

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

Department of Health Management and Policy
College of Public Health
University of Iowa

Note: This revised document was adopted by consensus on July 2, 2017. These expectations will be in full force for all HMP faculty hired after July 2, 2017. Consistent with Section 10.5.2 of the University of Iowa Operating Manual, current HMP faculty may choose to be evaluated either (a) under the performance expectations in place at the time of their initial appointment or promotion to the rank that they now hold, or (b) these revised performance expectations, or (c) any subsequent revisions to these performance expectations in place at the time of their evaluation. The current HMP faculty candidate's choice from among these three options is binding on HMP and the CPH.

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.”

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

“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 is subjective, and any evaluation process must be sufficiently flexible to encompass differences across faculty in disciplinary training, teaching assignments, and research expertise.

Performance Expectations: Meeting performance expectations is “necessary but not sufficient” for promotion and especially, tenure. Changes in the overall budget, projected enrollment, or research and educational priorities also play a key role.

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.”

2. Key indicators of teaching performance for HMP:

- a. Student and peer evaluations, both numerical and open-ended comments.

- i. The general expectation is that by the end of the review period the summary score and the scores for the most important items as determined annually by the Department’s primary faculty, should consistently be sufficiently high to reflect confidence in the strong performance of teaching, with the median scores being in the “agree” range.
- ii. Student evaluations may be less favorable for required vs. elective courses, for larger vs. smaller classes, and so on. Therefore, in interpreting student evaluations, factors likely to affect student evaluations for specific courses should be taken into account. Similarly, the distribution of scores from student evaluations is more informative than simply examining means. 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. Similarly, a median of “4” in a class of 5 students is not the same as a median of “4” in a class of 30 students. Also, student and peer evaluations may vary by course level (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate), teaching load, and number of new course preparations.
- b. Teaching awards or other recognition of teaching excellence
- c. Incorporation of teaching methods and technologies, as appropriate
- d. 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 one or more student dissertation committees. However, service as chair of a dissertation committee should not be a criterion for promotion from assistant to associate professor.
 - 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 student dissertation committees (where enrollment permits)
 - 2. Student presentations and publication
 - 3. Awards for student presentations and publications

Research:

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.”

2. The primary media for publications in HMP are articles in peer-reviewed journals, which excludes abstracts, letters to the editor, and the like. Although publications not in peer-reviewed journals, such as blogs, policy briefs, book chapters, or books are

valued in HMP, they are given less weight with regard to research because they are largely viewed as contributions to professional, governmental, or societal service.

3. The HMP faculty are diverse in terms of their disciplinary backgrounds and research focus areas. In many cases, faculty in HMP publish longer articles with fewer 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 “solo” or “first authored” articles) may not be applicable. Moreover, because HMP and CPH both support and foster a collaborative research environment, some level of co-authorship with HMP and CPH colleagues should normally be reflected in HMP faculty publication dossiers in the aggregate.
4. 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 measures 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 HMP.
 - a. Peer-reviewed articles for candidates for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure:
 - i. The magnitude of the faculty member’s contribution to advancing knowledge is what matters, not the mere quantity of lines on a CV. A large number of low quality articles cannot serve as a substitute for quality. Conversely, a relatively small number of very high quality peer-reviewed articles may provide the basis for a substantial contribution to knowledge, if confirmed by other indicators of research impact.
 - ii. Ordinarily one would expect that at the time of the review, faculty in HMP would have published (or had accepted for publication): (a) a minimum of 12 peer-reviewed articles during the probationary period, (b) where the faculty member is lead author on at least five articles, and (c) with the majority of the 12 articles appearing in quality journals (see item *iii* below).
 - 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 articles published during that period. While such prior articles add to the candidate’s overall body of research, publication (or acceptance for publication) of 12 articles during the probationary period at UI (or during the years of service at another research university that are officially counted toward the UI probationary period) usually would be necessary to provide evidence of an ongoing high level of research productivity required for promotion and (especially) tenure.

