

*SPHTM APPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION AND TENURE
POLICIES AND GUIDELINES*

**Approved by the SPHTM General Faculty on June 8, 2021
and Amended March 25, 2025**

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Table of Contents:

<u>Section:</u>	<u>Page:</u>
I. Introduction.....	2
II. Authorities.....	2-3
III. APT Committee Composition and Jurisdiction.....	4
IV. Positions and Titles.....	5
V. Principles for Evaluating Faculty Members.....	5-6
Initial Appointment as Assistant Professor.....	7
Third Year Review.....	8
Promotion/Appointment to Associate Professor.....	10
Promotion/Appointment to Professor.....	16
Attachment A.....	23
Attachment B.....	25
Attachment C.....	26
Attachment D.....	27

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

I. Introduction

SPHTM Mission: As stewards of the first school of public health in the United States, the Tulane University School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine (SPHTM) cultivates independent thinkers, innovative leaders, fierce advocates, and accomplished scholars. From the neighborhoods of New Orleans to communities worldwide, we conduct research and collaborate with our partners to ensure that all of humanity has an equitable opportunity to be healthy and pursue optimal well-being. We train the problem solvers. In keeping with our values of legacy, diversity, collaboration, excellence, discovery, engagement, and balance, our vision is optimal health and well-being for all.

This document is to be used as guidance to evaluate faculty for appointment, promotion and tenure (for those on tenure track) at the Tulane University SPHTM. The School has three tracks for full time faculty: tenure-track and non-tenure consisting of a clinical and research track. Part-time faculty are considered “adjunct” and are on the non-tenure track. Tenure track faculty are expected to have sufficient credentials and potential to eventually satisfy the School evaluation criteria for the award of tenure. Non-tenure track should have the proper credentials to engage in teaching and clinical practice or research, depending on the track to which they have been hired.

Reviews and recommendations for appointment, promotion or award of tenure shall be based on qualifications of the candidates without discrimination because of race, ethnicity, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability, 2SLGBTQ+ or veteran status. These attributes also shall not be used in a discriminatory manner in review or recommendation for termination.

Tenure track faculty are evaluated at the third-year review for an interim evaluation and again at the 6th year for tenure which is generally accompanied by promotion to Associate Professor. The third-year evaluation is done to assess if the tenure track faculty is progressing sufficiently toward the goal of obtaining tenure but is not assurance of tenure. If at the third year review the faculty is not progressing adequately, the Provost can recommend a non-renewal of contract (according to the Tulane Faculty Handbook). The tenure clock can be extended for certain circumstances outlined in the Tulane Faculty Handbook (e.g., the birth of a child, illness, natural disaster). Non-tenure track faculty on the clinical or research track do not have a specified time-period by which they must go up for promotion. It is recommended that faculty in these tracks discuss and agree on a timeline for promotion with their Department Chair and representative on APT. In general, it is expected that it takes 5-8 years for faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor on the clinical and research track to be ready to go for promotion to the rank of Associate, and then another 5-8 years to the rank of Professor.

II. Authorities

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to prepare the appropriate documents in the correct format for review as outlined by the School and the Tulane Faculty Handbook.

The first level of evaluation is at the Department. It is the responsibility of the Chair and senior departmental representatives, with these criteria in mind, to decide if the candidate is eligible for the initial appointment, a change of track, promotion and/or award of tenure and to provide the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee with a letter containing arguments and evidence supporting their decision. Given the range and diversity of academic fields represented across the Departments within the School, Departmental or School peers are best qualified to evaluate the scholarly work of the faculty in terms of the faculties' impact in publications, grants/contracts, teaching, mentoring, service and practice in public health. The Department Chair should provide a letter to the Dean's Office indicating their decision with supporting rationale for this decision.

External peer reviewers are chosen by the candidate and by the Department and should be experts in the field. For promotion to Associate Professor (with tenure) and Professor in the tenure track, the Department Chair should provide the names of at least 10 potential external reviewers who can independently evaluate the candidate, with the expectation that at least 6 letters will be submitted. For promotion to Associate Professor and Professor in the clinical and research track, the Department Chair should provide the names of at least 7 potential external reviewers who can independently evaluate the candidate, with the expectation that at least 3 letters will be submitted. These external peers will review the faculty's scholarly work for the discipline and gauge if the faculty would be eligible at their institution for a similar promotion. The faculty under review also submits the names of reviewers who are familiar with the candidate's academic work. The APT will also consider these reviews (generally weighting the external reviews chosen by the Department more heavily than those chosen by the faculty).

The second level of review is the APT Committee which is comprised of tenured faculty, predominantly full Professors, and who represent the General Faculty. The APT Committee evaluates the request for promotion using the guidelines in this document and considers advice from the Department, as well as letters from external peers (third-year review does not require external letters). The APT Chair (or the Chair's designee) provides a verbal report to the Executive Faculty Committee, who then vote to approve or deny the promotion.

