

## **Performance Expectations for Tenure-Track Faculty Relating to Promotion and Tenure**

Department of Community and Behavioral Health  
College of Public Health  
University of Iowa

This document is based on the approved document in the Department of Health Management and Policy, College of Public Health, University of Iowa.

Acknowledgment of the effort that was put into this document and permission to take from it is greatly appreciated.

### General Principles:

- “The bar is always rising.” Enhancing the quality and reputation of the Department’s research and educational programs over time entails increasing the quality of the faculty. A level of performance that was sufficient for promotion or tenure in the past may not be sufficient now, and the level of performance that is sufficient now may not be sufficient in the future.
- Meeting performance expectations is “necessary but not sufficient” for promotion and, especially, tenure. Changes in the Department’s overall budget, projected enrollment, or research and educational priorities also play a key role. This principle is intended to be consistent with University policy as stated in OM (III-10.1a.(4)(c))<sup>1</sup>.
- The activities within each portfolio of teaching, research and service need to be considered as a complete package. These will vary between faculty members in the department given other administrative and organizational positions they may be involved in.

### Criteria for Promotion:

As stated in the University operations manual:

“The criteria for promotions include teaching, research, and other professional contributions. Since teaching and research are the central functions of the faculty, other professional contributions are considered subsidiary to these fundamental tasks. The length of service, whether long or short, does not constitute, of itself, a qualification for promotion nor the sole justification for the denial of same.” (OM III 10.2)

The general qualifications for faculty appointment at (or promotion to) specific ranks stated in the operations manual are (OM III 10.4):

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Iowa 2005 Operations Manual, March 2005

“b. Associate Professor.

- (1) Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students.
- (2) Demonstration of ... scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications ... of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s).
- (3) Departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service will be expected at an appropriate level.
- (4) The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly/artistic accomplishment, and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.

c. Professor.

- (1) Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels, including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students to the completion of their degree programs, where applicable.
- (2) Continued artistic or scholarly achievement of high quality, accompanied by unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar or creative artist in the chosen field.
- (3) The candidate should have a record of significant and effective service to the department, college, and/or the University and, if appropriate, to the profession.”

In short, promotion and tenure decisions are to be based on a record of achievement in teaching, research, and service. Of course, the specific elements of performance in teaching, research, and service that reflect a level of achievement worthy of promotion are subjective, and any evaluation process must be sufficiently flexible to encompass differences across faculty in disciplinary training, teaching assignments, and research expertise.

Performance Expectations:

*Teaching:*

1. General criteria as stated in the operations manual:

“The prime requisites for an effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, and independence; a willingness to consider suggestions and to cooperate in teaching activities; a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads to the development and strengthening of course content in the light of developments in the area of interest, as well as to improve methods of presenting material; a vital interest in teaching and working with students and, above all, the ability to stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate. This evaluation is so important, however, that recommendations for promotion should include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of

students, of student counselors and of colleagues who have visited the individual classes or who have been closely associated with the person's teaching as supervisor or in some other capacity, or who have taught the same students in subsequent courses. Academic counseling or advising of students should be recognized as an important component of the teaching process, and due credit should be given to faculty members who exert an unusual effort in this function.” (III 10.2(a))

2. Key indicators of teaching performance for CBH:
  - a. Peer evaluations of teaching- this will be weighted the heaviest in consideration of teaching quality
  - b. Teaching awards or other recognition of teaching excellence
  - c. Successful mentoring of student research
    - i. Candidates for promotion from **assistant** to **associate** professor are expected to devote less effort to mentoring student research. Faculty at the rank of assistant professor should contribute to mentoring student research to the extent possible, for example as a member of a student’s dissertation. However, service as chair of a dissertation committee should not be a criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor. Service on Masters’ thesis or MPH practicum as a chair and committee member is expected.
    - ii. For candidates for promotion from **associate** professor to **professor**, success as a mentor of student research is an important component of teaching performance. Indicators include:
      1. Chairing a student’s dissertation committee
      2. Student presentations and publications
      3. Awards for student presentations and publications
  - d. Student evaluations, both numerical and open-ended comments.
    - i. Student evaluations tend to be less favorable for required vs. elective courses, for larger vs. smaller classes, and so forth. Therefore, in interpreting student evaluations, factors likely to affect student evaluations for specific courses must be taken into account. When possible, evaluations for an instructor of a required course should be compared to evaluations of other instructors of the same course.
    - ii. The distribution of scores from student evaluations is more informative than simply examining means, particularly in small classes. For example, a rating of “3” by 100% of students is not the same as a bimodal distribution of “5” or “1” by 50% each. Also, a mean of “4” in a class of 5 students is not the same as a mean of “4” in a class of 30 students).

