
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER
The College of Medicine

The purpose of this survey is to insure that all aspects of a faculty member's contributions are clearly documented and conveyed to the diverse group of people, MD and Ph.D., charged with considering that faculty member for promotion.

No promotion should be made solely based on points, although the point system defines a minimum level of accomplishment that must be met by the faculty. Having achieved the required points, all candidates are still required to meet the specific minimum career-track requirements of the rank to which they are seeking promotion.

One copy of the completed survey, 4 pages with one page devoted per mission, should be submitted with the nomination package of a given faculty going up for promotion and/or tenure. The survey should be completed by the Departmental P&T Committee and confirmed by the Chair. A score of 3 must be justified by statements in the Chair's letter and supported by documentation provided in the candidate's dossier.

If a department does not have at least three tenured faculty members (Faculty Handbook Section 4.4.2) the College P & T Committee (Faculty Handbook Section 4.4.3) will perform the evaluation.

Things to note:

- No one faculty member is expected to meet all expectations in all missions and categories.
- **These metric characteristics are guidelines, not absolute standards or policy/rules.** They are not all inclusive, nor sufficient for promotion. They are an indicator of suitability for promotion.
- When considering if a nominee is below, meeting, or exceeding expectations the comparison to be made is to faculty currently holding the rank being requested.
- Intangibles that may move faculty from a 2 (meets expectations) to a 3 (exceeds expectations) in a given category/mission include such things as:
 - A faculty member who is a team player or catalyst for intra- and interdepartmental and/or inter-institutional interactions, collaborations or ventures at a level above and beyond the average faculty
 - A faculty member whose spirit, optimistic outlook and/or interpersonal interactions energize and enhance the activities and attitude of their colleagues; i.e., yielding a situation where the whole is greater than the sum of the parts
 - A faculty member who consistently volunteers or takes on teaching, scholarly, clinical and/or service duties while meeting/exceeding expectations in maintaining their normal scope of activities

An explanation for moving a faculty from a 2 to a 3 for these intangibles must be provided in the Chair or Departmental letter for that faculty.

To complete the Metric Survey you will need to know the current College of Medicine guidelines on minimum publications. Remember publications to meet these minimums are counted only over the period when the faculty is at their current rank.

Track	Assistant to Associate Prof	Associate Prof to Full Prof
Non-tenure (clinicians, teachers)	2	5
Non-tenure (researchers)	5	10
Tenure	5	10

- The "final" calculated score value and its application to promotion is summarized as:
 - For promotion to Assistant Professor, the candidate must accumulate a total of 3.5 points if he/she does not have a clinical practice and 4.0 points if he/she has practice responsibilities.
 - For promotion to Associate Professor, the accumulation of a minimum of 6 points is required from new/continuing activities since appointment or last promotion.
 - For promotion to Professor, the accumulation of a minimum of 7.5 points is required from new/continuing activities since appointment or last promotion.

COMPOSITE TEACHING: check (✓) all those applicable

Faculty Candidate _____
Department _____

A. Teaching Director

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> did a below average job as Director of Course, Clerkship, Residency or Fellowship training	<input type="checkbox"/> did a good job as Director of Course, Clerkship, Residency or Fellowship training <input type="checkbox"/> was Associate Director of Course, Clerkship, Residency or Fellowship	<input type="checkbox"/> did an exceptional job as Director of Course, Clerkship, Residency or Fellowship training <input type="checkbox"/> maintained more than 1 Directorships of Course, Clerkship, Residency or Fellowship training

B. Other Teaching Duties

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> refused to assume additional lecture hours or clerkship/GME responsibilities yet below the department/division average in lecture hours <input type="checkbox"/> refused to accept mentoring responsibilities as is consistent with department/division averages <input type="checkbox"/> failed to appear at scheduled teaching / mentoring obligations	<input type="checkbox"/> number of lecture hours or clerkship/GME efforts were consistent with average of the same of comparable department/division <input type="checkbox"/> consistently mentored trainees <input type="checkbox"/> served on thesis or research oversight committees <input type="checkbox"/> current or past trainees have done well / progressed appropriately	<input type="checkbox"/> lecture hours or clerkship/GME efforts were >25% above the average of the same or comparable department /division <input type="checkbox"/> number of mentored trainees was significantly greater than the faculty average for the same or comparable department/division <input type="checkbox"/> served on multiple thesis committees beyond that of a typical faculty member <input type="checkbox"/> current/past students or trainees have excelled and/or received faculty positions or awards