The Dean and the Executive Faculty are provided with the APT report and the dossier of the faculty, including external peer reviews. The Executive Faculty then makes a determination and votes. With consideration of the Executive Faculty vote, along with the Chair's letter and APT report, the Dean's decision is sent to the Provost. The Provost makes the final determination, taking into account the recommendations made by the Department, external reviews, the APT Committee, the Executive Faculty Committee, and the Dean.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Should there be disagreement between the APT Committee, the Dean or the Provost, the APT will meet with whomever they are in disagreement so that the reason for the disagreement is communicated and discussed. This should be a rare circumstance. Faculty members who disagree with the outcome of their promotion review can grieve the outcome with appropriate evidence and procedures as outlined in the Tulane Faculty Handbook.

III. APT Committee Composition and Jurisdiction

The APT Committee is responsible for: 1) making recommendations to the General Faculty on changes to and implementation of this Policy Statement; 2) reviewing APT criteria to ensure consistency with the Faculty Handbook and this Policy Statement; and 3) acting on behalf of the General Faculty to advise the Dean on matters covered in this Policy Statement, namely matters of faculty status to include appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, discipline, and dismissal. The Committee does not have jurisdiction over grievances.

The APT Committee comprises one tenured faculty at the Professor rank from each Department of the School plus one additional “at large” tenured faculty member. These members are chosen by the Dean. The *at large* member shall rotate among the Departments of the School annually (when the new Departments of Social and Behavioral Sciences and International Health and Sustainable Development are established, there will no longer be an *at large* member). Members of the Committee may not be members of the administration of the School and may not be Chairs or acting Chairs of Departments. When reviewing the case of a faculty going up for promotion in the clinical or research track, the APT may add an additional *ad hoc* voting member to the Committee to participate in that review. *Ad hoc* faculty in the clinical and research track must be at the rank of Associate Professor or higher for review of promotion cases to Associate Professor, and must be at the Professor rank for promotion cases to the rank of Professor.

While appointed by and advisory to the Dean, the Committee occupies a special level of independence from the administration to act appropriately in fulfilling the General Faculty’s primary responsibility in matters of faculty status. The Committee’s highest priorities are to maintain academic freedom, to foster academic responsibility and excellence, and to ensure adherence by all parties to University and School policy in these matters. In its role of advising the Dean, the Committee functions under strict standards of confidentiality. The Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs and Development will serve as an *ex-officio* non-voting member of the APT Committee.

No member of the APT Committee, the General Faculty, or of the administration of the School or of any Department may engage in any *ex parte* communications regarding any aspect of the deliberations of the Committee as they relate to individual members or prospective members of the faculty.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

IV. Positions and Titles

Full time faculty members with primary appointments in the Tulane SPHTM are appointed or promoted to the following position titles:

Tenure track	Clinical track (non-tenure)	Research track (non-tenure)
	Instructor	
Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor	Assistant Professor
Associate Professor	Associate Professor	Associate Professor
Professor	Professor	Professor
Professor Emeritus*	Professor Emeritus*	Professor Emeritus*

* A full-time faculty member who has served with distinction until retirement for at least 20 years

V. Principles for Evaluating Faculty Members

In adopting these criteria, the General Faculty is expressing its desire to evaluate the faculty member in a holistic and comprehensive manner. Trajectory, impact, productivity, and peer recognition are important. While the criteria include words such as “impact”, “significant” and “substantial,” it is the responsibility of each Department to ascertain what these qualifiers mean in the context of the Department’s focus and the candidate’s area(s) of expertise, and with each recommendation, show how the individual’s portfolio relates to those qualifiers. For example, while the overall number of published articles can be an indicator of productivity in research, among other measures, the Department would be expected to provide a more nuanced assessment, based on the quality of the journal or the impact on the field for these publications.

The Department, APT Committee, Executive Faculty, Dean and Provost should be provided with the full dossier as outlined in Attachment A. The APT criteria are meant to serve as guidelines. All persons involved in the review process should review the faculty member on the quality of their work rather than the quantity. For example, in addition to the quantity of students mentored, the impact the faculty’s mentoring has had on students’ growth and careers should also be considered when possible. Not all service activities are equal and that should be considered when judging if the faculty’s contribution to service is worthy of the particular action being considered. Peer review, invitation to serve, impact in the scientific/professional community should be taken into consideration. Faculty should demonstrate engagement in meaningful contributions to the academy, their profession, and their academic community consistent with expectations for their respective track and rank.

All persons evaluating the faculty member for promotion and/or tenure must consider the context of that faculty member’s situation. Nuances are important. For tenure,

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

balance between teaching, research and service should be considered. Clinical track faculty are primarily responsible for teaching and public health practice and service. Research track faculty are primarily responsible for engaging in work on externally funded research grants and contracts, as well as peer reviewed publication. It is the responsibility of the APT Committee to represent the General Faculty in their evaluation, taking into consideration the Department's evaluation and the requirements of the faculty member's track.