*Research:*

The overriding philosophy is that a faculty member will have an identified stream of research indicated by their publications, grants/contracts and student research projects. This stream may be in a content area or methods area but in all cases will demonstrate the addition of new science to this area.

1. General criteria as stated in the operations manual:

“[P]ublications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction. . . . Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either in a single work of considerable importance or a series of studies constituting a general program of worthwhile research. The candidate should pursue a definite, continuing program of studies, investigations or creative works.” (OM III 10.2(b))

In addition, for the purposes of promotion and tenure decisions<sup>2</sup> the Department of Community and Behavioral Health affirms that the following need to be included as consideration issues for faculty conducting research in the area of Community-Based Research(CBR). Community-based research (CBR) is an overarching term used to encompass a variety of approaches, including participatory action research, feminist participatory research, collaborative inquiry and systems change programs. It is a critical orientation to public health research and practice that redresses health disparities resulting from environmental causes. CBR takes place when trained health professionals and community members work together to critically examine and change the socio-political and physical environment in an effort to improve people’s health. Although definitions may vary, CBR is generally defined as a collaborative process that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings. It begins with a research topic of importance to the community with the aim of combining knowledge and action for social change.

Key principles are:

- often the role of the faculty member is one of collaboration with health agencies and communities, rather than the more traditional role of "principal investigator;"
- the results of the work are directly and immediately applicable, as compared to the more "distant" application of research findings;
- a faculty member works with a national, state, or local health agency, or directly with a community, to help solve some current public health problem;
- CBR usually involves helping health agencies assess public health problems or, plan, implement or evaluate public health programs;
- CBR often involves helping communities or health agencies assess public health problems, assure the delivery of public health services, or develop public health policies;
- CBR often involves the faculty member in direct contact with communities or populations that are the clients, recipients or beneficiaries of public health programs or services;
- the program planning, implementing and evaluating process is often long-term and time intensive;

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on guidelines developed by Emory University.

- the "scholarly" product of CBR includes peer-reviewed articles, books, chapter, and presentations to professional meetings, but also may take the form of technical reports and organizational program documents;
  - CBR often has an advocacy component;
  - there is a linkage between a faculty member's CBR experiences and the teaching of public health graduate students; such linkage may be in the classroom or it may be in supervised field experiences, or other similar types of experiences in which graduate students work with or under the supervision of the CBR faculty member;
  - there can be a research component to CBR: CBR oriented research is defined by communities/agencies and deals with immediate problems; the practitioner/researcher collaborates with communities/agencies and the research is jointly owned; and,
  - CBR may directly facilitate the research of others as in the case of biostatistical or methodological collaboration.
2. The CBH faculty are diverse in terms of their disciplinary backgrounds and research focus areas. In many cases, faculty in CBH publish papers in the area of community-based research that require more time to come to fruition and a greater coordination of co-authors than is the norm for many other disciplines typically represented in colleges of public health. As a result, some of the usual quantitative benchmarks for research productivity (such as the total number or number of "co-authored" publications) **may** not be applicable and must be taken into account with the research conducted. No differential between multi-authored and solo authored papers will be considered.
3. The ultimate measure of performance in research is a national or international reputation for advancing the state of knowledge in the field ("the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar ... in the chosen field"). Different individuals possess different strengths and weaknesses, and different disciplines have different ways of disseminating information or measuring impact. As a result, any quantitative measure of performance will by nature be more suggestive rather than prescriptive for any individual. Nonetheless, it is useful to provide some general guidance for key indicators of research performance for CBH:
- a. Peer-reviewed publications:
    - i. Ordinarily one would expect faculty in CBH to contribute on average 3 peer-reviewed publications per year after the completion of the PhD, where the faculty member is lead author on one-third or more, with the majority of these papers appearing in quality journals in the area of their research. (see item *iii* below).
      1. For candidates for promotion from **assistant to associate** professor with tenure, this means that in most cases the candidate should have in the range of 12-15 papers published (or accepted for publication).
        - Candidates with post-doctoral research experience prior to their appointment at UI, either as a post-doc or as faculty elsewhere, often will have had papers published during that period.

