

University of Florida College of Dentistry Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, Policies and Procedures

Table of Contents

Preamble	Page 2
Article 1	Page 4
Promotion and Tenure Committee composition	
Faculty appointment	
Minimum qualifications for tenure-track appointments	
Article 2: Qualifications for promotion: Tenure track guidelines	Page 7
Scholarly productivity	
General criteria	
Maximum probationary period	
Promotion and tenure when ready	
Qualification for promotion	
To the rank of associate professor	
To the rank of professor	
Article 3: Qualifications for promotion: Non-tenure track guidelines	Page 13
Qualification for promotion	
To the rank of associate professor	
To the rank of professor	
Article 4: Specialty ranks and courtesy faculty	Page 17
Article 5: Tenure procedures	Page 18
Article 6: Policy on mentoring	Page 20
Article 7: Policy on mid-career review for tenure-accruing faculty	Page 21
Appendix 1: What are journal “impact factors?”	Page 22
Appendix 2: Mentoring guidelines for tenure-accruing faculty	Page 27

Preamble

Qualifications for tenure and promotion in a tenure track should be dependent on the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service. Definitions of these terms "teaching," "research," and "service" may vary, as will the weights assigned to each in the tenure decision. However, it is expected that institutional review will be conducted in the broad context of the following traditional criteria:

1. Quality of, and commitment to, student instruction (including teaching, course design, course material, interaction with students outside of formal instructional periods, and other mechanisms of enhancing student learning);
2. Quality of, and productivity in, scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and
3. Service contributions to the university, the profession, and the public.

Student instruction. The award of tenure will not normally be made unless there is evidence of both the candidate's sustained commitment to classroom and/or clinical instruction and the candidate's sustained effectiveness as a contributor to the intellectual development of students through devices such as course design, course material, interaction with students outside of formal instructional periods, and other mechanisms of enhancing student learning. The means of assessment of that contribution will vary with the field, with the level at which the teaching is concentrated, and with the degree of objectivity with which outcomes can be measured during the probationary period. The volume of teaching will also be taken into consideration. Student evaluations must be a part of the evidence in all cases, but by themselves they are not enough. Students are important judges of a teacher's fairness, organization, and personal qualities in the classroom, clinic, laboratory, seminar, or office; but the candidate's faculty peers are normally the better judge of the content of her or his pedagogy. Popular teaching and good teaching is not necessarily the same thing. Advising, availability to students and other forms of beneficial interactions between the candidate and students may be given appropriate weight as a part of the "student instruction" criterion, but are not, by themselves, a substitute for accomplished instruction or for other elements of the tenure standards.

Research. While the standard will be discipline specific, there must exist a body of original research or creative work sufficient in quality and quantity to have led at least to the beginning of a national reputation in the candidate's field. There must also be strong indications of a commitment to original research or creative work that will lead to sustained contributions over time and to the judgment that growth in stature will continue. While external evaluations of the candidate's contributions to original research or creative work are a required component of a positive case for promotion or tenure, it is also required that the appropriate faculty unit and the dean make a careful

and independent judgment that the quality and quantity of the candidate's scholarly output is sufficient to justify the recommended action.

Service. Service to the University is an obligation of every regular faculty member. Service to one's professional discipline and, in a number of disciplines, to the broader public is important and sometimes essential in terms of job definition. The proportions of each will vary widely, however, not only from department to department, but among candidates as well. Quality and effectiveness of service are difficult to assess. The effort must nevertheless be made. In certain disciplines, strong external service can appropriately be given substantial weight in the tenure evaluation process. Genuine contributions to patient care institutional governance through committees and otherwise, are a part of the obligations expected from faculty. Service is, therefore, a qualification for tenure, even though its relative weight will vary. In no case, however, can it stand alone to justify the award of tenure nor can devoted service compensate for inadequate student instruction or research.

Article 1

Promotion and tenure committee composition

The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College of Dentistry is elected from the ranks of the full-time (1.0 FTE) tenured professors in the college. The purpose of this committee is to review the candidates' applications for completeness and appropriateness and to serve as an advisory group to the dean. This committee does not approve or disapprove a candidate's application for promotion with or without tenure.

This committee will also be responsible for conducting mid-career review for tenure-accruing faculty. This review will be conducted following the initiation of this process by the candidate's department chair. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will make its findings in regard to mid-career review known to the dean, the candidate's chair, the candidate's assigned mentor, and the candidate. It should be noted, by university regulations regarding tenure-accruing faculty, the responsibility for ensuring that the candidate is making sufficient progress lies with the candidate and the candidate's department chair.

Faculty appointment

The academic ranks in the College of Dentistry include assistant professor, associate professor, and professor in any of the academic departments. Academic appointments follow one of two tracks: tenure-accruing or non-tenure accruing.

Tenure at the College of Dentistry and the University of Florida requires excellence in two of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Historically, the greatest emphasis has been placed on teaching and research. Thus it is suggested that individuals appointed to the tenure-accruing track should have an assignment of no less than 0.25 FTE or no more than 0.85 FTE to organized research. Individuals with less than 0.25 FTE assigned for organized research should be appointed to the clinical track, while individuals with greater than 0.85 FTE should be appointed to the research track.

Guidelines for Faculty Assignment to Organized Research (FTE)

	Tenure Accruing	Non-TenureAccruing	
		Clinical Track	Research Track
Minimum	0.25	-	0.85
Maximum	0.85	0.25	-

1. **Tenure track** positions consist of appointments as assistant professor, associate professor and professor. These ranks may be appointed in any of the academic

disciplines at the college. To be eligible for appointment in this track a faculty member must be employed or assigned full-time and participate in the academic programs of the college. This track is eligible for tenure at the rank of associate professor and above. Appointment or promotion to the rank of associate professor and above requires review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee followed by the committee's recommendation to the dean.