The criteria set forth in this document are progressive across ranks for each of the three tracks of faculty in the School (tenure, clinical, research). It should be noted that the administrative processes for appointments/progressions may differ slightly across tracks (e.g., whether searches need to be national or local/regional) and that external funding expectations (which are administrative) will also vary. It is also understood that while these criteria are set forth in the context of regular (full-time) faculty, visiting faculty (who are typically full-time with a finite appointment horizon) should meet the criteria for the track and rank at which they are visiting.

Adjunct faculty are defined as part-time faculty. The Department is responsible for designating the specific rank and track for each adjunct faculty, under which APT will evaluate appointments and promotions. It should be noted that being appointed as a part-time faculty member meeting the criteria in the tenure track does not carry with it tenure or the prospect of tenure.

In each case for consideration, the Department will forward to the Dean's Office (for referral to the School's APT Committee) a packet that includes the candidate's dossier having the content listed in (Attachment A), a list of potential external reviewers as appropriate (Attachment B), and a Departmental Committee/Chair letter that sets forth their recommendation with regards to the requested action and the basis on which the Department has evaluated each of the criteria applicable to that action (Attachment C). The Department Chair's letter should contain an account of the Departmental meeting in which the candidate's case was discussed, including a summary of the majority and minority opinions expressed during the meeting and a tally of the votes cast. Faculty are required to submit their CV in the designated format in Attachment D. This will allow for a more systematic and consistent evaluation of their scholarly activities.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

INITIAL APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Tenure Track¹

- Must have a terminal academic degree in relevant field to the position to which they are being appointed (examples include PhD, DrPH, ScD, MD, DO, DDS, DVM, JD, SJD, DPharm).
- Demonstrated ability to publish in peer-reviewed journals, with at least one paper published, or in-preparation for submission to a peer-reviewed journal.
- An emerging area of research that they will focus on in teaching, ascertaining external research support and publishing should be demonstrated.

Clinical Track

- Must have a terminal academic degree in relevant field to the position to which they are being appointed (examples include PhD, DrPH, ScD, MD, DO, DDS, DVM, JD, SJD, DPharm) OR professional degree with notable professional experience in a defined area of relevant expertise.
- Peer-reviewed publications, technical reports or policy documents preferred, but not required.
- Demonstrated expertise in the content area of the courses they will be teaching is important.

Research Track

- Must have a terminal academic degree in relevant field to the position to which they are being appointed (examples include PhD, DrPH, ScD, MD, DO, DDS, DVM, JD, SJD, DPharm)
- Demonstrated ability to publish in peer-reviewed journals and/or technical reports, with at least one paper or technical report published, or in preparation.
- Demonstration of an emerging area of research that they will focus on in their work supported on external research grants and contracts is important.

¹All initial appointments in the tenure track require a national search unless a search waiver is granted by the Provost office.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

THIRD YEAR REVIEW

Tenure Track only

Research:

- Continued demonstration of an emerging area of research that they will focus on in teaching, ascertaining external research support and publishing.
- Positive trajectory of peer-reviewed publications that will lead to tenure. It is recognized that incoming junior faculty will need to go up for their third-year review after only two years on the tenure clock in many instances, which often does not provide sufficient time to have their research published in peer-reviewed journals. In assessing the trajectory of the faculty's publication record, APT will consider the following factors, among others: the total number of publications, the discipline and area of focus of the faculty's research, research approach (e.g., community-based or community-partnered participatory research), the impact of the journals published in, cumulative citations the publications have yielded, and/or evidence that publications have contributed to public health policy changes or notable impacts in their field. In assessing whether the faculty has an appropriate trajectory to achieve tenure, the APT may also consider the faculty's plan for publishing as outlined in their personal statement.
- Establishing a track record of presentation of scientific work at national/international conferences
- Demonstrating a positive trajectory of becoming an independent researcher in their field of expertise. The faculty should be submitting, or preparing to submit, application(s) for external research grants or contracts. In assessing whether the faculty has an appropriate trajectory to achieve tenure, the APT may also consider the faculty's plan for pursuing external research funding as outlined in their personal statement.

Teaching:

The faculty should start to actively participate in the educational mission of their Department, the School and University. The dimensions of education that should be considered for the evaluation of teaching performance are: classroom instruction, non-classroom instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision, mentor/role model/career advisement, training/continuing education, and other teaching-related contributions to one's field. Specifically, these include the following:

- Actively participating in educating students in the University that involves courses/workshops/guest lecturing, balanced against their external research and other responsibilities. Examples of contributions to education at the third-year review may include the following:

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

- Number and type of course taught, with most weight given to teaching foundational courses, large undergraduate courses or other course with consistently high enrollments
- Course evaluations used to assess student satisfaction, with student satisfaction improving over time and demonstrated responsiveness to course evaluations, as appropriate
- Attending teaching workshops (as evidence of trying to improve teaching)
- Invited lectures in other courses
- Appropriate share of Departmental mentoring of undergraduate, masters and/or doctoral students

Service:

Faculty should be starting their service to the scientific community, Department, School and/or University (e.g., service on scientific committees that set/changed policy holds the most weight, University and School committees hold more weight than Departmental committees).