- While such prior publications add to the candidate's overall body of research, publication of on average 2 or 3 papers per year during the probationary period at UI usually would be necessary to provide evidence of an ongoing high level of research productivity required for promotion and (especially) tenure.
2. For candidates for promotion from **associate professor to professor**, citation frequency (see item 3*b* below) may be a more reliable indicator of the cumulative impact of the candidate's research than the cumulative number of publications. Nonetheless, in most cases a candidate for full professor normally would be expected to have, at a minimum, 50 published papers in quality peer-review journals, with evidence of an ongoing high level of research productivity.
    - ii. Evidence of journal quality could consist of quantitative measures such as the journal's impact factor score, published rankings of journal quality based on surveys of researchers in a particular area, or attestations of journal quality by external reviewers of the candidate's promotion/tenure dossier.
- b. Citation frequency:
- i. Although imperfect, one objective measure of research impact is citation frequency. A published paper that has never been cited by anyone several years after its publication is unlikely to have made a significant contribution to knowledge. Conversely, review articles, methodological papers, and papers presenting estimates of prevalence or costs of specific diseases tend to be cited more frequently than papers addressing a specific research issue. Also, papers published in peer-reviewed journals targeted to practitioners (rather than researchers) may be read and used often but cited less frequently.
  - ii. Given the lag between the publication of a paper and measurement of its impact in the form of citation frequency, in general it would be inappropriate to set any specific quantitative expectation for citation frequency for candidates for promotion from assistant to associate professor. Nonetheless, some indication of a trend toward increasing citation frequency helps to demonstrate "scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications."
  - iii. For candidates for promotion **to full professor** only, citation frequency can be an extremely important indicator of impact. Generally, one would expect a candidate for promotion to full professor to have a cumulative total of around 250 citations or more, with a substantial number of citations to papers where the candidate was the lead author, and where one paper does not account for virtually all citations. To evaluate this, we use the *Web of Science* to access the Institute for Scientific Information's *Science Citation Index* and *Social Science Citation Index*.
- c. External reviewers:
- The intent of external promotion and tenure reviews is to provide an arms-length evaluation by individuals who are leading experts in the candidate's area of

expertise. Therefore, as a general rule, evaluations by frequent coauthors, former thesis advisors, former colleagues, or close friends tend to have less impact than evaluations by experts who have not had such relationships with the candidate. In identifying potential external reviewers, all participants in the selection process will take into account the standing of the prospective reviewer in the discipline, the likely knowledge of the reviewer of the material to be reviewed, the apparent impartiality of the reviewer, and the contribution of the reviewer to achieving an overall "balanced" review among the reviewers on any criterion for which there might be a range of perspectives. It is critical to avoid any situation in which a personal and/or professional relationship (including advising, mentoring, co-authoring, etc.) between the candidate and a prospective reviewer could undermine the reviewer's apparent impartiality.

- i. Although external reviewers can and do comment on performance in the areas of teaching and service, their assessments of the candidate's contribution to knowledge in the field are particularly important.

d. Research funding:

- i. External research funding is an essential element of the fiscal health of the Department, the College, and the University. However, in an academic institution the fundamental role of external research funding is (or should be) to provide the means to expand scientific knowledge. The fact that others are willing to provide financial support for the faculty member's research provides a signal that the research is important and timely.
- ii. Funding in dollars is not a direct measure of potential contribution. In particular, CBH faculty often obtain external funding for projects that do not entail extensive primary data collection, expensive equipment or research supplies, or other types of "pass-through" expenditures. The most relevant quantitative measure of funding for CBH faculty relates to the total faculty effort and graduate research assistantships supported.
- iii. In general, funding from a source using peer review to guide funding decisions provides a clearer indicator of likely contribution to knowledge than non-peer-reviewed grants or contracts.
- iv. Funding as a PI serves as an indicator of an individual faculty member's contribution to the funded research effort. Accordingly:
  1. In most cases one would expect a candidate for promotion from **assistant to associate** professor to have externally funded grants or contracts support as a PI to demonstrate the likelihood of future support for the candidate's developing research agenda.
  2. Candidates for promotion from **associate to full** professor should have had several externally funded grants or contracts as a PI.
- v. Candidates for promotion from **assistant to associate** professor should demonstrate a trend toward consistently meeting or exceeding departmental expectations regarding salary offsets from external research funding, including a trend toward a significant portion of salary offsets coming from funded projects where the candidate is the PI.

- vi. Candidates for promotion from **associate to full professor** should consistently meet or exceed departmental expectations regarding salary offsets from external research funding, with a significant portion of salary offsets coming from funded projects where the candidate is the PI.

#### 4. Community Based Research

Competence in CBR can be demonstrated by providing the following types of materials and information at time of promotion and tenure:

- Description of CBR activities;
- For each CBR project, the nature and duration of the project, and the role played by the faculty member;
- Documentation that the CBR contributions have had important effects on policy, and/or on a community, agency or program;
- Evidence that the CBR activities involved or resulted in the creation or development of new public health knowledge;
- Evidence that the CBR activities have contributed to the teaching activities of the faculty member and/or the department; for instance, that teaching is directed at CBR issues such as assessing public health problems, assuring the delivery of public health service, or developing public health policies;
- Evidence that teaching contributions include linking classroom activities and other teaching activities with public health agencies;
- Evidence that new knowledge, methods, or policies derived from the candidate's CBR have diffused to other communities, or health agencies;
- Evidence that new CBR ideas, policies, programs, methods, etc. have been disseminated through publications. In addition to articles in refereed journals, "publication" can mean producing technical reports that are used by public health agencies and/or communities to help them assess public health problems, assure the delivery of public health services, or develop public health policies.
- Receiving honors or awards in recognition of outstanding contributions to CBR;
- Invitations by other institutions or health agencies to help plan, organize or review CBR activities;
- Appointments to national commissions, committees, boards, etc. related to CBR;
- Grants and contracts received by other groups and agencies to fund CBR activities.

#### *Service:*

##### 1. General criteria as stated in the operations manual:

“From time to time, a faculty member is called upon to render major professional services to the University or to society in general. Such contributions should be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University and its effect on the development of the individual.” (OM III 10.2(c))

2. Key indicators of service performance for CBH:
  - a. Service on departmental, collegiate, or university-level committees
  - b. Service as a journal peer-reviewer
  - c. Service on an NIH/AHRQ/VA or similar study section
  - d. Service on the editorial board of a journal in the field
  - e. Service as a journal editor (includes assistant and associate editorship)
  - f. Service on ad hoc committees for a scientific or professional organization
  - g. Service as an elected or appointed officer of a scientific or professional organization
  - h. Participation on boards or task forces at the community, regional, national, or international level.
  - i. Service to the State of Iowa or other governmental entities
3. Candidates for promotion **to associate professor with tenure** are expected to demonstrate a trend toward increasing service effort.
4. Candidates for promotion **to full professor** should have a demonstrated record of achievement in service.

Tenure Decisions:

In general, a grant of tenure is a much more momentous decision than promotion among those with tenure. For candidates for promotion from assistant to associate professor, the tenure decision usually is tied to the promotion decision. For faculty initially appointed as an untenured associate or full professor, the performance expectations for a grant of tenure at that rank would be, at an absolute minimum, equivalent to the performance expectations for promotion to that rank. Performance during the candidate's probationary period at the University of Iowa would be an especially important consideration in the tenure decision.

CBR Issues that are Relevant to Promotion and Tenure

Schools and College of Public Health are currently implementing guidelines to inform their promotion and tenure process. The Community-Campus Partnership and Association of Schools of Public Health strongly support such initiatives. Thus, this effort by the University of Iowa, College of Public Health, Department of Community & Behavioral Health, reflects a broader trend of large schools and public health organizations to recognize the value of CBR in public health.