ACADEMIC TRACK

CORE EXPECTATIONS

The goal of all faculty in the academic track is to develop and disseminate impactful scholarship in their respective area(s) of expertise. These scholarly products should result in the development of regional and national/international recognition for excellence in a specific discipline.

For the promotion of faculty in the academic track, three areas of academic excellence are defined in:

1. Research
2. Education
3. Clinical Care

A faculty member selects one of these three areas – in consultation with the Department Chair or her/his designee – when preparing documents for promotion in rank.

Achievements in the candidate’s scholarly area of focus will serve as the primary basis for promotion in rank. Contributions in the other areas also will be considered, but candidates must meet the criteria for promotion as defined in this document.

Targeting one area of academic excellence does not preclude a candidate from changing to a different area, or contributing to a combination of areas, on the pathway to promotion. Faculty members have the flexibility to choose the area of academic excellence that best reflects their actual achievements over time, rather than starting and ending in a fixed area. The selected area for one promotion cycle can be different when the faculty member requests a future promotion.

The selected area of academic excellence should represent the candidate’s major area of achievement, impact, and reputation. The area should reflect the activities, since last promotion or appointment at rank, to which the faculty member has devoted a substantial proportion of time and academic effort. It is the area in which the faculty member has become an expert and leader in the field, primarily through substantial and sustained peer-reviewed scholarship.

Continuous scholarly activity is the basis for promotion in all three focus areas of academic excellence. Scholarly activity is defined as activities (in education, clinical areas, and/or research) in which a faculty member not only applies current knowledge and resources in their field, but also creates and broadly disseminates new knowledge and scholarly products to advance the field. Promotion is based on both quality and quantity of scholarship. An average of at least one significant, publicly available contribution annually is the minimum scholarship level needed to be considered for promotion; this criterion is in addition to the others defined in this document for a selected focus area of academic excellence. Regardless of the selected area of excellence, it must be demonstrated by their trajectory of scholarship that the faculty member is likely to sustain academic productivity at a level commensurate with the academic rank achieved.

Promotion is based on achievements and contributions since the last promotion. Although specific or typical times in rank are not specified, promotion at relatively early times requires
very clear demonstration of an unusually high rate of achievement and a strong trajectory that is likely to be maintained.

**CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION IN RANK**

Promotion Criteria and Standards for All Faculty Members in the Academic Track

Regardless of their chosen focus area of academic excellence, all candidates for promotion in the academic track are expected to provide evidence demonstrating they meet all of the following criteria:

1. **Scholarship**
2. **Service**
3. **Teaching/Mentoring**
4. **Reputation**
5. **Professionalism**

Requirements for scholarship and service for each area of academic excellence are described in detail below. Requirements for teaching/mentoring, a regional or national reputation, and professionalism are common to all focus areas:

1. **Scholarship**
   
   Peer-reviewed scholarship is required, particularly at the regional and national levels, in accordance with rank of promotion. Evidence is sought that the work is scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance.

2. **Service**
   
   This is reflected in both of the following:
   
   a. Service to the division, department, graduate program, Medical School, and/or University.
   b. Service to the candidate’s discipline.

3. **Teaching/Mentoring**
   
   This can be demonstrated by the following:
   
   a. Teaching and other activities related to education, with positive evaluations from learners (students, trainees, peers) and course/program directors.
   b. Mentoring of peers and trainees, with evaluations demonstrating the effectiveness of mentoring and the inclusion of mentee outcomes.
   c. Mentoring is required for promotion to Professor.

4. **Reputation**
   
   This is reflected in external recognition of the candidate’s contributions to an area of scholarship. Attainment of a scholarly reputation as an expert and leader should be readily acknowledged in letters provided by external experts in the candidate’s field. A regional reputation is required for promotion to Associate Professor, and a national reputation is required for promotion to Professor. Achievement of a national reputation for Associate Professors or an international reputation for Professors will be looked on favorably, but is not required for promotion.
Regional (or emerging national) recognition is documented by external letters of evaluation and as exemplified by invitations or nominations to:*

a. Serve on at least one of the following: study sections, regional/national policy boards, regional/national committees, editorial boards of national or international publications
   OR
b. Review manuscripts submitted to peer-reviewed national journals, AND
c. Present their research orally at regional/national scientific meetings or clinical symposia, OR
d. Deliver lectures or seminars at other academic institutions regionally or nationally.