National recognition/reputation:

Faculty should be demonstrating the capacity to contribute to the academic/scientific community through some combination of peer-reviewing for journals, grant reviews, membership on scientific committees and/or participation in academic societies and organizations, among others.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair is essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

PROMOTION/APPOINTMENT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Tenure Track (with or without tenure)²

Research:

- Defined area of research that is the focus of the faculty's teaching, external research support and publishing should be established.
- Faculty must demonstrate an impactful and substantial track record in peer-reviewed publications in their area of focus. In assessing the weight and impact of a faculty's publication record, APT will consider the following factors, among others: the total number of publications, the discipline and area of focus of the faculty's research, research approach (e.g., community-based or community-partnered participatory research), the impact of the journals published in, cumulative citations the publications have yielded, and/or evidence that publications have contributed to public health policy changes or notable impacts in their field.³
- Substantial track record of presentation of scientific work at national/international conferences.
- Principal investigator (PI), project leader or demonstrated major role in external research grants or contracts, particularly those that are peer-reviewed.

Teaching:

The faculty should be actively participating in the educational mission of their Department, School and University. The dimensions of education that should be considered for the evaluation of teaching performance are: classroom instruction, non-classroom instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision, mentor/role model/career advisement, training/continuing education, and other teaching-related contributions to one's field. Specifically, these include the following:

- Actively participating in educating students in the University that involves courses/workshops/guest lecturing, balanced against their external research and other responsibilities. Examples of contributions to education for promotion to Associate Professor on the tenure track include the following:
 - Number and type of course taught, with most weight given to teaching foundational courses, large undergraduate courses or other course with consistently high enrollments
 - Evidence of revision and update of courses taught

²Promotion from Assistant to Associate at Tulane is linked to tenure; initial appointment as Associate could be without tenure if the Department has a rational basis for doing so related to its ability to evaluate teaching and service.

³Impact factor can be obtained on GoogleScholar and includes the Hirsch index (H-index) and i10 index.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

- Evidence of faculty stimulating critical thinking, innovation in methods, and effectiveness of teaching in their courses
 - Course evaluations used to assess student satisfaction, with student satisfaction improving over time and demonstrated responsiveness to course evaluations, as appropriate
 - Peer review of teaching: this can be done by a senior faculty or teaching faculty outside of the School
 - Evidence of working to improve teaching through attendance of workshops and other continuing pedagogical trainings
 - The design or update of a program curriculum or development or update of a course that fits within a program
 - Evidence of interactive and/or innovative methods for learning in the classroom (e.g. multimedia)
 - Supervision of independent studies
 - Organization of seminars
 - Supervision of doctoral student teaching
 - Invited lectures in other courses
- Appropriate share of Departmental mentoring of undergraduate, masters and/or doctoral students.
 - Chair or member of at least 1 doctoral committee (e.g., chair holds more weight than member), as appropriate.

Service:

Significant service to the Department, School and/or University (e.g., service on scientific committees that set/changed policy holds the most weight, University and School committees hold more weight than Departmental committees). The faculty should also increasingly demonstrate service to the wider scientific community in their area of focus outside of the University.

National recognition/reputation:

Demonstrated contribution to the wider academic/scientific community in their area of focus through some combination of participation in scientific committees and/or panels, participating in study sections and/or grant peer-review, peer-reviewing for journals, work in professional organizations, and editorial board membership, among others.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair and positive reviews from external referees from peer institutions chosen by the Department/Chair are essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Clinical Track

Teaching:

It is critical that clinical faculty demonstrate their active participation in the educational mission of their Department, the School and University. The dimensions of education that should be considered for the evaluation of teaching performance are: classroom instruction, non-classroom instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision, mentor/role model/career advisement, training/continuing education, and other teaching-related contributions to one's field. Specifically, these include the following:

- Actively participating in educating students in the University that involves courses/workshops/guest lecturing. Examples of contributions to education for promotion to Associate Professor in the clinical track include the following:
 - Number and type of course taught, with most weight given to teaching foundational courses, large undergraduate courses or other course with consistently high enrollments
 - Evidence of revision and update of courses taught
 - Evidence of faculty stimulating critical thinking, innovation in methods, and effectiveness of teaching in their courses
 - Course evaluations used to assess student satisfaction, with student satisfaction improving over time and demonstrated responsiveness to course evaluations, as appropriate
 - Peer review of teaching: this can be done by a senior faculty or teaching faculty outside of the School
 - Evidence of working to improve teaching through attendance of workshops and other continuing pedagogical trainings
 - The design or update of a program curriculum or development or update of a course that fits within a program
 - Evidence of interactive and/or innovative methods for learning in the classroom (e.g. multimedia)
 - Supervision of independent studies
 - Organization of seminars
 - Supervision of doctoral student teaching
 - Invited lectures in other courses
- Excellent record of mentoring students (undergraduate, graduate, doctoral). This includes serving on committees for honors, masters and doctoral theses.