2. The **non-tenure track** includes the clinical track and the research track.

The **clinical track** consists of appointments to the ranks of clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor in any of the departments of the college. Progression through this track is based on achievement in teaching, clinical service and research. This track is not eligible for tenure. Appointment or promotion to the rank of clinical associate professor and above requires review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee followed by the committee's recommendation to the dean.

The **research track** consists of appointments to the ranks of research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor, is reserved for faculty primarily involved in research in any of the college's academic departments. The research track differs from the tenure track in that excellence in research must be weighted more heavily than achievement in teaching or service. This track requires full time employment or assignment at the college. This track is not eligible for tenure. It is expected that a research track position will be exclusively funded from extramural sources. Appointment to the research track is normally expected to be at the level of research assistant professor and to be initiated by the department chair. However, under certain circumstances, exceptions to this could occur. Appointment or promotion to the rank of research associate professor and above requires review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee followed by the committee's recommendation to the dean.

Minimum qualifications for tenure-track appointments

Depending on the qualifications of the individual, new faculty may be appointed at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor

Assistant professor: Appointment at this rank requires an earned doctorate (DMD, DDS, MD, and /or PhD, or the equivalent) from a recognized academic institution. It is expected that the doctorate would be in a discipline relevant to the appointing department. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor with tenure is not permitted under any circumstances.

Associate professor: The rank of associate professor shall indicate a sustained record of professional achievement. Outstanding achievement must be demonstrated in research/scholarly achievement and in teaching or service (usually clinical care).

Appointment at this rank will be made almost exclusively without tenure and must satisfy all of the requirements for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. It is expected that the appointee will be at the mid-career level, has established a record of excellence in research and teaching, and is achieving national prominence in his/her field.

It is recognized, in a few exceptional instances, that it may be to the college's and the university's advantage to make an appointment at the associate professor rank with the granting of tenure. The granting of tenure to a new appointee at the associate professor level must be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and must meet all of the standards established for promotion to the rank of associate professor with the granting of tenure.

Professor: The rank of professor shall be reserved for those who have been accepted and recognized nationally and internationally for the distinction and excellence of their professional achievements. Outstanding achievement must be demonstrated in research/scholarly achievement and at least one other area, teaching or service. Competence must be demonstrated in the other area. Appointment at this rank may be made with or without tenure and is reserved for senior faculty with a continuous record of excellence and productivity in research and teaching, national and international recognition for expertise in their field, and the potential to make further significant contributions to their field, to the college, and to the university.

Appointment of new faculty to this rank may be accompanied with tenure. Such appointments must be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the applicant must successfully satisfy all of the criteria given for internal promotion to the rank of professor.

Requests for tenure upon appointment are to be approved by the dean, Senior Vice President for Health Affairs and the President before the formal letter of offer is tendered to the candidate. The candidate's complete curriculum vita, three letters of reference and recent teaching evaluations are to be included with the request and referred to the Vice President's office.

Article 2

Qualifications for promotion: Tenure track guidelines

In general, the criteria for promotion within tenure are similar to those for the granting of tenure, except that there should be substantially increased attention to the candidate's (a) national prominence (with international recognition desired wherever possible) and (b) sustained demonstration of distinguished performance in student instruction, research, and service.

Scholarly productivity. Promotion within the tenure track must consider the applicant's contribution to the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. This is most commonly measured by the applicant's contributions to the research literature in his/her field and the impact that the applicant's contributions have made in his/her field. While it is not desirable to specify a minimum number of publications required for promotion, it is to the candidate's best interest to be provided with means to quantitatively as well as qualitatively assess readiness for promotion and tenure.

It is recognized that certain journals are more prestigious and require higher standards for publication while the standards for other journals are less demanding. It is also recognized that many scientific publications reflect extensive collaborations and result in a significant number of authors, all of whom may not have contributed equally to the publication. Based on these considerations, the following qualitative and quantitative assessments are proposed:

- As a general qualitative guide, an impact score will be calculated for each publication based on a combination of the journal impact factor and whether or not the author is the first/primary/senior author.
- The publication would receive a numerical score based on the impact factor of the journal as defined by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) journal citation index (see Appendix 1).
- For those journals that are peer-reviewed but do not receive a wide enough distribution to be included in the ISI index or else receive an ISI value of 1 or less, a value of '1' would be given.
- For those journals that receive an index value of 1 up to 5, the actual index number would be used.
- For those few journals that receive an impact factor with a value greater than 5, the value would be capped at '5'. This scheme will award individuals that publish in high impact journals but will also recognize publication in journals with a lesser distribution. Capping the value at 5 will prevent over-compensation for a single publication in a very high impact journal.
- In addition to the above, an additional point would be assigned to the first author and to the corresponding author for all publications with an impact of

5 or less. However, a single individual would not be eligible to receive credit as both first author and corresponding author.

It is recognized that scientific publications of basic, applied, and clinical research often reflect extensive collaborations and may result in a number of authors, all of whom may not have contributed equally to the research being reported. To account for this disparity, the candidate would be required to indicate his/her role in the research.

It is hoped that the combination of a **qualitative assessment** of each publication in combination with a **quantitative assessment** for all publications will provide a fair and equal evaluation of the candidate's research productivity.

Considering the above scheme, the following are proposed as general quantitative guidelines for research productivity based on an assignment of 100% research effort. The cumulative impact score required will be directly proportional to the applicant's assigned research effort.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:	50 impact points
Promotion to Professor:	150 impact points

The 'points' listed above are not intended to constitute a rigid criteria but are to provide a general assessment for both the candidate and his/her chair to determine readiness for promotion.

An example of how the Impact Factor would be applied to a candidate's packet:

A candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure who has an average of 0.25 FTE assigned for research would be expected to have around 12-13 points as determined by this scheme. Depending on the impact factors of journals in which the publications were published, whether the candidate was either a first or corresponding author, or the candidate's role in the research reported, 4 to 6 publications could potentially satisfy this requirement. In addition, it is expected that the applicant's publication rate will have demonstrated a steady and continuous productivity and that this level of productivity will be equivalent or better than contemporaries in the same field or related discipline at this and other AAU institutions, taking the assigned effort into consideration.

