

Academic Career Pathways (Research & Teaching)

Assessment Criteria for
Promotion to Clinical Professor
2025-26

Assessment Criteria

This section sets out the promotion criteria for the ACP R&T processes, which apply to all academic staff. The Assessment Criteria for each academic office are given below together with generic Indicators of Excellence.

Each application will be considered and assessed on its own merit against the Assessment Criteria for the level in question, taking into equal account evidence of both inputs and outputs. For clarity, in relation to:

- **Teaching:** account may be taken from previous academic employment in the University and/or College(s), whether engaged as an employee or a worker at the University, in relation to teaching but not from institutions external to the University.
- **Research/Scholarship:** Account may be taken of evidence in relation to research/scholarship, including researcher development, regardless of where it has been undertaken.
- **Service:** Evidence of contribution to the applicant's subject other than in teaching and research may also include contributions made outside the University.

The generic Indicators of Excellence as well as the respective School/Institution-specific Indicators of Excellence provide examples of evidence of fulfilment of these criteria. All examples are suggestive in nature and non-exhaustive, and not all the indicators will be relevant to all applicants.

Applicants should refer to the committees section (in particular [Overarching Considerations](#)) for more guidance on the approach that committees are expected to take in evaluating evidence.

The General Board has the discretion to make changes to the weighting, thresholds, score range, or any other element of the scoring methodology that it deems necessary.

School/Institution-specific Guidance and Indicators of Excellence

Each School/Institution is expected to adopt and publish its own specific guidance on expectations for promotion and exemplar Indicators of Excellence; these indicators are in addition to the more generic Indicators of Excellence set out in this guidance. The School/Institution-specific guidance will state the expectations with regard to the balance between teaching and researcher development for promotion.

To ensure parity of standards and expectations, the School guidance must be approved by the respective School Councils prior to adoption. Each School will be expected to review their guidance annually and update it, as necessary, to ensure it remains relevant and fit for purpose. Schools may find it helpful to refer to the minutes of previous ACP R&T exercises for examples of Indicators of Excellence for their disciplines.

Please see the School/Institution-specific information for further details.

- [Arts and Humanities](#)
- [Biological Sciences](#)
- [Clinical Medicine](#)
- [Humanities and Social Sciences](#)
- [Physical Sciences](#)
- [Technology](#)

Clinical Professor: Criteria for the Assessment of Research and Research Leadership

Promotion to Clinical Professor requires **outstanding achievement in research and research leadership assessed by reference to international levels of excellence**. This includes both individual and collaborative contributions to research, as well as contributions to leading an excellent institutional research culture.

There are two criteria and outstanding achievement is normally required in both. Clinical academic applicants would be expected to demonstrate the same quality of contribution across both criteria as non-clinical applicants. However, in recognition of their clinical responsibilities, some adjustment may be made for expectations around volume of contribution, in particular in relation to Criterion 2.

Whilst expectations around quality and impact remain the same, there may be differences in the publications portfolio of applicants in research fields which are highly collaborative, and who have substantial involvement in consortia or clinical trials, for example. For these applicants, the balance of evidence under Criterion 2 may be greater. In such cases, it is particularly important that applicants clearly demonstrate their intellectual thought leadership and research-related leadership, in consortia/collaborative settings.

CRITERION 1: Consistently conducts rigorous research addressing significant questions, contributing new ideas and advancing the boundaries of the field whilst ensuring the highest standards of research integrity are promoted and maintained.	
<i>Generic examples of Indicators of Excellence</i>	<i>Generic examples of impact</i>
• A substantial portfolio of high quality research outputs that are internationally recognised as world-class in terms of their originality, significance and rigour. The University acknowledges that the intellectual content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published. • Makes a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge in their research discipline. • Produces and disseminates research outputs that have an impact, for example in the REF or informs national or international policy development. • It is expected that significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge would be at least partly evidenced by authorship position.	• Frequently invited to present work at major national and international conferences and institutions. • A significant track record of winning competitive research funding. • In receipt of prizes and honours for research. • Applicants working in highly collaborative methodological fields (for example in biostatistics, or imaging), would be expected to be producing high quality methodological papers, as well as publications in the field in which their methods are being used.

CRITERION 2: Consistently provides high-quality research leadership, strategically planning for the future and supporting an inclusive and productive research culture

<i>Generic examples of Indicators of Excellence</i>	<i>Generic examples of impact</i>
• Leads and contributes to collaborative research projects. • Elected/appointed to research-related leadership roles. • Creates and manages large research groups. • Convenes and leads major research conferences and seminar programmes. • Provides intellectual thought leadership which informs and contributes to setting the international research agenda in an individual's area. • Contribution to international healthcare policy and guidelines (for example, NICE, WHO).	• Participation in high-quality public, industrial and/or policy engagement activities linked to research. • Edits major academic journals. • Promotes and maintains high standards of research integrity. • Promotes collaboration and develops cross-disciplinary research activities.

Clinical Professor Applications: Criteria for the Assessment of Teaching and Researcher Development

Applicants are required to show that they have **made an effective contribution toward the University's goal of providing high quality research-led teaching to undergraduate and postgraduate students and/or fostering the professional development of research students and early career research staff.** It is recognised that applicants may contribute in different ways at different points in their career and that effective contributions may differ between disciplines. Contributions will be assessed in the context of the relevant Institution's expectations, including the local workload model where applicable. In its guidance, each Institution should indicate the balance of expectation as between teaching (undergraduate/postgraduate) and researcher (PhD/Postdoc) development. An effective contribution must be shown by reference to all or some of the following criteria.

