

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

Department of Epidemiology
College of Public Health
University of Iowa

This document is based on the approved documents in the Department of Health Management and Policy and the Department of Community and Behavioral Health, 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

- One of the components of our mission is scholarship. The definition of the composition, quantity and quality of scholarship is changing and will change with further development of electronic publishing and other technological advances.
- The evaluation is based upon the entire performance of scholarship, teaching and service. These are necessary components and may not be sufficient for promotion and/or 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))¹.
- 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.

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)

¹ University of Iowa 2005 Operations Manual, March 2005

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

Associate Professor.

- (1) Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students.
- (2) Demonstration of artistic or scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications or equivalent artistic creations or performances, 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.

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.

The qualifications for faculty appointment at (or promotion to) specific ranks stated in the College of Public Health Faculty Handbook are:

Associate Professor.

- (1) Convincing evidence from peer-review and student assessments that the candidate is an effective teacher.

- (2) National recognition for a productive program of research, scholarship, or creative work, supported by substantial publications (or equivalent artistic creations), as appropriate to the discipline.
- (3) Evidence of departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service.
- (4) The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly accomplishment, and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.
- (5) A tenure appointment, except that for persons appointed from off the campus, the initial appointment may be for a term of three years or less.

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 scholarly achievement of high quality, including substantial first-authored publications and grant support, some of which is as principal or co-principal investigator, as appropriate to the discipline, accompanied by unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar 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.
- (4) A tenure appointment, except that for persons appointed from off the campus, the initial appointment may be for a term of three years or less.

Additional criteria for the department of epidemiology are:

Associate Professor.

- (1) Evidence demonstrates that the faculty member has the ability and willingness to provide leadership in promoting or advancing a programmatic activity that has the potential to enhance the

corporate value and reputation of the department. Such a program could serve any major dimension of the department – teaching, research and service.

Professor.

(1) Clear evidence that the faculty member has the ability and willingness to provide leadership in promoting or advancing a programmatic activity that has the potential to enhance the corporate value and reputation of the department. Such a program could serve any major dimension of the department – teaching, research and service.

Promotion and tenure decisions are 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. Any evaluation process must be sufficiently flexible to encompass differences across faculty in disciplinary training, teaching assignments, and research expertise. It is a multi-decision process where the dossier and documentation become the ultimate means of judging proficiency and competency.

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 Epidemiology:

- a. Peer evaluations of teaching
 - i. Required and documented adequacy of teaching quality
- b. Teaching awards or other recognition of teaching excellence
- c. Teaching development or improvement activities
 - i. Course development or major revision
 - ii. Continuing education in teaching methods
 - iii. Publication of teaching or curriculum methods or evaluation
- d. Successful mentoring of student thesis and preceptorship or practicum 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. Because of the interdisciplinary aspect of epidemiology this may include dissertation committee’s in other Departments or Colleges within the University. Service on Masters’ thesis, research preceptor 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 PhD student’s dissertation committee
 2. Mentoring student presentations and publications

- 3. Awards for student presentations and publications
- e. Student evaluations, both numerical and open-ended comments.
 - i. Student evaluations are to be interpreted based upon class size, teaching format and level of the students. 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).
 - iii. Supplemental teaching evaluations are encouraged and will be considered in addition to required evaluations.
- f. Professional post-graduate education
 - i. Directing or teaching courses/symposia to students and trainees in epidemiology, public health and other colleges (medical, pharmacy or nursing students, medical residents or fellows)
 - ii. Directing or teaching of continuing education courses/symposia for professional audiences such as public health practitioners, physicians, pharmacists, nurses, etc.

Research

The faculty member should be developing and demonstrating scholarly activity which is evidenced by research publications, funding and recognition at a local, state, national and international level.

1. General criteria as stated in the operations manual:

“In most of the fields represented in the programs of the University, publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction. An original contribution of a creative nature is as significant or as deserving as the publication of a scholarly book or article. 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))

2. The Epidemiology faculty is diverse in terms of their disciplinary backgrounds and research focus areas. Also some of the research involves state, national or international collaborations. These factors of publication policies and publication as a cooperative group should be considered through the impact of the research. The usual qualitative and 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. The expectation is that the faculty member will publish an average of 3 publications per year. No differential between multi-authored and solo authored papers will be considered. The faculty member should indicate his/her contribution to the multi-authored paper and how this paper is a part of his/her research expertise.

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.