*Candidate must demonstrate either “a”, or “b+c”, or “b+d” to meet this metric.

National or international recognition is documented by external letters of evaluation and as exemplified by invitations or nominations to all of the following:

a. Serve on at least one of the following: study section of a national granting agency, national policy board, national/international committee in the discipline, editorial board of a peer-reviewed journal.
b. Participate in a leadership role or presentation of their research in national/international scientific meetings or clinical symposia.
c. Deliver lectures or seminars at other academic institutions nationally/ internationally.

5. Professionalism

a. High standards of professionalism are demonstrated by department head letters, departmental reports, annual reviews, and both internal and external review letters. This is reflected in the following:
b. Maintenance of high standards of ethical behavior and a commitment to fulfilling professional responsibilities.
c. Demonstration of professional behavior towards all faculty, learners, staff, other academic health professionals, and patients where applicable.
d. Contribution to the governance and administration of the department, Medical School, and/or University.

Promotion Criteria and Standards for Focus Areas of Academic Excellence

In addition to the general promotion criteria defined above, candidates for promotion are expected to also provide evidence demonstrating that they meet the specific criteria for promotion in at least one of the three focus areas of academic excellence: (1) Research, (2) Education, and/or (3) Clinical Care.

Important Clarifications:

A. The following sections provide examples of common achievements for a given rank. Candidates may report additional achievements not specified in the metrics.
B. The wording of the scholarship criteria for areas of academic excellence – particularly Education and Clinical Care – might suggest that a faculty member only conducts scholarship within the boundaries of that area. However, this need not be the case. Faculty members can produce scholarly products in any defined area(s). For example:

- A PhD basic science faculty member who devotes significant effort to teaching and other education service activities might publish results from laboratory-based research.
- An MD faculty member who devotes significant effort to clinical service activities might produce and disseminate peer-reviewed curricula as a metric of education scholarship.

The criteria for excellence in scholarship should be applied thoughtfully to accommodate such diversity, and with the understanding that all candidates seeking promotion in the academic track are held to similar standards.

**Focus Area 1: Academic Excellence in Research**

Faculty members seeking promotion in this focus area are expected to demonstrate excellence either in an area of their own research or in a unique area of expertise that is critical to the success of existing collaborative research programs. Excellence requires demonstration that the candidate has made an impact in the research domain, including a major contribution to an interdisciplinary or multi-investigator research program. Demonstration of peer-reviewed, publicly-disseminated scholarship and a track record of external funding, as principle or co-investigator, are required for promotion. Supervisory, internal, and external peer reviews of the research must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Recognition in a defined area of research must be supported by external letters. Key elements for promotion are accomplishments that have been sustained over a period of time. The candidate should be able to demonstrate that they have achieved a level of identifiable and verifiable impact and reputation outside the University of Minnesota Medical School and its affiliates.

**Excellence in Research: Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor**

All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should be on a trajectory toward promotion at the Professor level. A regional or emerging national reputation in an area of research is required and must be supported by external letters.

Candidates must meet the general criteria for promotion in the track as defined above (reputation, service, proficiency in education, professionalism) and the specific criteria for both scholarship and service, as defined next.

1. Scholarship

   All candidates must demonstrate excellence in sustained peer-reviewed scholarship.

   The expectation is that the candidate will have on average at least one scholarly peer-reviewed publication per year, where the contributor is listed as an author, and with a
significant portion as first- or senior-author. Statements of peer evaluators documenting the creativity and/or significance of the candidate's contributions to multi-authored or team science publications are expected to support the promotion and should give the unique contributory role of the candidate. Serving as a member of a study group on a publication without being listed as one of the main authors does not represent a substantial contribution, unless a significant contribution can be demonstrated but organizational policy prevented authorship.

Peer-reviewed scientific publications are required at the regional and national levels. The work must be scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance as evidenced by:

a. First/senior-author and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions to multi-authored journal articles (may include, but not limited to book chapters, monographs, and books). For multi-authored publications, statements from peer evaluators that comment on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions should be provided, with justification for impact on the field.

