course Coordinator
 Prof/Scientific Paper Presentation Preceptorship

Evaluate the faculty member in each of the following categories using the scale below:

- 5 = Excellent / Outstanding 2 = Below average*
4 = Better than average 1 = Poor / Unacceptable
3 = Average/Acceptable N/A = Not applicable or did not occur

1. Knowledge of subject matter.	NA	1	2	3	4	5
2. Interest and enthusiasm in teaching.	NA	1	2	3	4	5
3. Material/presentation is well organized.	NA	1	2	3	4	5
4. Presentation relevant to audience.	NA	1	2	3	4	5
5. Stimulates interest in subject matter	NA	1	2	3	4	5
6. Explains concepts well, even when new or difficult.	NA	1	2	3	4	5
7. Overall evaluation of this teacher.	NA	1	2	3	4	5

Comments of Peer Observer:

Comments of Course Coordinator / Chair

Person performing this assessment:

Name

Date