Service and Professional Contribution:

While not required for promotion on the clinical track, it is desirable that the faculty demonstrate service to the scientific community, Department, School and/or University.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Research

- Defined area of specialization that is the focus of the faculty's teaching should be established.
- It is desirable for the faculty to have a track record in publishing peer-reviewed papers, white papers, technical reports, and/or pedagogical materials, although this is not a requirement for promotion in the clinical track.
- It is desirable for the faculty to have a track record of presentation of scientific work at national/international conferences, although this is not a requirement for promotion in the clinical track.
- It is desirable for the faculty to have a track record of participating in work funded by external research grants and contracts, although this is not a requirement for promotion in the clinical track.

National recognition/reputation:

It is desirable that the faculty demonstrate contribution to the wider academic/scientific community in their area of focus through some combination of participation in scientific committees and/or panels, national and international organizations, associations, and/or societies, peer-reviewing for journals, editorial board membership, or other areas of practice.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair and positive reviews from external referees from peer institutions chosen by the Department/Chair are essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Research Track

Research:

- Defined area of research that is the focus of the faculty's work funded by external research support and publishing should be established.
- The faculty must demonstrate an impactful and substantial track record in publications in their area of focus. Publications can include those in peer-reviewed journals, technical reports, policy papers and white papers. In assessing the faculty's publication record, APT will consider the following factors, among others: the total number of publications, the discipline and area of focus of the faculty's research, research approach (e.g., community-based or community-partnered participatory research), the impact of the journals published in, cumulative citations the publications have yielded, and/or evidence that publications have contributed to public health policy changes or notable impacts in their field.⁴
- The research faculty must have demonstrated a major contribution to work funded by external research grants or contracts. While it is desirable that the research faculty has a leadership role on externally funded research projects, it is not required for promotion on the research track.
- It is desirable that the faculty have a track record of presenting their work at national/international conferences, although this is not required for promotion in the research track.

Teaching

- While teaching is not required for promotion in the research track, research faculty may teach one course per year and this can be included in their review for promotion.
- Some mentoring of students/post-docs and/or guest lectures is desirable, as determined by the Department, but is not required for promotion in the research track.

Service:

While not required for promotion on the clinical track, it is desirable that the faculty demonstrate service to the scientific community, Department, School and/or University.

National recognition/reputation:

It is desirable that the faculty demonstrate contribution to the wider academic/scientific community in their area of focus through some combination of participation in scientific

⁴Impact factor can be obtained on GoogleScholar and includes the Hirsch index (H-index) and i10 index.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

committees and/or panels, participating in study sections and/or grant peer-review, peer-reviewing for journals, work in professional organizations, editorial board membership, or other areas of practice.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair and positive reviews from external referees from peer institutions chosen by the Department/Chair are essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

APPOINTMENT/PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Tenure Track

Research:

- The faculty must have a well-established and recognized area of independent research that is the focus of the faculty's teaching, external research support and publishing.
- Faculty must demonstrate a sustained track record in peer-reviewed publications that are highly impactful and substantial in their area of research. It is expected that the faculty has published a significant number of publications with increasing numbers as senior. In assessing the weight and impact of a faculty's publication record, APT will consider the following factors, among others: the total number of publications, the discipline and area of focus of the faculty's research, research approach (e.g., community-based or community-partnered participatory research), the impact of the journals published in, cumulative citations the publications have yielded, and/or evidence that publications have contributed to public health policy changes or notable impacts in their field.⁵
- Substantial track record of presenting scientific work at national/international conferences is essential, especially invited presentations and keynote talks.
- Consistent role as PI, project leader or demonstrated major role in external research grants or contracts is essential, particularly those that are peer-reviewed.

Teaching:

The faculty should have a sustained track record in actively participating and playing a leadership role in the educational mission of their Department, the School and University. The dimensions of education that should be considered for the evaluation of teaching performance are: classroom instruction, non-classroom instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision, mentor/role model/career advisement, training/continuing education, and other teaching-related contributions to one's field. Specifically, these include the following:

- Actively participating and leading in educating students in the University that involves courses/workshops/guest lecturing, balanced against their external research and other responsibilities. Examples of contributions and leadership in education for promotion to Professor on the tenure track include the following:
 - Number and type of course taught
 - Evidence of revision and update of courses taught

⁵Impact factor can be obtained on GoogleScholar and includes the Hirsch index (H-index) and i10 index.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