Abstracts are not sufficient for promotion.

OR

b. Publications of new techniques, patents, intellectual property disclosures, approval for a new investigational drug by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, or for therapies with justification for impact on the field.

In addition, candidates must demonstrate the following:

External research funding from granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, or institutions that sponsor programs in biomedical research subject to peer review as evidenced by:

a. Principal investigator (PI), multiple-Program Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI), site-PI, or co-investigator with unique contributions on external, peer-reviewed, funded research grants, contracts or established research programs.

OR

b. Director of a core laboratory critical to peer-reviewed, funded, external research grants or contracts.

2. Research Service

All candidates must document and demonstrate excellence in their research service.

In addition to arm’s length reviews, candidates should demonstrate at least two of the following criteria:

a. Participation in appropriate regional/national discipline specific professional societies.

b. Involvement as a member of regional/national administrative and leadership groups related to research area of expertise.

c. Organizer or member of a departmental or graduate program committee.

d. Regional/national awards and honors for research accomplishments.
Excellence in Research: Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Candidates seeking promotion to Professor must meet all of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, and demonstrate new and sustained accomplishments since the last promotion. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate an increased level of scholarly productivity, sustained funding for their research, and an established national or rising international recognition that is supported by external letters.

1. Scholarship

The candidate must demonstrate national recognition for excellence in scholarship:

Sustained publication of peer-reviewed manuscripts with substantive contributions documented. The expectation is that the candidate for promotion will have on average at least two publications per year where the contributor is listed as an author with a significant portion listed as a first or last author. Serving as a collaborator or a member of a study group without being listed as one of the main authors does not represent a substantial contribution.

Peer-reviewed scientific publications are required at the national and international levels. The work must be scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance as evidenced by:

a. First/senior-author and/or documentation of major, substantial contributions to multi-authored journal articles (may include, but not limited to book chapters, monographs, and books). For multi-authored publications, statements from peer evaluators that comment on the creativity and significance of the candidate's contributions should be provided, with justification for impact on the field. Abstracts are not sufficient for promotion.

OR

b. Publications of new techniques, awarding of patents, licensing of intellectual property disclosures, an FDA Investigational New Drug, or development of therapies that impact the field.

In addition, candidates must demonstrate the following:

Sustained external research funding from granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, or institutions that sponsor programs in biomedical research subject to peer review. Exemplified by sustained roles as PI, PD/PI, site-PI, or a co-investigator with unique contributions for funded research grants, contracts, or established research programs.

2. Research Service

In addition to arm’s length reviewer letters, candidates should demonstrate at least three of the following:

a. Leadership roles in appropriate national/international discipline specific professional societies.

b. National/international administrative and leadership groups related to research area of expertise.

c. Director of a departmental or graduate program committee.
Focus Area 2: Academic Excellence in Education

Faculty members seeking promotion in this focus area spend a significant amount of their time engaged in education-related activities. They also have a defined area of scholarship that may be, but is not necessarily, in education. The candidate must have a reputation in any of the following: innovation in approaches to teaching or mentoring, learner assessment, application of new educational modalities or models, curriculum development, or educational leadership. Academic excellence in education implies more than just good teaching; it requires demonstration that the candidate has made an impact outside of their home institution and is a major contributor to a scholarly program. Excellence in both a defined area of scholarship and education service is required for promotion. Supervisory and peer reviews of the educational service activities must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Reviews by the learners must also be obtained where relevant, and should support the rating of excellence. Recognition in a defined area of scholarship should be supported by external letters. Key elements for promotion are accomplishments that have been sustained over a period of time. The candidate should be able to demonstrate they have achieved a level of identifiable and verifiable impact and reputation outside the University of Minnesota Medical School and its affiliates.

Excellence in Education: Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should be on a trajectory toward promotion at the Professor level. A regional or emerging national reputation in an area of scholarship is required and must be supported by external letters. Candidates must meet the general criteria for promotion in the track as defined above (reputation, service, proficiency in education, professionalism) and the specific criteria for both scholarship and service, as defined next.

