

College of Medicine Faculty Annual Evaluation Criteria & Scoring Standards

This document outlines the faculty annual evaluation criteria and scoring standards and is intended to serve as a reference for both faculty and department chairs during the annual evaluation period.

A. Core Evaluation Areas:

1. Teaching
 - Quantity and quality of teaching effort (courses, lectures, clinical teaching)
 - Student/resident/peer evaluations, when provided
 - Development of educational materials/curricula
 - Mentorship
2. Research/Scholarship
 - Peer-reviewed publications
 - Grants submitted and funded
 - Presentations and abstracts at scientific meetings
 - Contributions to collaborative projects
 - Innovation/patents
3. Service
 - Departmental, college, university service
 - Service on committees, task forces
 - Professional service (e.g., editorial boards, grant review panels, leadership in organizations)
 - Community engagement related to professional expertise
4. Clinical Care
 - Patient care quality metrics
 - Volume and complexity of clinical work
 - Patient satisfaction scores
 - Contributions to clinical program development
5. Citizenship (not rated)
 - Compliance with institutional policies
 - Interpersonal interactions and teamwork

B. Differences Between Tenured and Nontenure-Track Faculty Focus

Areas	Nontenure -Track	Tenure-Track
Teaching	Highest Importance	High Importance
Research	lower emphasis in educator and clinical tracks	Essential, highest importance for non-clinical, clinical scientist, and Research tracks
Service	Higher Importance	Moderate Importance
Clinical Care	Highest Importance for Clinical Practice Faculty track	Variable, clinical scientist track

C. Scoring Standards

Score	Rating	Description
5	Exceptional	Performance far exceeds assigned expectations.
4	Outstanding	Performance exceeds assigned expectations.
3	Good	Performance aligns with assigned expectations.
2	Needs Improvement	Performance falls below assigned expectations.
1	Unsatisfactory	Performance fails to meet basic assigned standards.

D. Examples of General Narrative Assessment

Score	Rating	General Narrative Assessment
5	Exceptional	Faculty members' contributions go far beyond assigned responsibilities, demonstrating leadership and impact at the national and international level and major influence within the University and broader community. They serve as role models within the institution.
4	Outstanding	Faculty members demonstrate notable achievements beyond assigned duties. They show initiative, contribute beyond their primary duties, and sustain productivity that positively impacts both the department and the University.
3	Good	Faculty members meet the established expectations for their role. They perform assigned duties competently, reliably, and at the satisfactory level, contributing effectively to teaching, research, service, or clinical care as required.
2	Needs Improvement	Faculty members' performance fall below expectations in one or more key areas. A performance improvement plan is recommended to address identified gaps in order to meet minimum role standards.
1	Unsatisfactory	Faculty members do not meet expected standards. Significant deficiencies are evident in performance, and immediate corrective action is required. Continued performance at this level may affect contract renewal or employment status.

E. Examples of Specific Narrative Assessment

Teaching:

Score	Ratings	Description
5	Exceptional	Faculty members innovate in curriculum design and instructional methods, publishing peer-reviewed work adopted by other institutions, and hold leadership roles in education-related organizations. They receive regional and national teaching awards and serve as role models within the institution, with significant impact nationally, internationally, and within the University and broader community.

4	Outstanding	Faculty members contribute meaningfully beyond their primary duties, engage in curriculum development and instructional improvement, publish scholarly work, and earn excellent student evaluations and institutional teaching awards. They participate in professional and educational organizations and serve as a mentor to other educators, positively influencing the department, University, and students.
3	Good	Faculty members provide reliable and effective teaching, with positive feedback from students that meets departmental and college expectations.
2	Needs Improvement	Faculty members' teaching effectiveness is inconsistent, as evidenced by a lack of engagement and quality.
1	Unsatisfactory	Faculty members' teaching performance is poor, with repeated negative feedback and documented concerns from peers and students.

Research/Scholarship:

Score	Ratings	Description
5	Exceptional	Faculty members lead groundbreaking basic or clinical research projects with significant external funding, secure new major external grants, publish high-impact, peer-reviewed basic and clinical research in top-tier medical journals, and demonstrate a national reputation.
4	Outstanding	Faculty members maintain a steady research output with quality publications in peer-reviewed medical journals, moderate funding, and an emerging national reputation.
3	Good	Faculty members actively participate in research, meeting assigned research and scholarship expectations.
2	Needs Improvement	Faculty members' research productivity falls below the assigned research and scholarship expectations.
1	Unsatisfactory	Faculty members fail to meet assigned research and scholarship expectations.

Service:

Score	Ratings	Description
5	Exceptional	Faculty members hold leadership positions on institutional committees or in professional organizations. They make impactful contributions nationally, within university and broader community.
4	Outstanding	Faculty members actively contribute to institutional or professional service beyond assigned expectations, including a leadership role on a key committee with significant time commitments.
3	Good	Faculty members actively participate in assigned institutional and professional service activities with reliability and professionalism.

2	Needs Improvement	Faculty members' service involvement is minimal or inconsistent with assigned expectations, characterized by occasional lapses in attendance or participation that hinder overall contribution.
1	Unsatisfactory	Faculty members fail to meet required service activities, with documented frequent absences and persistent lack of reliability that substantially compromise service obligations.

Clinical Care:

Score	Ratings	Description
5	Exceptional	Faculty members lead clinical innovations and programs recognized locally or nationally. Demonstrates recognition for their clinical expertise through publications and national or international invitations. Delivers exemplary patient care and show excellent clinical productivity.
4	Outstanding	Faculty members contribute to quality improvement and patient outcome programs. Provides consistently high-quality clinical care, and services with strong patient satisfaction, as assessed by peers and supervisors.
3	Good	Faculty members meet assigned expectations for clinical practice and patient care responsibilities, receiving positive feedback from peers and supervisors.
2	Needs Improvement	Faculty members' clinical practice effectiveness is inconsistent, marked by repeated negative feedback from supervisors and documented concerns regarding the quality of patient care.
1	Unsatisfactory	Faculty members demonstrate persistent and significant deficiencies, with serious and ongoing concerns about patient care and service responsibilities raised by peers and supervisors.

Note:

A rating of 3 is appropriate in any area of assigned activity, regardless of the percentage of effort, when expectations are met. Ratings of 4 or 5 are most likely to be achieved in the primary area of activity, where faculty devote the majority of their assigned time. Although less common, high ratings may also be earned in areas with relatively limited assigned time.

Faculty are not expected to meet every example listed in the narrative boxes. However, they should demonstrate a sufficient number of these examples, with appropriate quality and impact, particularly in areas of greatest effort, to justify a performance rating above Good.

The overall score is calculated by multiplying the percentage of effort by the rating in each area and summing the results. As a result, strong performance in the primary area of responsibility has the greatest influence on the overall score.