- iii. Evidence of journal quality may be demonstrated by quantitative measures such as the journal's impact factor score, or published rankings of journal quality based on surveys of researchers in a particular area, or general recognition within a particular field that the journal in question is a top-tier journal, or attestations of journal quality by external reviewers of the candidate's promotion/tenure dossier. Indicators of journal quality are especially important for candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In addition, each member of HMP's DCG will individually read and evaluate the faculty member's articles selected for the dossier, and the DCG as a whole will discuss and evaluate them openly during their deliberations.
 - iv. Given the lag between the publication of an article 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."
- b. Peer-reviewed articles and citations for candidates for promotion from associate professor (with or without tenure) to professor with tenure
- i. In most cases a candidate for full professor normally would be expected to have published, at a minimum, 25 articles in quality peer-review journals since promotion to associate professor with tenure, with clear and compelling evidence of an ongoing high level of research productivity. Moreover, the candidate's position in the order of authorship on these peer-reviewed journal articles should reflect a pattern including first- and senior-authored works reflecting their lead roles in the research projects coupled with their increasing responsibilities for mentoring students and junior faculty and providing them with the opportunity for and facilitating their achievement of first-authorships. Evidence of journal quality may be demonstrated as in *4.a.iii* above.
 - ii. More reliable than the number of published articles, however, is their cumulative impact on the discipline, which may be imperfectly measured by the number of times the articles are cited by others. A published article 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 articles presenting estimates of prevalence or costs of specific diseases tend to be cited more frequently than papers addressing a specific research issue. Also, articles published in peer-reviewed journals targeted to practitioners (rather than researchers) may be read and used often but cited less frequently.
 - iii. Generally, one would expect a candidate for promotion to full professor to have a cumulative total of 250 citations or more, with 150 or more representing citations to papers where the candidate was the lead author, and where a few articles do not account for virtually all citations. Because there are several sources for ascertaining citation counts that have different

restrictions on what is counted, HMP expectations for citations are based on Reuter-Thompson's *Web of Science*.

- c. External reviewers:
 - i. 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 collaborators, or close friends are inappropriate. .
 - ii. Although external reviewers can and do comment on performance in the areas of teaching and service, their assessments of the candidate's scholarly contributions 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, HMP 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 HMP faculty relates to the total faculty effort and extent to which graduate research assistantships are supported.
 - iii. Funding as a PI serves as an indicator of an individual faculty member's contribution to the funded research effort. In general, competitive funding from a source using peer review to guide funding decisions (e.g., NIH, AHRQ, HRSA, VA, PCORI, RWJ, and Commonwealth Fund) provides a clearer indicator of likely contribution to knowledge than non-peer-reviewed grants or contracts.

 - iv. In most cases one would expect a candidate for promotion from assistant to associate professor to have externally funded, competitive grant or contract support as a PI to demonstrate the likelihood of future support for the candidate's developing research agenda.
 - v. For grants on which the faculty member is a Co-PI, the role, and the extent of involvement (e.g., level of effort) will be considered, along with the type of award (competitive versus non-competitive, prime versus sub-award).
 - vi. Candidates for promotion from associate to full professor should have had several externally funded, competitive grants or contracts as a PI.
 - vii. The Department and College expect that every tenure track faculty member has a minimum of 50% salary offset, unless modified by a post-

tenure allocation effort agreement. Candidates for promotion from assistant to associate professor should demonstrate a trend toward consistently meeting or exceeding departmental and collegiate expectations regarding salary offsets from external research funding, including a trend toward an increasing 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 and collegiate expectations regarding salary offsets from competitive, 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.”

2. Key indicators of service performance for HMP are:
 - a. Service by writing blogs, policy briefs, book chapters, or books.
 - b. Service on departmental, collegiate, or university-level committees
 - c. Mentoring colleagues within the University, especially candidates for promotion.
 - d. Mentoring colleagues outside of the University.
 - e. Service as a journal peer-reviewer
 - f. Service on the editorial board of a journal in the field
 - g. Service as a journal editor
 - h. Service on an NIH/AHRQ/VA or similar study section
 - i. Service on ad hoc committees for a scientific or professional organization
 - j. Service as an elected officer of a scientific or professional organization
 - k. Participation on boards or task forces at the community, regional, national, or international level.
 - l. Service to public health or health care organizations.
 - m. Service to state, federal, or international agencies.
3. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure are expected to demonstrate a trend toward increasing engagement in service.
4. Candidates for promotion from associate to full professor should have demonstrated a clear record of engagement in service to the University, the profession, and/or society, and in their service statement make the case for the effectiveness of that 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.