General criteria: Tenure track guidelines

Maximum probationary period. As stated in the university's procedure for tenure, individuals in the tenure accruing track must be considered for tenure after seven years of service at the rank of assistant professor. The university may grant certain waivers to this requirement when extenuating circumstances exist. Such examples may include a prolonged illness of the individual or a member of the individual's immediate family, paternal leave of absence, or other similar circumstances. However, a prolonged sabbatical leave is not considered applicable for the deferment of the tenure process.

"Promotion and tenure when ready." The College of Dentistry supports the concept of promotion and tenure when ready, within the University of Florida's guidelines, and does not require a mandatory minimal time at a particular academic rank before a candidate is eligible for consideration. However, certain minimal requirements are expected and required of all candidates for promotion in either tenure track or non-tenure track lines.

Qualification for promotion to the rank of associate professor

Teaching. High priority must be given to the candidate's teaching skills and volume of teaching, the influence exerted on students and mastery of his/her field. Teaching productivity may include teaching or mentoring of undergraduate students, dental students, dental residents, graduate students, post-doctorates, general practitioners and mentoring of junior faculty. Teaching productivity includes also publication of educational articles/books and development of new educational technologies.

To be more specific, all applicants must provide the following information related to teaching activities:

- **Student Evaluation Summary.** A statistical summary of the faculty member's teaching evaluation(s) for the past five years by his/her students. This summary should include departmental and/or college means in addition to the faculty member's means, a statement regarding the evaluation scale used i.e. high low, and median and an example of the questions used for the evaluation.
- **Course Evaluation Summary.** A summary of strengths and weaknesses for the current course(s) assigned to the applicant and efforts by the faculty member to encourage active learning, and the process of critical thinking development in the course(s).
- **Chairperson Evaluations.** Copies of the last five annual letters of evaluation or summaries of these letters. The amount of time assigned on teaching in the job description will also be considered.

- Peer Observation of Teaching Summary. A list of faculty invited/assigned to observe classroom and/or clinical instruction over the past three to five years and their written critiques of their observations.
- Participation in education higher than basic dental education (e.g. participation in resident programs, Master and PhD committees, continuing dental educational courses, and/or mentoring of junior faculty).

Research. Research productivity (laboratory, clinical or educational) should be evaluated for its originality, its scientific competence, its clinical relevance (alternatively: its significance for dentistry), and convincing documentation. Special emphasis will be given to:

- The quality rather than quantity of the research of an individual. The quality criteria being used will be the impact factor assigned for the journal in which the article was published. The citation index for the publication will also be taken into consideration when available. The impact factor will be the one assigned for that journal the year the article was published. For articles in press or published the year of the promotion application, the last available impact factor will be used.
- While it is not desirable to specify a minimum number of publications, it is important to provide some quantitative guidelines for the candidate. Thus, a minimum requirement of 50 publication impact points (based on 100 percent research effort) is provided as a general guideline. The publication impact points would be calculated as previous described based on the application's percent effort (FTE) assigned for research. The assumption is that any individual in the tenure track line will be allotted no less than 0.25 FTE for research and scholarship. This is a basic requirement for a tenure track position. Thus, an applicant with a 0.25 FTE research assignment would be required to have 12-13 publication points (along with the other criteria given) for consideration for promotion and tenure as an associate professor.
- In addition to item two above, it is expected that the publication rate will demonstrate a steady and continuous productivity and that this level of productivity will be equivalent or better than contemporaries in the same field or related discipline at this and other AAU institutions, taking the assigned effort into consideration. In most instances this comparison of productivity to peers will be dependent on external letters of recommendation.
- Evidence of external funding equivalent to assigned effort and the potential of continued external funding will also be a consideration.

Service and leadership. Quality of leadership is expressed by attitude, initiative, and identification with sustained efforts on behalf of the institution and the profession. Emphasis will be given to:

- Satisfactory performance of service assignments including attendance of scheduled meetings. Documentation from organizations showing that the candidate has participated in services/leadership should be included.
- If involved in clinical care, the candidate should not only be a master of scientific knowledge and the technology of his/her field, but also should be skilled in the techniques of delivery of dental care. This requires personal characteristics, which ensure effectiveness in establishing rapport with patients and students. Evidence of excellence in clinical care is expected (awards or personal recommendation, clinical activities, or other evidence of high peer regard).

Qualification for promotion to the rank of professor with tenure

Promotion to the rank of professor with tenure confers the highest academic prestige and recognition in the university and requires demonstration of sustained contributions and achievements in the three domains of teaching, research, and service. However, it is expected that promotion to this rank will be based on solid evidence of continuous scholarly activities. In practicality, this will be judged primarily on teaching and research activities.

Minimum requirements are:

- Continuous evidence of scholarship as determined by publication record in national and internationally recognized peer-review journals based on the impact factor of the journal and the citation index of the publication. The citation index will normally be applied to publications that have been in press for a minimum of three years.
- Although a minimum number of publications are neither desirable nor possible to establish as a rigid criteria for promotion to the rank of professor, certain guidelines are necessary for both the applicant and the college. For promotion to professor, the scale of 150 publication impact points is recommended based on the assignment of 100 percent research effort. The publication impact points would be calculated as previously described based on the application's actual percent effort assigned for research. The assumption is that any individual in the tenure track line will be allotted no less than 0.25 FTE for research and scholarship. Thus, an applicant for promotion to the rank of professor with a 0.25 FTE research assignment would be required to have a minimum of 37-38 publication points (along with the other criteria given) for consideration for promotion. This number would be increased in direct proportion to percent FTE assigned to research for those applicants with greater than 0.25 FTE research effort.
- Record of continuous extramural funding and demonstration of potential of continued funding proportional to assignment.