Scholarship activities will be assessed according to a relative priority. It is expected that products of research be documented in the dossier to understand the complete scope of the research. The portfolio is not specific to composition but may be adapted for the faculty member’s field of study. Clearly peer-reviewed scholarship is given top priority and consideration for promotion and tenure.

a. Priorities of scholarship-related productivity are as follow:

Very High importance

- Peer-reviewed journal articles

High importance

- Research books
- Invited presentations, scientific conference
- Peer-reviewed presentations
- Textbook, editor
- Chapters
- Invited presentations, academic
- Invited presentations, public health conference
- Poster presenter, national or international conference
- Visiting professor
- Public health reports and documents
- Invited editorials

Medium importance

- Poster presenter, regional conference
- Technical reports
- Laboratory/ technical manual
- Technical development and patents

Lower importance

- Non-peer reviewed manuscripts/letters to journals
- Research website
- Progress reports

Other indicators of research productivity include:

1. Partnership development/ Cooperative networks
2. Policy Development
3. Interdisciplinary research
4. Elected membership or fellow status in national or international organization
5. Selection and serving on peer review panels
6. National scientific committee membership
7. Awards from National/International Organizations

b. 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. It is expected that with a tenure-track appointment that the faculty member conducts research.
- iii. Funding as measured by dollars is not a direct measure of achievement.
- iv. The faculty member should have demonstrated evidence that their intellectual ideas are fundable.
- v. 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.
- vi. 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.
- vii. 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.

- viii. 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.

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 Epidemiology:
 - a. Service on departmental, collegiate, or university-level committees
 - b. Service as a journal peer-reviewer
 - c. Service on an NIH/AHRQ/VA/CDC 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 committees, task forces, or other service for a scientific or professional organization
 - g. Service as an elected or appointed officer of a scientific or professional organization
 - h. Departmental or multidisciplinary center administration
 - i. Administrative activities associated with grants/contracts and research centers
 - j. Participation on boards or task forces at the community, regional, national, or international level
 - k. Participating in the development of guidelines for practice or research at the national or international level
 - l. Service to the State of Iowa or other governmental entities
 - m. Service to the public in the state of Iowa, the nation, or internationally through the planning or presentation of educational programs
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.

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.

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.

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.

Review of Tenured Faculty Members

Review of tenured faculty members is described in the University Operations Manual Section III.10.7 and in the College of Public Health Faculty Handbook (section titled "Post-Tenure Reviews").

Faculty members are reviewed annually. Comprehensive post-tenure peer reviews are conducted every five years to determine whether tenured faculty members are meeting the expectations of their position.

In general, the criteria of meeting expectations are similar to those that would lead to tenure and/or promotion to their current rank, as specified in the College of Public Health

Faculty Handbook (section titled “Expected Standards of Performance for Tenured Faculty”). Variability in performance might be expected to some extent, but a substantial and sustained reduction in performance below expectations may be cause to initiate a management plan to improve performance, as described in section III.10.7.d of the University Operations Manual and the College of Public Health Faculty Handbook. The five-year peer review should take into consideration that evolving duties may impact the performance of a faculty member in particular areas. Increased responsibilities in one area may reduce output in another. For example, administrative positions or funding for non-research activities may potentially provide some beneficial salary offset but also reduce the faculty member’s research productivity because of competing duties. A faculty member who teaches more than two courses may similarly have a reduction in research productivity due to additional teaching duties, and have reduced offset from external funding that is made up for by the additional teaching. High levels of external funding could understandably reduce the faculty member’s contributions to teaching or service. This assessment should consider the faculty member’s performance globally by allowing flexibility in how the balance of duties impacts performance in specific areas, recognizing that contributions in teaching, research, and service are all of value. Changes in responsibilities should be “documented in the Post-Tenure Effort Allocation agreement that is updated during annual reviews,” as specified in the College of Public Health Faculty Handbook.

If a faculty member is deemed by the Dean of the College of Public Health to be performing below expectations based on the results of their five-year review, section 10.7.d of the University Operations Manual provides guidelines regarding next steps. This may include a plan to address problems uncovered in the five-year peer review. A timetable is provided for evaluation of acceptable progress toward addressing these problems, which normally occurs at the faculty member’s next five-year review. While it is the choice of the faculty member whether to not agree with a plan to address problems uncovered in the review, the department should provide support for the faculty member to address these problems. Efforts of the department to support faculty for whom problems are uncovered in the five-year review may include but are not limited to the following.

- Support of faculty retraining
- Realignment of the faculty member’s responsibilities with their strengths, as feasible
- Exploring opportunities for new collaborations in new research areas
- A mentoring plan with another faculty member doing research in an area of interest