- Material used in teaching that demonstrates stimulating critical thinking, innovation in methods, and effectiveness
 - Course evaluations used to assess student satisfaction, with student satisfaction improving over time and demonstrated responsiveness to course evaluations, as appropriate
 - Peer review of teaching: this can be done by a senior faculty or teaching faculty outside of the School
 - Evidence of working to improve teaching through attendance of workshops and other continuing pedagogical trainings
 - Responsibility for a degree or certificate program
 - The design or update of a program curriculum or development or update of a course that fits within a program
 - Evidence of interactive and/or innovative methods for learning in the classroom (e.g. multimedia)
 - Supervision of independent studies
 - Organizing seminars
 - Supervision doctoral student teaching
 - Invited lectures in other courses
 - Publications on teaching methods, educational approaches or scholarship of teaching in a discipline; this could include peer reviewed papers or white papers with wide circulation
 - Development of teaching tools for the classroom for use by others
 - Development or giving short courses and continuing education in professional settings
- Appropriate share of Departmental mentoring of undergraduate, masters and/or doctoral students.
 - Substantial contribution to doctoral student training which can be demonstrated in several ways. This includes serving as the Chair or member of doctoral committees, teaching courses in the doctoral program, contributing to doctoral seminars and workshops, mentoring doctoral students to publish papers, as well as other professionalization activities for doctoral students.
 - Demonstrated mentoring of post-doctoral students and junior faculty.

Service:

Significant service is expected to the Department, School and/or University, with at least two roles in leadership on such committee work (e.g., service on scientific committees that set/changed policy holds the most weight, University and School committees hold more weight than Departmental committees). The faculty should also have a substantial track record in service and leadership to the wider scientific community in their area of focus outside of the University.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

National and international recognition/reputation:

It is essential that the faculty have demonstrated recognition and reputation in their field at national and/or international level. This can be demonstrated by participation and leadership in scientific panels, invited review papers or book chapters, invitations to present scholarly work at prestigious scientific meetings, participation in and contribution to governmental and other policy making, awards recognizing scholarly work, and invitations as a keynote speaker and conferences, among others. Other examples include membership in scientific academies, academic societies, national or international committees for developing public health recommendations, policies, and guidelines, as well as leadership in grant review panels or study sections.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair and positive reviews from external referees from peer institutions chosen by the Department/Chair are essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Clinical Track

Teaching:

The clinical faculty should have a sustained track record in actively participating and playing a leadership role in the educational mission of their Department, the School and University. The dimensions of education that should be considered for the evaluation of teaching performance are: classroom instruction, non-classroom instruction, thesis/dissertation supervision, mentor/role model/career advisement, training/continuing education, and other teaching-related contributions to one's field. Specifically, these include the following:

- Actively participating and leading in educating students in the University that involves courses/workshops/guest lecturing. Examples of participation and leadership in education for promotion to Professor on the clinical track include the following:
 - Receiving School, University or other teaching awards
 - Number and type of course taught
 - Evidence of revision and update of courses taught
 - Material used in teaching that demonstrates stimulating critical thinking, innovation in methods, and effectiveness
 - Course evaluations used to assess student satisfaction, with student satisfaction improving over time and demonstrated responsiveness to course evaluations, as appropriate
 - Peer review of teaching: this can be done by a senior faculty or teaching faculty outside of the School
 - Evidence of working to improve teaching through attendance of workshops and other continuing pedagogical trainings
 - Responsibility for a degree or certificate program
 - The design or update of a program curriculum or development or update of a course that fits within a program
 - Evidence of interactive and/or innovative methods for learning in the classroom (e.g. multimedia)
 - Supervision of independent studies
 - Organizing seminars
 - Supervision doctoral student teaching
 - Invited lectures in other courses
 - Publications on teaching methods, educational approaches or scholarship of teaching in a discipline; this could include peer reviewed papers or white papers with wide circulation
 - Development of teaching tools for the classroom for use by others
 - Development or giving short courses and continuing education in professional settings

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

- Excellent record of mentoring students (undergraduate, graduate, doctoral). This includes serving on committees for honors, masters and doctoral theses.
- Contribution to doctoral student training is highly desirable.
- Demonstrated mentoring of post-doctoral students and junior faculty is highly desirable.

Service and Professional Contribution:

It is important for the faculty to demonstrate service to the wider scientific community, Department, School and/or University. It is highly desirable that the faculty member participate in service related to the educational mission of their Department, School and University, including certificate programs, admissions, serving on the curriculum committee, and performing peer-reviewed teaching, among others.

Research

- Well-defined and recognized area of research that is the focus of the faculty's teaching should be established.
- It is highly desirable for the faculty to have a track record in publishing peer-reviewed papers, white papers, technical reports, and/or pedagogical materials.
- It is highly desirable for the faculty to have a track record of presenting their work at scientific meetings and conferences.
- It is highly desirable for the faculty to have a track record of participating in work funded by external research grants and contracts, although this is not a requirement for promotion in the clinical track.