- Excellence in teaching at both undergraduate and graduate level as determined by student and peer evaluation.
- Member of the Graduate Faculty where appropriate.
- Board certification where appropriate.
- Record of service activities at college, university, and national and international levels.
- Record of participating in graduate education as mentor of master and/or doctoral candidates either as the primary advisor or as committee member where appropriate and/or mentoring of junior faculty and/or involvement in continuing dental education.
- Prominence in candidate's field at national and international level as determined by letters from internal and external reviewers.

It is neither advisable nor desirable to provide rigid criteria for promotion to academic professor. However, evidence is required that the individual being considered has made significant contributions to the college, to the university, and to the profession and demonstrates the ability to continue to do so.

Article 3

Qualifications for promotion: Non-tenure track guidelines

Non-tenure track positions include a separate clinical track, research track and specialty ranks. Based on continued demonstration of excellence in performance and value to the mission of the college, clinical track faculty may be offered renewable multi-year contracts. Contracts for research track faculty may coincide with their grant funding dates.

The clinical track will include the ranks of clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor, and clinical professor; the research track will include the ranks of research assistant professor, research associate professor, and research professor; the specialty ranks include assistant-in, associate-in and senior associate-in.

Promotion to the rank of clinical associate or research associate professor may be considered after five to six years as clinical assistant or research assistant professor. Promotion to the rank of clinical professor or research professor may be considered on an "as ready basis."

Exceptions to these time frames may be made under certain circumstances where an individual has demonstrated outstanding ability and productivity and recognition of the individual's sustained contributions are in the best interest of the college and the university.

Minimal promotion requirements: Clinical associate professor

To be promoted to the level of clinical associate professor, the candidate should have a significant teaching effort (>50%) in the clinic/pre-clinic facilities. Other clinical activities, such as treating patients and participating in clinical or laboratory research activities will also be used to judge the qualification of the candidate. Clinical performance will be based on student and peer evaluations, participation in continuing educational courses, and traditional letters of recommendation (these should originate from both inside and outside of the institution by individuals at the rank of associate professor or higher).

While the clinical track is reserved for individuals with a high commitment and effort to teaching and patient care, time for scholastic activity is a necessity in any academic environment. All individuals appointed to the clinical track should be allotted a minimum of 0.1 FTE for research and scholarly activity. While it is neither desirable nor appropriate to demand the same proportion of research productivity as expected of the tenure accruing track individuals, some measure of scholastic activity is required.

Using the same scale of requiring a publication impact factor of 50 for an individual assigned to 100 percent research, an impact factor of 5 would be expected for promotion from assistant clinical professor to associate clinical professor. However, someone with an assignment of 0.1 FTE for research and scholarly activities will rarely have the opportunity to gain additional impact factor points for being either a first or corresponding author on a publication. Therefore the following is proposed:

- The total of 5 impact points may be satisfied by peer-reviewed publications or up to 3 points may be satisfied by publication of case reports, mini-reviews, etc. on the college's Web site.
- Each publication on the Web site would require internal review and would count as one point. Thus, minimal qualifications would most likely require a single peer-reviewed publication in a traditional scientific journal and three reports on the college's Web sites.
- Other possible venues could include being an author on an abstract presented at a scientific meeting (worth 1 impact point), a case report or other such article in a non-reviewed journal, and/or a table clinic.

Minimal promotion requirements: Clinical professor

To be promoted to the level of clinical professor, the candidate should have a significant teaching effort (>50 percent) in the clinic/pre-clinic facilities. Clinical performance will be based on student and peer evaluations, participation in continuing educational courses, and traditional letters of recommendation (these should originate from both inside and outside of the institution by individuals at the rank of professor). Additional criteria include:

- Demonstrated national recognition as a prominent clinician/educator, holding leadership positions in professional societies and/or extraordinary service to the College of Dentistry.
- Evidence of service to the department, college, university, and profession.

All individuals appointed to the clinical track should be allotted a minimum of 0.1 FTE for research and scholarly activity. While it is neither desirable nor appropriate to demand the same proportion of research productivity as expected of the tenure accruing track individuals, some measure of scholastic activity is required. Using the same scale of requiring a publication impact factor of 150 for an individual assigned to 100 percent research, an impact factor of 15 would be expected for promotion to clinical professor. However, someone with an assignment of 0.1 FTE for research and scholarly activities will rarely have the opportunity to gain additional impact points for being either a first or corresponding author on a publication. Therefore the following is proposed:

- The total of 15 impact points may be satisfied by peer-reviewed publications or up to 10 points may be satisfied by publication of case reports, mini-reviews, etc. on the college's Web site.
- Each publication on the Web site would require internal review and would count as one point. Thus, minimal qualifications would most likely require three to four peer-reviewed publications in a traditional scientific journal and 10 reports on the college's Web sites.
- Other possible venues could include being an author on an abstract presented at a scientific meeting, a case report or other such article in a non-reviewed journal, and/or a table clinic (each separate occurrence being assigned a value of one point).

Minimal promotion requirements: Research associate professor

Promotion will be based largely on the research accomplishments of the applicant and a record of extramural funding.

General requirements:

- Demonstration of a significant research effort combined with external research funding.
- Proof of independent research (e.g. PI on grant(s) or major contract(s) and/or significant contributions as co-investigator).
- Continuous evidence of scholarship as determined by publication record in national and internationally recognized peer-review journals based on the impact factor of the journal and the citation index of the publication. The citation index will normally be applied to publications that have been in press for a minimum of three years.
- A requirement of 50 publication impact points (based on 100 percent research effort) is provided as a guideline. The publication impact points would be calculated as previously described based on the application's percent effort assigned for research. The assumption is that an individual appointed at the assistant research professor rank will be assigned no less than 0.8 FTE for research and scholarship. This percentage would translate to a total of 40 impact points.
- Record of continuous extramural funding and demonstration of potential to secure extramural funding as an independent investigator.