C. Acknowledged Excellence in Teaching

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> consistently received poor reviews in evaluations <input type="checkbox"/> consistently received poor reviews from Director of teaching/training program	<input type="checkbox"/> student/trainee evaluations note a job well done <input type="checkbox"/> consensus among Faculty and Director of teaching program of a job well done	<input type="checkbox"/> received multiple teaching awards <input type="checkbox"/> consistently received outstanding student/trainee evaluations <input type="checkbox"/> consistently received outstanding review by Director of program

D. Innovation in Teaching

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> used out-of-date information <input type="checkbox"/> material disorganized and presented in an uninteresting fashion <input type="checkbox"/> lacked clear objectives in training/lectures <input type="checkbox"/> ignored questions and requests for added help <input type="checkbox"/> lectures were duplication of book or other single source <input type="checkbox"/> exams were arbitrary in material tested <input type="checkbox"/> (other, describe below)	<input type="checkbox"/> well organized and interesting presentations <input type="checkbox"/> used appropriate multi-media technology <input type="checkbox"/> assessed and updated materials at reasonable intervals <input type="checkbox"/> provided help / answered questions in a professional fashion <input type="checkbox"/> objectives were stated and adhered to <input type="checkbox"/> gave handouts and/or online access to materials from lectures, i.e. graphs, images, or bullet points <input type="checkbox"/> exams tested the objectives and material presented	<input type="checkbox"/> developed and implemented curriculum for new course or clinical rotation <input type="checkbox"/> annually upgraded material based on board scores, standards set by professional organizations, emerging concepts <input type="checkbox"/> created student, residency or fellowship manuals for standard practice in division or department <input type="checkbox"/> introduced novel and useful teaching tool(s) that require significant effort by faculty, i.e. DVD or web based tutorial. <input type="checkbox"/> developed simulations or standardized patients and/ or implemented their use <input type="checkbox"/> consistently sought out trainees that were struggling and provided additional instruction <input type="checkbox"/> published or presented at national meeting on innovative teaching <input type="checkbox"/> (other, describe below)

Scholarly Activity: check (✓) all those applicable

Faculty Candidate _____

Department _____

A. Publications

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> fell short of the minimum number of peer-reviewed publications for promotion (see Table 1) during time in current rank <input type="checkbox"/> typically published in lower quality journals <input type="checkbox"/> limited number of citations for published work greater than 3 years old (see Scopus)	<input type="checkbox"/> obtained the minimum number of peer-reviewed publications for promotion (see Table 1) during the time in current rank <input type="checkbox"/> typically published in mid- to high- level journals as evidenced by a journal Impact Factor greater than 1.0 or other measure of importance of the journal to the field <input type="checkbox"/> had ≥ 2 citations for the majority of publications greater than 3 years old (see Scopus database) <input type="checkbox"/> authored at least 2 unique chapters or review articles <input type="checkbox"/> edited a textbook	<input type="checkbox"/> has double the minimum number of peer-reviewed publications for promotion (see Table 1) during time in current rank <input type="checkbox"/> published, more than once, in extremely high impact journals, i.e. >8 <input type="checkbox"/> publications were cited with an impressive level of frequency (see Scopus) <input type="checkbox"/> authored greater than 5 chapters or reviews <input type="checkbox"/> edited textbooks