National recognition/reputation:

It is essential that the faculty demonstrate contribution to the wider academic/scientific community in their area of focus through some combination of participation in scientific committees and/or panels, membership in scientific academies, national and international organizations, associations, and/or societies, peer-reviewing for journals, editorial board membership, serving as an external examiner, or other areas of educational and/or scientific practice.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair and positive reviews from external referees from peer institutions chosen by the Department/Chair are essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

Research Track

Research:

- The faculty must have a well-established and recognized area of research that is the focus of the faculty's work funded by external research support and publishing.
- Faculty must demonstrate a sustained track record in publications that are highly impactful and substantial in their field. Publications can include those in peer-reviewed journals, technical reports, policy papers and white papers, with peer-reviewed papers carrying the most weight. In assessing the weight and impact of a faculty's publication record, APT will consider the following factors, among others: the total number of publications, the discipline and area of focus of the faculty's research, research approach (e.g., community-based or community-partnered participatory research), the impact of the journals published in, cumulative citations the publications have yielded, and/or evidence that publications have contributed to public health policy changes or notable impacts in their field.⁶
- It is essential the research faculty continue to demonstrate a major contribution to work funded by external research grants and contracts. It is highly desirable that the research faculty has a leadership role on externally funded research projects.
- It is highly desirable that the faculty have a track record of presenting their work at national/international conferences.

Teaching

- While teaching is not required for promotion in the research track, research faculty may teach one course per year and this can be included in their review for promotion.
- Mentoring of students/post-docs and/or guest lectures is highly desirable, as determined by the Department.

Service:

While not required for promotion on the clinical track, it is desirable that the faculty demonstrate service to the Department, School and/or University. Outside the University, the faculty should also have a substantial track record in service and leadership to the wider scientific community in their area of focus.

National and International recognition/reputation:

It is essential that the faculty have demonstrated recognition and reputation in their field at national and/or international level. This can be demonstrated by participation and leadership in scientific panels, invited review papers or book chapters, invitations to

⁶Impact factor can be obtained on GoogleScholar and includes the Hirsch index (H-index) and i10 index.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

present scholarly work at prestigious scientific meetings, participation in and contribution to governmental and other policy making, and awards recognizing scholarly work. Other examples include membership in scientific academies, academic societies, national or international committees for developing public health recommendations, policies, and guidelines, as well as leadership in peer-review grant review panels or study sections.

Other:

Positive endorsement from Department/Chair and positive reviews from external referees from peer institutions chosen by the Department/Chair are essential.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

ATTACHMENT A

FACULTY DOSSIER

For the types of review listed below, the faculty member being reviewed prepares a dossier having the content outlined herein. The dossier is submitted first to the Department. After the Department has completed its review, the dossier with the covering Departmental recommendation (see Attachment 3) is forwarded to the Dean of the School who refers it to the APT Committee for its review. Any of the dossier content may be provided by the Dean of the School to external referees, including the Candidate's Statement (content item F below). The dossier in its entirety is sent with the School's recommendation to the University Provost.

Tenure-track faculty members in particular are encouraged to monitor the web pages of the University Provost. Those pages can be accessed directly from the University's site.

Reviews requiring a dossier:

1. Tenure-track third year review
2. Review for award of tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor in the tenure track
3. Review for promotion to Associate Professor in the clinical or research tracks
4. Review for promotion to Professor in any track

Dossier Contents:

- A. Candidate's CV—The content of the CV should include all information within the categories shown in Attachment 2.
- B. Publications—At a minimum, all publications since the prior formal review/initial appointment should be included. Publications should be separated into peer-reviewed, non-peer-reviewed reports and editorials, and book chapters. For tenure track, the emphasis will be on peer-reviewed publications.
- C. Unpublished Articles—Provide copies of manuscripts/proofs in press or submitted.
- D. Description of Research Grants and Contracts—List those funded, pending, and completed. Give dates, funding agency, nature of participation in the project, etc.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

- E. Teaching Portfolio—This document should provide details of an individual’s achievement as a teacher, learner, and educational leader. The portfolio should contain the following:
1. Narrative—The narrative section should be a detailed statement of your teaching and learning philosophy. This section should not exceed 10 pages in length.
 2. Appendices—The appendices should contain supplemental documentary evidence that reflects most accurately the candidate’s achievements. The materials may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. A record of the candidate’s course assignments, semester by semester (including enrollments).
 - b. Student evaluations for courses taught each semester. Both quantitative and written evaluation should be included in the dossier.
 - c. Syllabi for courses taught.
 - d. Communications (solicited or unsolicited) from students and alumni.
- F. Candidate’s Statement—The candidate’s statement should detail past accomplishments and prospective plans for development in the areas of research teaching, and professional/public health service and practice (outside of the University). Descriptions of presentations, posters, panels, testimony, consultancies, etc. should be included here. A summary of highlights in research, teaching and service should be given, drawing on and referencing the more detailed descriptions of these three areas presented in sections D, E and G of the candidate’s dossier, respectively.
- G. Service—This section should highlight details of service responsibilities to the *Department, School, University, and academic/professional field*.
- H: Statement on Alignment with School’s vision to promote “optimal health and well-being for all”. Describe how your teaching, research, and service support that vision.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

ATTACHMENT B

EXTERNAL REFEREE LETTERS

For all promotions and tenure reviews, except for third-year reviews, external peer-review letters must be included in the dossier. These letters are obtained by the Dean's Office. Candidates have the option of selecting referees to be contacted on their behalf, these reviewers may include prior mentors, collaborators, etc.. Candidates provide the names of referees using the form "Optional-SPHTM Nomination and Qualification of External Referees" in Interfolio.