Minimal promotion requirements: Research professor

To be eligible for consideration for promotion, the following criteria are expected:

- Continuous evidence of scholarship as determined by publication record in national and internationally recognized peer-review journals based on the impact factor of the journal and the citation index of the publication. The citation index will normally be applied to publications that have been in press for a minimum of three years.
- A requirement of 150 publication impact points (based on 100 percent research effort) is provided as a guideline. The publication impact points would be calculated as previously described based on the application's percent effort assigned for research. Since the rank of associate research professor is reserved exclusively for individuals whose primary assignment is research, consideration for promotion to the rank of research professor must be based largely on publication record. Assuming a minimum assignment of 0.8 FTE to research activities, 120 publication impact points would be required to satisfy the publication requirement.
- Independent investigator as evidenced by serving as principal investigator on major grants or contracts (e.g. PI on R01, subproject director of P50, etc.)
- Prominence in candidate's field at national and international level as determined by letters from internal and external reviewers.
- Evidence of service to the department, college, university, and profession.
- Compelling evidence of potential for continued productivity and extramural funding.

Article 4: Specialty Ranks and Courtesy Faculty

Specialty ranks

Promotion within the specialty ranks does not require the submission of a packet to go forward to the Academic Personnel Board. The final decision rests with the vice president for health affairs. Specialty faculty ranks would be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee for promotion to the next level. These ranks include assistant in, associate in and senior associate in. The candidate must possess the minimum requirement of a master's degree. Promotion shall be based on additional qualifying education and/or experience and on accomplishments in performing assigned duties as identified in the department chair's letter of evaluation. Current curriculum vitae of the promotional candidate should be attached. Authorship or co-authorship of significant publications in the field of specialization may be regarded as evidence of qualifying experience and training.

Courtesy faculty

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will review requests for promotion of courtesy faculty at the request of the department chair with support of the dean. To promote a courtesy faculty member the department chair should inform the dean in writing with a justification as to why the promotion is warranted and attach up-to-date curriculum vitae of the promotional candidate. Courtesy faculty should meet similar criteria for their academic rank as salaried faculty. Years spent in private practice, service to the profession, and service to the college and university could be factors for consideration.

Article 5: Tenure Procedures

The procedure for tenure is printed in the Florida Administrative Code, 6C1-7.003, 7.010, 7.013, 7.019, and 7.022.

All new faculty are to be provided a copy of the UF College of Dentistry Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures upon employment. New faculty may be tenured upon employment provided he/she holds tenure at another university at his/her current rank if the qualifications are equivalent to or better than those required for the rank at UFCD. Such tenure must be supported by a positive vote of the tenured faculty of the department, the department chair, review by the Promotion and Tenure committee, and approved by the Dean.

Any promotion involved in the recruitment of a new faculty member must be considered by the College of Dentistry Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Procedure for evaluation

A. Promotion to Assistant Professor

Recommendations for promotion/employment as assistant professor are decided by direct negotiation between the chair of the respective department and the dean.

B. Promotion to associate professor or professor, associate clinical professor or clinical professor, and associate research professor or research professor

Initiation of nominations (preparation of nomination forms, solicitation of letters, etc.) of faculty for promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor and the awarding of tenure is handled at the departmental level (except in the case of a departmental chair) when the dean initiates the process. It is important to emphasize that the applicant is responsible for providing the required documentation. The departmental faculty members eligible to vote with regard to tenure and promotion should meet to discuss the nominations before Oct. 1. The faculty at the same or higher rank as the rank to which the nominee has been proposed will be polled by secret ballot. Only tenured faculty may vote upon tenure nominations. All departmental recommendations are forwarded to the dean.

Each year a Promotion and Tenure Committee will be elected from the full-time faculty to provide fact finding and consultative functions to the dean for those faculty forwarded by departments for consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The

committee shall consist of eight full time faculty; six tenured full professors, one tenured associate professor and one clinical associate or clinical full professor elected by the Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Assembly shall elect all the committee members, including the committee chairman. They shall consult with the dean on the record of nominees proposed for the academic rank of professor and associate professor, for both tenure and non-tenure tracks, and/or for tenure at the rank of professor and associate professor.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the record of the nominees and provide consultative functions to the dean. The dean will make the college's final recommendations. Whether the decision made by the dean is positive or negative on an individual application that decision and the nominee's file will proceed to the vice-president of the Health Science Center and through the remaining process to a final decision by the university president unless a request to have a packet withdrawn is made by the candidate.

Promotion and tenure materials and discussions. All records reflecting evaluations of employee performance compiled for promotion and/or tenure, including records of any discussions of these evaluations, shall be regarded as limited access records and shall be made known only to those individuals who are required to participate in making recommendations or making the decision unless otherwise required by law. All such discussions shall be considered confidential

Article 6: Policy on Mentoring

The department chair will initially select a mentor for both tenure accruing and non-tenure accruing faculty members.

Faculty (both tenure accruing and non-tenure accruing) hired after 11/07/2000, regardless of rank, must be assigned a mentor. The assignment of a mentor for faculty (tenure accruing and non-tenure accruing) hired at the rank of assistant professor prior to 11/06/2000 is optional.

The mentor will meet with the faculty member and provide him/her with a copy of both the University of Florida and College of Dentistry Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. After reviewing the guidelines, the faculty, mentor, and chair will meet to discuss the criteria for tenure and promotion.

Tenure accruing faculty- During this meeting, the mentor should recommend that the faculty member enter the university tenure and promotion packet on his computer to begin the process of preparing the packet for the mid-career review for tenure. In the College of Dentistry, the mid-career review for tenure will occur after three years of employment at the University of Florida.

Non-tenure accruing faculty - During this meeting, the mentor should recommend that the faculty member (includes faculty with Clinical and Research modifiers) enter the university tenure and promotion packet on his computer and begin the process of preparing the packet for the promotion process. In the College of Dentistry the clinical faculty member would normally be considered for promotion in the seventh to 10th year of employment.