B. Extramural Funding

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> did not obtain funding consistent with %effort. For example, a faculty with >50% research effort not having extramural grant(s) <input type="checkbox"/> ignored grant deadlines and comments in past reviews <input type="checkbox"/> for faculty with >50% research effort, did not obtain principal investigator (PI) or co-PI status <input type="checkbox"/> unable to sustain extramural funding <input type="checkbox"/> did not submit grant application	<input type="checkbox"/> maintained funding consistent with designated % effort. Typically, faculty with >50% effort in research should have a R01-like funding (~200K/yr direct) while a faculty member with 10% research effort might collaborate on a grant or have limited industry support <input type="checkbox"/> responded in a timely and appropriate manner to grant reviews <input type="checkbox"/> for faculty with > 50% research effort, principal investigator status in extramural funding and/or consistently is designating 50% time on extramural grants <input type="checkbox"/> co-investigator or collaborator on multiple grants with different investigators <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrated ability to competitively renew extramural funding <input type="checkbox"/> co-investigator or collaborator on grants, or mentor/sponsor for K08 or similar training grants	<input type="checkbox"/> consistently maintained multiple R01-like grant funding as principal investigator <input type="checkbox"/> program project/center director <input type="checkbox"/> received awards for excellence in funding (Davits award) <input type="checkbox"/> consistently designating >75% time on extramural grants <input type="checkbox"/> consistently maintained R01-like grant funding and PI/Director on a training, core, or major equipment grant

C. Other Scholarly Activities

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> limited other scholarly activity or quality of those activities	<input type="checkbox"/> developed local practice guidelines <input type="checkbox"/> authored articles for the lay press or patient brochures <input type="checkbox"/> submitted abstracts or articles <input type="checkbox"/> obtained patent <input type="checkbox"/> gave at least 2 invited lectures over the time in current rank <input type="checkbox"/> gave at least 2 presentations at regional / national / international meetings <input type="checkbox"/> featured presentation at grand rounds for another UT department or outside UT <input type="checkbox"/> collaborated/published with faculty from UTHSC and other institutions <input type="checkbox"/> organized and contributed to journal clubs or noon conferences	<input type="checkbox"/> participated in national guideline setting panels <input type="checkbox"/> frequently invited to comment in national press on area of expertise <input type="checkbox"/> successfully took patent to production / application stage <input type="checkbox"/> gave plenary lecture at national or international meeting in area of expertise <input type="checkbox"/> collaborated/published with outstanding nationally or internationally recognized investigators <input type="checkbox"/> gave >5 invited lectures or presentations outside UT

Patient Care: check (✓) all those applicable

Faculty Candidate _____
Department _____

A. Productivity/Patient Load/Scheduling:

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> fell short by 25% or more of the department/division set goal or AAMC average for RVU / FTE <input type="checkbox"/> fell short by 25% or more of the department/division set goal or MGMA average for charges / FTE <input type="checkbox"/> fell short by 25% or more of the department/division set goal for numbers of procedures <input type="checkbox"/> fell short by 25% or more of the department/division set goal for numbers of clinics / week <input type="checkbox"/> fell short by 25% or more of the department/division set goal for numbers of patients seen <input type="checkbox"/> consistently late in completion of reports / medical records	<input type="checkbox"/> met the department/division set goal for RVU / FTE or, if not set, the AAMC University Hospital based average RVU / FTE value for that discipline <input type="checkbox"/> met the department/division set goal for charges / FTE or, if not set, the MGMA (Medical Group Management Assoc) private practice median for physicians in that discipline <input type="checkbox"/> met the department/division set goal for numbers of procedures <input type="checkbox"/> met the department/division set goal for numbers of clinics / week <input type="checkbox"/> met the department/division set goal for numbers of patients seen <input type="checkbox"/> completed reports / medical records in a timely fashion	<input type="checkbox"/> exceeded by 25% or more the department/division set goal or AAMC average in RVU / FTE <input type="checkbox"/> exceeded by 25% or more the department/division set goal or MGMA average in charges / FTE <input type="checkbox"/> exceeded by 25% or more the department/division set goal for numbers of procedures <input type="checkbox"/> exceeded by 25% or more the department/division set goal for numbers of clinics / week <input type="checkbox"/> exceeded by 25% or more the department/division set goal for numbers of patients seen