1. Scholarship

All candidates must demonstrate excellence in sustained peer-reviewed scholarship.

The expectation is that the candidate will have on average at least one scholarly peer-reviewed publication per year, where the contributor is listed as an author, and with a significant portion as first- or senior-author. Statements of peer evaluators documenting the creativity and/or significance of the candidate's contributions to multi-authored publications are expected to support the promotion and should give the unique contributory role of the candidate. Serving as a member of a study group on a publication without being listed as one of the main authors does not represent a substantial contribution, unless a significant contribution can be demonstrated but organizational policy prevented authorship.

Peer recognition of excellence in scholarship may be through traditional peer-reviewed publications (not necessarily limited to education), or a combination of peer-reviewed
publications and other scholarly products such as contributions to peer-reviewed online repositories such as MedEdPORTAL. In some instances educational scholarship products that have undergone meaningful growth and enhancement and sustained use and recognition outside the University of Minnesota and its affiliates may meet the criteria of peer-reviewed and publicly available scholarship.

In addition, candidates should demonstrate significant additional scholarly contribution including at least two of the following:

a. Development of educational products that have been adopted by others regionally/nationally. Products may include:
   - Development of new methodologies.
   - Application of existing methodologies in a new way.
   - Curriculum development that is searchable electronically, publicly available, and demonstrated to have been adopted by others regionally/nationally, including continuing medical education curricula,
   - Demonstration of meaningful learner outcomes from those using the products.

b. Successful grant funding through internal or external peer-reviewed processes.

c. Instructional, curricular, or assessment innovations/findings presented at regional and/or national forums, on average annually.

d. Educational policy development with impact regionally and/or nationally

e. Authorship with substantial contribution to a book chapter.

f. Peer reviewer for national journal or other national repository for educational materials.

g. Other types of relevant, high quality, non-traditional peer-reviewed scholarship that are available to and used by the professional public outside of the University of Minnesota and its affiliates will also be considered.

2. Education Service

All candidates must document and demonstrate excellence in their educational roles.

Education activities include but are not limited to classroom or bedside teaching, faculty development, and mentoring of peers and/or trainees. Description of the faculty member’s role must include concise descriptions of the frequency of teaching, numbers of learners, and duration of the responsibility. Where relevant, reviews by the learners should be provided (numerical and all comments) and should support the rating of excellent. Supervisory (Division Director, Department Chair, and/or Course Director) reviews must be provided and support the rating of excellent.

In addition to arm’s length reviews, candidates should demonstrate at least two of the following:

a. Sustained engagement in structured mentoring or advising activities for which learner outcomes are demonstrated. For each individual mentee, descriptions must include the trainee level, the specific role played, duration of mentoring or advising, and the trainees’ current positions.

b. Sustained participation in interprofessional and/or interdisciplinary teaching efforts, with role clearly outlined and supported by documentation.
c. Development of innovative educational materials, instructional methods, or assessment methods for students, residents, and/or practicing physicians that is sustained. Description of the role in developing the materials and any evaluation of the materials should be provided.
d. Service on education-related committees in professional societies or other regional/national organizations.
e. Honors and awards for teaching at the local, regional, and/or national level.
f. Leadership role within a course or other educational program (e.g. medical student course, residency, fellowship, CME course). Description of the faculty member’s role must include concise descriptions of the frequency and duration of the responsibility and evaluations of the outcomes, and learner reviews of the program.

Excellence in Education: Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Candidates seeking promotion to Professor must meet all of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, and demonstrate new and sustained accomplishments since the last promotion. The expectation is that the candidate for promotion will have on average at least two peer-reviewed, publically disseminated scholarly products per year where the candidate is listed as an author or significant contributor. At least one per year must be as first or senior author or as a leading inventor. In addition to continued substantial excellence in scholarship and service, the candidate should demonstrate national and/or international recognition. Candidates must to meet criteria in both scholarship and service, as defined next.