At the end of each year the mentor will write an annual assessment (after reviewing the tenure and promotion packet) to the faculty member describing his/her progress toward tenure and/or promotion using the guidelines and form located in Appendix 2. This assessment should be provided orally to the faculty member initially and he/she should be given an opportunity to respond and for the assessment to be modified as a result of this meeting if appropriate. The department chair and the mentor will meet on an annual basis (prior to the annual evaluation process) to discuss the progress of the faculty member. At this meeting the mentor will share the faculty member's annual assessment with the chair.

At the end of the faculty member's first year, the faculty member and the chair should discuss the relationship with the mentor and decide whether a new mentor might be more appropriate. Where appropriate, the chair should give strong consideration to the preference of the faculty member.

Article 7: Policy on mid-career review for Tenure-accruing faculty

The mid-career review process for tenure-accruing and non-tenure accruing faculty in the College of Dentistry will occur after three years of employment at the University of Florida. The review process will be used to formally advise the tenure-accruing faculty member on his/her progress toward tenure, any weakness in the record, and recommended courses of action to improve the record. For non-tenure accruing faculty, the review process will be used to formally advise the candidate of his/her progress toward promotion.

The mid-career review process for faculty will follow the tenure and promotion process. The faculty member will prepare a tenure and promotion packet (without letters of evaluation and without a departmental vote). The department chair and appropriate faculty (individuals of the same rank or higher) of the department will meet to discuss the candidate's progress. After the discussion, the chair will prepare a Mid-Career Review Progress Report that he/she will share with the faculty member. The chair will forward the Mid-Career Review Progress Report, the original packet, and six copies of the packet and the progress report to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. After review, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will prepare a formal evaluation that will be presented to the candidate, his/her chair, and to the dean.

The packet for the mid-career review should be initiated by the candidate by Aug. 15. This packet should be reviewed within the department and a chairperson's evaluation should be prepared and presented to the candidate. The candidate's mid-career packet (original plus six copies) and the chairperson's evaluation should be submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee no later than Oct. 1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the candidate's packet in conjunction with the chairperson's evaluation and prepare a formal response by Dec. 1. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will advise the candidate of his/her progress and identify any weaknesses, and may suggest possible courses of action to correct such weaknesses. This evaluation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be shared with the candidate, the candidate's chair, and the dean.

Appendix 1: What are journal "impact factors?"

Thomson ISI website

<http://www.isinet.com/>

Journal Impact Factor is from Journal Citation Report (JCR), a product of Thomson ISI (Institute for Scientific Information). JCR provides quantitative tools for ranking, evaluating, categorizing, and comparing journals. The impact factor is one of these; it is a measure of the frequency with which the "average article" in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period.

The *Journal Citation Reports on the Web (JCR® on the Web)* provides sitewide access to quantifiable statistical data, offering a systematic, objective way to determine the relative importance of journals within their subject categories. It is a unique multidisciplinary research tool ideal for a broad range of practical applications by a variety of information professionals. *JCR® Web* is available in two editions: the *Science Edition* covers over 6,100 leading international science journals from the ISI database. The *Social Sciences Edition* covers approximately 1,800 leading international social sciences journals from the ISI database.

The latest release of *JCR Web* includes what subject matter each journal covers (Scope Notes), what journals are related by citation or subject, what each journal issue contains and where the journal can be found. Enhanced data display provides more tools for analysis, including a display of key citation data and a graphical display of cited or citing journal data. As part of the *ISI Web of KnowledgeSM*, JCR Web serves as an essential analytical tool along with *Essential Science IndicatorsSM*.

2003 Impact Factors for Journals:

<http://www.sciencegateway.org/impact/if03a.htm>

Journal	IF	Journal	IF	Journal	IF
J DENT RES	2.702	OPER DENT	1.136	INT J PERIODONT REST	0.841
CRIT REV ORAL BIOL M	2.612	INT J PROSTHODONT	1.113	AM J ORTHOD DENTOFAC	0.840
DENT MATER	2.064	COMMUNITY DENT ORAL	1.100	J CRANIO MAXILL SURG	0.700
CLIN ORAL IMPLAN RES	1.922	ARCH ORAL BIOL	1.098	BRIT DENT J	0.669
ORAL ONCOL	1.876	ACTA ODONTOL SCAND	1.083	DENTOMAXILLOFAC RAD	0.669
J CLIN PERIODONTOL	1.582	J AM DENT ASSOC	1.069	EUR J ORTHODONT	0.656
J PERIODONTOL	1.490	J ENDODONT	1.056	J ORAL REHABIL	0.643
CARIES RES	1.486	INT J ORAL MAX SURG	1.043	ANGLE ORTHOD	0.612
J OROFAC PAIN	1.434	AM J DENT	1.029	QUINTESSENCE INT	0.572
J PERIODONTAL RES	1.407	ORAL SURG ORAL MED O	1.027	BRIT J ORAL MAX SURG	0.559
INT J ORAL MAX IMPL	1.381	ORAL DIS	1.016	INT DENT J	0.531
PERIODONTOL 2000	1.333	J PUBLIC HEALTH DENT	1.000	J PROSTHET DENT	0.527
INT ENDOD J	1.312	J ORAL PATHOL MED	0.969	CRANIO	0.375
EURO J ORAL SCI	1.248	DENT TRAUMATOL	0.918	AUST DENT J	0.358
ORAL MICROBIOL IMMUN	1.242	J ORAL MAXIL SURG	0.912		
J DENT	1.233	CLEFT PALATE-CRAN J	0.888		

THE IMPACT FACTOR: INSTITUTE FOR SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Dr. Eugene Garfield

Founder and Chairman Emeritus, ISI

This essay was originally published in the Current Contents print editions June 20, 1994.