B. Quality of Care/Patient Satisfaction/ Reputation as Clinician

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> received consistent negative reviews on standardized evaluations carried out in the practice setting <input type="checkbox"/> receive frequent complaints from patients or relatives of patients <input type="checkbox"/> received negative evaluations from local peers and other health care providers <input type="checkbox"/> received minimum number of referrals	<input type="checkbox"/> met expectations on standardized evaluations carried out in the practice setting <input type="checkbox"/> received positive evaluations from local peers and other health care providers <input type="checkbox"/> received referrals both locally and regionally that are consistent in number with average for department ./ division <input type="checkbox"/> played a role in development and local implementation of practice guidelines for care or to prevent medical errors <input type="checkbox"/> used and disseminated new surgical procedure, cutting edge diagnosis, treatment or prevention approach	<input type="checkbox"/> exceeded expectations on standardized evaluations carried out in the practice setting <input type="checkbox"/> received frequent compliments from patients <input type="checkbox"/> received outstanding evaluations from peers and other health care providers <input type="checkbox"/> received referrals from across a large, multi-state region <input type="checkbox"/> participated in clinical national guideline setting panels or protocol writing panels <input type="checkbox"/> key role in development of innovative approach to diagnosis, treatment or prevention of disease, applications of technologies and/or models of care delivery that influence care regionally or nationally <input type="checkbox"/> gave plenary lectures at national and international meetings <input type="checkbox"/> participated in national boards

C. Professional Recertification/Enhancement of Knowledge Base

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> was unable to obtain or allowed lapse in board certification / licensure <input type="checkbox"/> disciplined by state board, local medical society or hospital	<input type="checkbox"/> acquired and maintained board certification / licensure <input type="checkbox"/> consistently participated in continuing education and special training programs	<input type="checkbox"/> demonstrated ability to translate continuing education and special training programs into working knowledge and usable procedures <input type="checkbox"/> received physician recognition award from AMA or other medical society for quantity/quality of completed CME

Service/Outreach: check (✓) all those applicable

Faculty Candidate _____
 Department _____

A. Institutional Service

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> provided limited service to UTHSC beyond assigned patient care, teaching, or research duties <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> was a member on more than 1 UTHSC (department, college, or campus-wide) or hospital committees <input type="checkbox"/> provided unique service to faculty at UTHSC (e.g. pathology lab, or transgenic or molecular core facility) <input type="checkbox"/> organized education or seminar series <input type="checkbox"/> played a role in trainee or faculty recruitment <input type="checkbox"/> mentored junior faculty <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> chaired UTHSC committee, or had above average commitment on UTHSC or hospital committee(s) <input type="checkbox"/> provided outstanding service as Head/Director of a service core at UTHSC <input type="checkbox"/> chaired multiple faculty recruitment / searches <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)

B. Professional Service

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> provided limited service to local, state or national organizations, granting institutions, or journals <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> participated in local, state or national organizations or societies <input type="checkbox"/> reviewed for professional journals <input type="checkbox"/> ad hoc reviewed for extramural granting institutions <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> organized or held an appointed position in local, state or national organization or society <input type="checkbox"/> editorial board member <input type="checkbox"/> standing member or chair of review panel for extramural grants (i.e. NIH study section) <input type="checkbox"/> organized meeting or symposia <input type="checkbox"/> served on Editorial Boards <input type="checkbox"/> reviewed greater than 6 articles / yr for journals <input type="checkbox"/> role as medical or scientific expert for local, state or federal government needs <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)

C. Community Service/Outreach

1 (Below Expectations)	2 (Meets Expectations)	3 (Exceeds Expectations)
<input type="checkbox"/> provided limited profession-related community service or outreach	<input type="checkbox"/> participated in community health initiatives <input type="checkbox"/> gave health-related presentations to local groups <input type="checkbox"/> participated in K-12 activities in area schools (i.e. health fairs, science fair) <input type="checkbox"/> provided research/training/teaching opportunities to community high school or undergraduate students/teachers or other local groups <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)	<input type="checkbox"/> organized community health initiatives <input type="checkbox"/> provided clinical service in community settings (i.e. Church Health Center) <input type="checkbox"/> established K-12 program on health or science issues <input type="checkbox"/> established programs providing research/training/teaching opportunities to community high school or undergraduate students/teachers or other local groups <input type="checkbox"/> other (please list)