1. Scholarship

Candidates must demonstrate a least two of the following:

a. Grant funding through external peer-reviewed processes.
b. Sustained peer-reviewed scholarship as defined in the preceding section.
c. Leadership roles in national forums and/or consultations at other universities in a focused area of teaching or educator activity. External letters should support national recognition of excellence.
d. Service as a peer-reviewer for scholarly products disseminated nationally, or service as an editor or member of an editorial board of a nationally recognized publication.
e. Invitations at a national level to speak on issues related to education scholarship.
f. Other types of relevant, high quality and publicly disseminated non-traditional peer-reviewed scholarship outside of the University of Minnesota and its affiliates will also be considered.

2. Educational Service

In addition to arm’s length reviewer letters, candidates should demonstrate at least three of the following:

a. Educational leadership/administration on a national/international level in program development, teaching methods, and/or curriculum development.
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b. Election or appointment to national/international committees involved with teaching, curriculum development, advising/mentoring, educational leadership/administration, or learner assessment.

c. Invitations as a visiting professor for education-related activities.

d. Convening/chairing national/international conferences focused on education.

e. Invitations to evaluate an educational activity at another academic institution. These might include:

- Participation in subspecialty board review or test development committee
- Invitation to be an accreditation site visitor for entities such as the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME), or the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME).

Focus Area 3: Academic Excellence in Clinical Care

This area of excellence is appropriate when a specific area of clinical expertise provides the primary focus for the candidate's academic activities and achievements. Excellence in clinical scholarship and related service is evidenced by recognition as a regional/national/international authority in a clinical specialty. The candidate may have a reputation as an innovator in approaches to diagnosis, treatment or prevention of disease, applications of technology to clinical care, and/or in developing models of care delivery. The extent of effort devoted to scholarship can range across a broad spectrum. The candidate must demonstrate sustained scholarship, which may include case series, chapters and reviews in the area of clinical expertise, publicly disseminated guidelines/protocols for patient care, publications evaluating the impact of a clinical innovation, and/or other research publications. Clinical excellence is not defined by revenue metrics. Clinically active faculty are expected to achieve and maintain appropriate board certification according to respective board specialty. Recognition in a defined area of scholarship must be supported by external letters. Key elements for promotion are accomplishments that have been sustained over a period of time. The candidate should be able to demonstrate they have achieved a level of identifiable and verifiable impact and reputation outside the University of Minnesota Medical School and its affiliates.

Excellence in Clinical Care: Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor should be on a trajectory toward promotion at the Professor level. A regional or emerging national reputation in an area of peer-reviewed scholarship is required and must be supported by external letters.

Candidates must meet the general criteria for promotion in the track as defined above (reputation, service, proficiency in education, professionalism) and the specific criteria for academic excellence in Clinical Care, as defined next.

1. Scholarship

All candidates must demonstrate excellence in sustained peer-reviewed scholarship.
The expectation is that the candidate will have on average at least one scholarly peer-reviewed publication per year, where the contributor is listed as an author, and with a significant portion as first- or senior-author. Statements of peer evaluators documenting the creativity and/or significance of the candidate's contributions to multi-authored publications are expected to support the promotion and should give the unique contributory role of the candidate. Serving as a member of a study group on a publication without being listed as one of the main authors does not represent a substantial contribution, unless a significant contribution can be demonstrated but organizational policy prevented authorship.

The majority of peer recognition is expected to be through traditional peer-reviewed publications, not limited to the area of clinical service. The publications may be based on clinical observations, clinical research, translational research, quality improvement, and analysis of data from databases or the laboratory. Review articles (either invited or author initiated) and invited book chapters that have a significant impact on the field provide additional documentation of scholarship.

In addition, candidates should demonstrate at least two of the following:

a. External research funding from state or national granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, other institutions, or competitive peer-reviewed internal grants that sponsor programs in biomedical research. The candidate for promotion can serve as a principal investigator (PI), multiple-Program Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI), a site PI on a multicenter trial, or a collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts, who provide an essential contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research. The specific and essential contribution must be identified.

b. Innovations in clinical service, to include but not limited to development of new protocols, new clinical programs, or the expansion of existing programs. Demonstration of recognition and value of these innovations outside the University of Minnesota is expected.

c. Significant original contributions based on laboratory or clinical observations resulting in new diagnostic or therapeutic interventions that influence the practice of medicine.