Librarians and information scientists have been evaluating journals for at least 75 years. Gross and Gross conducted a classic study of citation patterns in the '20s.¹ Others, including Estelle Brodman with her studies in the '40s of physiology journals and subsequent reviews of the process, followed this lead.² However, the advent of the ISI[®] citation indexes made it possible to do computer-compiled statistical reports not only on the output of journals but also in terms of citation frequency. And in the '60s we invented the journal "**impact factor**." After using journal statistical data in-house to compile the *Science Citation Index*[®] (SCI[®]) for many years, ISI began to publish *Journal Citation Reports*[®] (JCR[®])³ in 1975 as part of the SCI and the *Social Sciences Citation Index*[®] (SSCI[®]).

Informed and careful use of these **impact** data is essential. Users may be tempted to jump to ill-formed conclusions based on **impact factor** statistics unless several caveats are considered.

Definition

The *JCR* provides quantitative tools for ranking, evaluating, categorizing, and comparing journals. The **impact factor** is one of these; it is a measure of the frequency with which the "average article" in a journal has been cited in a particular year or period. The annual *JCR* **impact factor** is a ratio between citations and recent citable items published. Thus, the **impact factor** of a journal is calculated by dividing the number of current year citations to the source items published in that journal during the previous two years (see Figure 1). The annual *JCR* **impact factor** is a ratio between citations and recent citable items published. Thus, the **impact factor** of a journal is calculated by dividing the number of current year citations to the source items published in that journal during the previous two years (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Calculation for journal impact factor.

A= total cites in 1992

B= 1992 cites to articles published in 1990-91 (this is a subset of A)

C= number of articles published in 1990-91

D= B/C = 1992 **impact factor**

The **impact factor** is useful in clarifying the significance of absolute (or total) citation frequencies. It eliminates some of the bias of such counts which favor large journals over small ones, or frequently issued journals over less frequently issued ones, and of older journals over newer ones. Particularly in the latter case such journals have a larger citable body of literature than smaller or younger journals. All things being equal, the larger the number of previously published articles, the more often a journal will be cited.^{4,5}

Perhaps the most important and recent use of **impact** is in the process of academic evaluation. The **impact factor** can be used to provide a gross approximation of the prestige of journals in which individuals have been published. This is best done in conjunction with other considerations such as peer review, productivity, and subject specialty citation rates. As a tool

for management of library journal collections, the **impact factor** supplies the library administrator with information about journals already in the collection and journals under consideration for acquisition. These data must also be combined with cost and circulation data to make rational decisions about purchases of journals.

The **impact factor** can be useful in all of these applications, provided the data are used sensibly. It is important to note that subjective methods can be used in evaluating journals as, for example, by interviews or questionnaires. In general, there is good agreement on the relative value of journals in the appropriate categories. However, the *JCR* makes possible the realization that many journals do not fit easily into established categories. Often, the only differentiation possible between two or three small journals of average **impact** is price or subjective judgments such as peer review.

Using the Impact Factor Wisely

The Institute for Scientific Information® (ISI®) does not depend on the **impact factor** alone in assessing the usefulness of a journal, and neither should anyone else. The **impact factor** should not be used without careful attention to the many phenomena that influence citation rates, as for example the average number of references cited in the average article. The **impact factor** should be used with informed peer review. In the case of academic evaluation for tenure it is sometimes inappropriate to use the **impact** of the source journal to estimate the expected frequency of a recently published article. Again, the **impact factor** should be used with informed peer review. Citation frequencies for individual articles are quite varied.

There are many artifacts that can influence a journal's **impact** and its ranking in journal lists, not the least of which is the inclusion of review articles or letters. This is illustrated in a study of the leading medical journals published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine*.⁶

Review Articles

Review articles generally are cited more frequently than typical research articles because they often serve as surrogates for earlier literature, especially in journals that discourage extensive bibliographies. In the *JCR* system any article containing more than 100 references is coded as a review. Articles in "review" sections of research or clinical journals are also coded as reviews, as are articles whose titles contain the word "review" or "overview."

The Source Data Listing in the *JCR* not only provides data on the number of reviews in each journal but also provides the average number of references cited in that journal's articles. Naturally, review journals have some of the highest **impact factors**. Often, the first-ranked journal in the subject category listings will be a review journal. For example, under Biochemistry, the journal topping the list is *Annual Review of Biochemistry* with an **impact factor** of 35.5 in 1992.

Methods Articles

It is widely believed that methods articles attract more citations than other types of articles. However, this is not in fact true. Many journals devoted entirely to methods do not achieve unusual **impact**. But it is true that among the most cited articles in the literature there are some super classics that give this overall impression. It should be noted that the chronological limitation on the **impact** calculation eliminates the bias super classics might introduce. Absolute

citation frequencies are biased in this way, but, on occasion, a hot paper might affect the current **impact** of a journal.

Variation between Disciplines

Different specialties exhibit different ranges of peak **impact**. That is why the *JCR*[®] provides subject category listings. In this way, journals may be viewed in the context of their specific field. Still, a five-year **impact** may be more useful to some users and can be calculated by combining the statistical data available from consecutive years of the *JCR* (see Figure 2). It is rare to find that the *ranking* of a journal will change significantly within its designated category unless the journal's influence has indeed changed.

Figure 2: Calculation for five-year impact factor:

One year of citations to five years of articles.

A= citations in 1992 to articles published in 1987-91

B = articles published in 1987-91

C= A/B = five-year **impact factor**

An alternative five-year **impact** can be calculated based on adding citations in 1988-92 articles published in the same five-year period. And yet another is possible by selecting one or two earlier years as **factor "B"** above.

Item-by-Item Impact

While ISI[®] does manually code each published source item, it is not feasible to code individually the 12 million references we process each year. Therefore, journal citation counts in *JCR* do not distinguish between letters, reviews, or original research. So, if a journal publishes a large number of letters, there will usually be a temporary increase in references to those letters. Letters to the *Lancet* may indeed be cited more often than letters to *JAMA* or vice versa, but the overall citation count recorded would not take this artifact into account. Detailed computerized article-by-article analyses or audits can be conducted to identify such artifacts.

