

## College of Medicine Proposed Post-Tenure Research Review Criteria for Foundational Sciences Departments

*During the post-tenure review process the University will review the cumulative level of accomplishment and productivity over the previous five years relative to the faculty member's assigned duties in research. This guiding document outlines general quantifiable criteria for assignment of performance ratings for faculty with at least a 50% research assignment and should be scaled in accordance with the faculty member's research assignment.*

A faculty member who **exceeds expectations** is expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- A minimum of grant awards or external financial support of \$2 million or more.  
**AND**
- A minimum of 25 peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality, which have led to significant advancements in their field.  
**And should also include**
- Leading and serving on national advisory committees for research foundations, federal funding agencies, or other authoritative bodies.
- Evidence of a high level of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations, exhibits, commissions, or performances at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within one's field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; professional awards; and citations to or critically acclaimed reviews of one's scholarly work.
- Receipt of awards or recognition for excellence related to research, scholarship or related activities.

A faculty member who **meets expectations** is expected to have produced evidence of the following over the prior 5 years:

- Grant awards or external financial support of \$500 thousand or more.
- Between 10 and 24 peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality.
- Evidence of professional impact, for example including regular participation in invited presentations, exhibits, commissions, or performances at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within one's field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; and citations to or reviews of one's scholarly work.

A faculty member who **does not meet expectations** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Minimal grant awards or external financial support.
- Between 5 and 9 peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality.
- Inconsistent evidence of professional impact, for example including irregular

participation in invited presentations, exhibits, commissions, or performances at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within one's field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; and citations to or reviews of one's scholarly work.

A faculty member who is **unsatisfactory** exhibits the following performance characteristics over the prior 5 years:

- Substantial and chronic deficiencies or failure to meet expectations in research, scholarship, education, service, or creative works as expected in the faculty member's discipline, with minimal to no efforts to follow previous advice or other efforts to make corrections.
- 4 or fewer peer reviewed research articles or scholarly works of similar quality.
- Absence of grant awards or external financial support.
- Absence of significant professional impact, for example as measured by regular participation in invited presentations, exhibits, commissions, or performances at key meetings, conferences, or other venues within one's field; seminar presentations at major research universities or state/federal agencies; and citations to or reviews of one's scholarly work.