d. Development of publicly disseminated patient education materials with demonstration that these materials were adopted for use by others outside the University of Minnesota.

e. Development of decision-making models or materials that are publicly disseminated with demonstration that the materials were adopted for use by others outside the University of Minnesota.

f. Development of patented medical products and technology or the development of new technology that can be demonstrated to have influenced the practice of medicine.

g. Invited regional/national presentations in scientific and clinical symposia, meetings, and lectures, which occur, on average, annually.

h. Other types of relevant, high quality, non-traditional peer-reviewed scholarship that are available to and used by the professional public outside of the University of Minnesota and its affiliates will also be considered.
2. **Clinical Service**

All candidates must document and demonstrate excellence in the clinical care of patients. This can be demonstrated through external and internal letters, and by documentation of patient outcomes, satisfaction survey, and other related metrics.

In addition to arm’s length reviewer letters, candidates should demonstrate at least two of the following:

a. Innovations in delivery of care (e.g., inventions, tools, laboratory diagnostic assays).

b. Service on committees in professional societies related to clinical areas of expertise.

c. Participation as a member of regional/national administrative and leadership groups related to clinical practice or the medical specialty.

d. Awards and honors for clinical accomplishments.

e. Demonstrated implementation of quality improvement initiatives and new models of care delivery.

f. Clinical leadership and program building.

---

**Excellence in Clinical Care: Criteria for Promotion to Professor**

Candidates seeking promotion to Professor must meet all of the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, and demonstrate new and sustained accomplishments since the last promotion. Excellence in both clinical service and clinical scholarship must be demonstrated by achievements since the prior promotion. Clinical Service expectations for promotion to Professor include a sustained recognition at the national/international level as an authority and a leader in a clinical specialty. Excellence should be demonstrated by sustained, high impact scholarship. Clinical excellence is not defined by revenue metrics. Clinically active faculty are expected to achieve and maintain appropriate board certification in their particular field(s).

1. **Scholarship**

The candidate must demonstrate national recognition for excellence in scholarship:

Sustained publication of peer-reviewed manuscripts with substantive contributions documented. The expectation is that the candidate for promotion will have on average at least two publications per year where the contributor is listed as an author with a significant portion listed as a first or last author. Serving as a collaborator or a member of a study group without being listed as one of the main authors does not represent a substantial contribution.

In addition, at least two of these additional areas should reach national recognition:

a. Independence of research accomplishments or significant contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative research as evidenced by a sustained track record of:

   - External research funding from federal and other national granting agencies, foundations, industry sponsors, or institutions that sponsor programs in
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biomedical research subject to peer review or serving as an essential collaborator, with role clearly specified.

- Principal investigator, co-investigator, or a major collaborator on peer-reviewed, funded research grants or contracts, or site PI on a multi-center trial.

b. Senior role on significant original contributions based on laboratory or clinical observations resulting in new diagnostic or therapeutic interventions that influence the practice of medicine.

c. Development of patented medical products and technology or the development of new technology that through peer-review influence the practice of medicine.

d. Service on national grant review committees, national policy boards, and/or editorial boards of national publications.

e. Invitations to present at national meetings and invitations for visiting lectureships in the candidate’s area of clinical expertise.

f. Other types of relevant, high quality, non-traditional peer-reviewed scholarship that are available to and used by the professional public outside of the University of Minnesota and its affiliates will also be considered.

2. Clinical Service

In addition to arm’s length reviewer letters, candidates should demonstrate at least three of the following:

a. Development of publicly disseminated patient education materials with demonstration that these materials were adopted for use by others nationally.

b. Development of decision-making models or materials that are publicly disseminated with demonstration that the materials were adopted for use by others nationally.

c. Innovations in delivery of care (e.g., inventions, tools, laboratory diagnostic assays).

d. Leadership roles (committees; task forces; meeting organization; etc.) of appropriate national/international professional societies related to clinical area of expertise.

e. National/international participation in administrative and leadership groups related to clinical practice or the medical specialty.

f. National/international awards and honors for clinical accomplishments.

g. Quality improvement initiatives and new models of care delivery on a national level.

h. Clinical leadership and program building recognized nationally.