Cited-Only Journals in the JCR

Some of the journals listed in the *JCR* are not citing journals, but are cited-only journals. This is significant when comparing journals by **impact factor** because the self-citations from a cited-only journal are not included in its **impact factor** calculation. Self-citations often represent about 13% of the citations that a journal receives. The cited-only journals with **impact factors** in the *JCR* Journal Rankings and Subject Category Listing may be ceased or suspended journals, superseded titles, or journals that are covered in the science editions of *Current Contents*[®], but not a citation index.

Users can identify cited-only journals by checking the *JCR* Citing Journal Listing. Furthermore, users can establish analogous **impact factors**, (excluding self-citations), for the journals they are evaluating using the data given in the Citing Journal Listing (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Calculation for impact factor revised to exclude self-citations.

A= citations in 1992 to articles published in 1990-91

B= 1992 self-citations to articles published in 1990-91

C= A - B = total citations minus self-citations to recent articles

D= number of articles published 1990-91
E= revised **impact factor** (C/D)
(see **Table 1** for numerical example)

Title Change

A user's knowledge of the content and history of the journal studied is very important for appropriate interpretation of **impact factors**. Situations such as those mentioned above and others such as title change are very important, and often misunderstood, considerations.

A title change affects the **impact factor** for two years after the change is made. The old and new titles are not unified unless the titles are in the same position alphabetically. In the first year after the title change, the **impact** is not available for the new title unless the data for old and new can be unified. In the second year, the **impact factor** is split. The new title may rank lower than expected and the old title may rank higher than expected because only one year of source data is included in its calculation (see Figure 4). Title changes for the current year and the previous year are listed in the *JCR*[®] guide.

Figure 4: Unified 1992 impact factor calculation for title change.

A=1992 citations to articles published in 1990-91 ($a_1 + a_2$)

A1=those for new title

A2=those for superseded title

B=number of articles published in 1990-91 ($B_1 + B_2$)

B1=those for new title

B2=those for superseded title

C=unified **impact factor** (A/B)

C1=A1/B1 = *JCR*[®] **factor** for the new title

C2=A2/B2 = *JCR* **factor** for the superseded title

Conclusions

The **impact factor** is a very useful tool for evaluation of journals, but it must be used discreetly. Considerations include the amount of review or other types of material published in a journal, variations between disciplines, and item-by-item **impact**. The journal's status in regard to coverage in the ISI[®] databases as well as the occurrence of a title change are also very important. In the next essay we will look at some examples of how to put tools for journal evaluation into use.

References

1. **Gross P L K, Gross E M.** College libraries and chemical education. *Science* 66:385-9, 1927.
2. **Brodman E.** Methods of choosing physiology journals. *Bull. Med. Libr. Assn.* 32:479-83, 1944.
3. *SCI[®] Journal Citation Reports[®]: a bibliometric analysis of science journals in the ISI[®] database.* Philadelphia: Institute for Scientific Information, Inc.[®], 1993.
4. **Garfield E.** Citation analysis as a tool in journal evaluation. *Science* 178:471-9, 1972.
5. **Garfield E.** Citation indexing for studying science. *Nature* 227:669-71, 1970.
6. **Garfield E.** Which medical journals have the greatest **impact**? *Ann. Intern. Med.* 105:313-20, 1986.

Appendix 2: College of Dentistry Mentoring Guidelines for Tenure-Accruing Faculty

The department chair will initially select a mentor for tenure-accruing faculty members.

Faculty (tenure accruing) hired after 11/07/2000, regardless of rank, must be assigned a mentor. The assignment of a mentor for faculty hired at the rank of assistant professor prior to 11/06/2000 is optional.

The mentor will meet with the faculty member and provide him/her with a copy of both the University of Florida and the College of Dentistry Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. After reviewing the guidelines, the faculty member and the mentor will meet to discuss the criteria for tenure and promotion.

During this meeting, the mentor should recommend that the faculty member enter the University Tenure and promotion packet on his computer to begin the process of preparing the packet for the mid-career review for tenure. The mid-career review for tenure will occur in the College of Dentistry after three years of employment at the University of Florida.

At the end of each year the mentor will write an annual assessment (after reviewing the tenure and promotion packet) to the faculty member describing his/her progress toward tenure and/or promotion. This assessment should be provided orally to the faculty member initially and he/she should be given an opportunity to respond and for the assessment to be modified as a result of this meeting if appropriate. The department chair and the mentor will meet on an annual basis (prior to the annual evaluation process) to discuss the progress of the faculty member. At this meeting the mentor will share the faculty member's annual assessment with the chair.

At the end of the faculty member's first year, the faculty member and the chair should discuss the relationship with the mentor and decide whether a new mentor might be more appropriate. Where appropriate, the chair should give strong consideration to the preference of the faculty member.

College of Dentistry Mentoring Program Annual Assessment for Tenure-Accruing Faculty

1. ASSIGNED DEPARTMENT ACTIVITIES SINCE UF EMPLOYMENT

Teaching
 Research
 Service
 Patient Care

2. PRODUCTIVITY AS AN INVESTIGATOR AND SCHOLAR

Original publications-senior authorship/ peer-reviewed journals	# _____
Publications/Non-Refereed	# _____
Books, Sole Author	# _____
Books, Co-Authored	# _____
Books, Edited (Editor, Co-editor)	# _____
Books, Contributor of Chapter(s)	# _____
Review Articles	# _____
 Publications Submitted	 # _____
 Peer-Reviewed External Funding (PI, Co-PI)	 # _____
 National Review Panels (Study Sections)	 # _____
(Editorial Boards)	# _____
(Other)	# _____
 Invited Presentations	 # _____
(International)	# _____
(National)	# _____
(Regional)	# _____
(State)	# _____

3. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT - Development of new educational materials, computer programs and related activities.

4. TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS - Faculty and student evaluations, awards, presentations, and administration of courses. (Teaching evaluations should be consistently at or above the college average.)

5. Faculty Average _____
 College Average _____