As the Clinical School has no Tripos courses and no 'standard' undergraduates, there are restricted opportunities for non-clinical applicants to become involved in teaching. Whilst non-clinical applicants would be expected to demonstrate the same quality of contribution as clinical applicants, the quantity of contribution under Criterion 1 and also Criterion 3 (which for clinical applicants includes postgraduate medical education) may be lower. The balance of evidence in Criterion 2 may therefore be greater for non-clinical applicants. Non-clinical applicants are able to demonstrate evidence under Criterion 1 relating to masters course teaching within the School, and also contributions to courses in other Schools within the University. Particularly for non-clinical applicants, College teaching may form a substantial portion of the evidence of contribution under Criterion 1.

CRITERION 1: Consistently delivers excellent teaching that benefits from and engages with Cambridge's research-rich environment and is intellectually challenging	
<i>Generic examples of Indicators of Excellence</i>	<i>Generic examples of impact</i>
• Designs and develops new programmes. • Leads/makes a significant contribution to internal teaching reviews. • Demonstrates breadth of knowledge and teaches effectively beyond immediate research area. • Receives prizes for teaching. • Undertakes examination/acts as a course examiner. • Provides educational leadership and organisation including curriculum development and learning design. • Clinical applicants would be expected to be teaching clinical students in a variety of settings, for example on wards, in clinic, in outpatients. They may also be teaching more broadly across the clinical curriculum, for example, in communications skills or professionalism, and would be expected to be involved in the creation and/or delivery of assessments. • It would be appropriate to include as evidence of excellence, the creation of innovative or enhanced electronic learning resources, or the introduction of new technology to enhance learning/course delivery.	• Successfully introduces innovative teaching/assessment methods or significant contribution to their enhancement. • Publishes major textbooks/e-learning materials adopted in courses internal or external to the University. • National or global press coverage of the applicant's educational ideas or activities. • Holding an educational leadership position within a professional body • Receives excellent student feedback. • Demonstrates sophisticated, reflexive approach to teaching and supporting learning which enables students to develop subject knowledge and capabilities.

CRITERION 2: Consistently delivers high-quality research supervision that is intellectually challenging and supportive	
<i>Generic examples of Indicators of Excellence</i>	<i>Generic examples of impact</i>
- Consistently high research student completion rates. - Award of prizes and honours for researcher development. - Consistently receives positive feedback from research students. - Researcher training and development processes includes oversight of placement opportunities (where available) with industrial or other partners.	- Provides inclusive leadership and delivers excellence through the performance of others. - Creates a positive working environment and acts as a role model in promoting inclusion and mutual respect. - Contributes significantly towards recruiting and winning support for research students. - Recognises and nurtures talent and demonstrates consistent engagement with researcher training and development processes.

CRITERION 3: Consistently ensures that early-career researchers receive excellent opportunities to develop their potential and prepare them for future success	
<i>Generic examples of Indicators of Excellence</i>	<i>Generic examples of impact</i>
- Consistently receives positive feedback from postdoctoral researchers. - Enables and encourages early-career researchers to develop independent research lines and/or pursue independent publications or funding applications. - Mentors or coaches early-career researchers in other groups or departments. - For clinical applicants, contribution to postgraduate medical education will be considered under this criterion. Indicators of excellence will include contribution to postgraduate training and assessment, and evidence of excellent trainee feedback.	- Provides inclusive leadership and delivers excellence through the performance of others. - Creates a positive working environment and acts as a role model in promoting inclusion and mutual respect. - Recognises and nurtures talent and demonstrates consistent engagement with researcher training and development processes. - Helps early-career researchers to be creative about their futures and takes active steps to support career pathways both in and beyond academia.

Clinical Professor Applications: Criteria for the Assessment of Service to the University and to the Academic Community

Applicants are required to show an **effective service contribution**. University members are expected to demonstrate and promote collegiality by nurturing a culture of mutual respect. The University recognises that individuals may contribute in different ways at different times and that as individuals become more senior they may be asked to take on more commitments that are external to the University. Nevertheless, the University normally expects applicants to demonstrate a significant degree of service contribution that is internal to the University. For the Clinical School, service to the community (in broad terms), and to the public (including patients), are key components under this heading.

CRITERION: Consistently makes an effective contribution of service to the University and to the academic community beyond the University. Promotes collegiality and engenders a culture of mutual respect.	
<i>Generic examples of Indicators of Excellence</i>	<i>Generic examples of impact</i>
• Departmental/Faculty/University academic leadership roles. • Sits on demanding Departmental/Faculty University committees and bodies. • Provides active mentoring and support for colleagues. • Promotes and demonstrates effective use of the Staff Review and Development Scheme. • Significant and sustained contributions to equality, diversity and inclusion activities. • Creates a positive working environment and acts as a role model in promoting inclusion and mutual respect. • Promotes cross-disciplinary collaboration and knowledge sharing. • Contributes to the running, administration and student support within Colleges. • Significant and sustained contribution to widening participation activity. • Evidence of excellence, impact and commitment to clinical practice and to the highest standards of professionalism. • Evidence of patient and public engagement. • Membership of national/international healthcare committees and advisory bodies. • Membership of relevant NHS committees and commitment to furthering the close relationship between the University and the NHS, particularly in the local context. • Widening participation activities can include junior doctors, and strengthening participation in under-represented specialties/areas. • Being asked to sit on/contribute to work of national curriculum and/or assessment committees (i.e. Royal Colleges, GMC Standards or medical schools council question banks).	• Engages significantly in peer review activity. • Advises government and parliamentary bodies. • Sits on public review bodies. • Significant and sustained contributions to fostering strategic partnerships (e.g. industry, trusts and foundations, philanthropic donors). • Supports the work of other HEIs (e.g. significant external examining; participation in research/teaching and learning reviews). • Significant and sustained public engagement activity. • Departmental/Faculty leadership roles also encompass Unit and Research Institute or Centre leadership roles.