The Candidate's Department will also select peer-reviewers who need to be independent from the Candidate. A list of Departmental referees should be sent via email to the Director of Faculty Affairs and Operations using the form "IDENTIFICATION AND QUALIFICATIONS OF EXTERNAL REFEREES". The solicitation of referees will include the Candidate's CV, Candidate's Statement and, in the case of tenure track and research faculty, three representative publications provided by the Candidate. Referees solicited on behalf of a clinical track promotion will include the Candidate's Teaching Narrative as well as a description of the clinical track in the SPHTM.

Selection of Independent External Referees:

The Department should select referees who are independent of the Candidate. That is, the independent reviewers should be selected from a slate of expert reviewers who have not been collaborators (e.g. have not co-authored publications, participated as a co-investigator) with the candidate in the last 5 years (the federal standard for defining conflicts of interest) nor have mentored or trained the Candidate.

The candidate will have the opportunity to recommend reviewers who may or may not be independent (e.g., former or current mentors) of the candidate.

Referee letters should be solicited only from recognized leaders or authorities in the Candidate's field who are affiliated with leading institutions of higher education. The following rankings of universities may be helpful when selecting referees from leading institutions:

AAU Universities: <https://www.aau.edu/who-we-are/our-members>

US News and World Reports, Tier 1 Institutions:
<http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/national-universities-rankings>

ASPPH Member Schools of Public Health: <https://www.aspph.org/member-directory/>

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

ATTACHMENT C

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION LETTER ACCOMPANYING THE FACULTY DOSSIER

A covering letter of recommendation is written by the Department Chair. (The APT Committee will also draft a letter that summarizes the candidate's accomplishments and development as well as the Committee's deliberations following the Committee's review of the candidate. Both letters will be available for further review by the Executive Committee and Dean and by the Provost.)

The Department Chair's letter shall include:

- A detailed assessment of the scholarship of the candidate;
- An assessment of the candidate's trajectory with respect to contributions to the Department, the School, the University, and the candidate's field with particular attention given to describing the promise of the faculty member for publication, research, teaching, and service as applicable;
- A description of successful funding efforts and how this research is being leveraged as the basis for future funding;
- An assessment of the candidate's publication record (numbers, types, and quality of publications). *This assessment goes well beyond the number of publications with emphasis placed on the faculty member's research with respect to moving the field forward and their impact on their area of focus;*
- A description of how the candidate's research and teaching fits within the mission of the School. *Include synergies with other faculty, Departments and Schools;*
- A brief explanation of the stature of external referees (if applicable) and methods/reasons for selection thereof;
- Discussion of content of external letters (if used for the Departmental review);
- A summary of the Department's assessment of the candidate's performance in teaching;
- A summary evaluation of the candidate's service contributions;
- A full and accurate account of the Departmental meeting in which the candidate's case was discussed, including a summary of the majority and minority opinions expressed during the meeting and a tally of the votes cast.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

ATTACHMENT D

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME

PERSONAL INFORMATION

ADDRESS:

CITIZENSHIP:

LANGUAGES:

EDUCATION

DEGREES: YEAR INSTITUTION

LICENSES:

CERTIFICATIONS:

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

DATES EXPERIENCE

HONORS AND AWARDS

YEAR AWARD NAME

CONSULTANCIES

YEAR CONSULTANCY

A. SERVICE

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND OFFICES

YEAR NAME OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

EDITORIAL BOARDS

YEAR NAME OF BOARD

NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEES/ADVISORY BOARDS

STANDING COMMITTEES

SPECIAL REVIEW COMMITTEES

ADVISORY BOARDS

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES/ADVISORY BOARDS

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

DATES NAME OF COMMITTEE

SCHOOL COMMITTEES

DATES NAME OF COMMITTEE

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES

DATES NAME OF COMMITTEE

OTHER SERVICE

A. Professional Committees/Task Forces

B. Peer-Review Activities

C. Conference Committees

D. Community Activities

B. TEACHING

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

COURSE NAME (CREDITS) AND DATES TAUGHT

GUEST LECTURES/SEMINARS

DATE AND TITLE OF LECTURE

UNDERGRADUATE THESIS COMMITTEES:

NAME OF STUDENT, DATE, ROLE (Chair/member/adviser)

MASTERS COMMITTEES:

NAME OF STUDENT, DATE, ROLE (Chair/member/adviser)

DOCTORAL COMMITTEES:

NAME OF STUDENT, TITLE OF THESIS, DATE, STATUS, EMPLOYMENT AFTER GRADUATION

JUNIOR FACULTY FORMALLY MENTORED:

NAME OF FACULTY, DATE, GRANT, STATUS OF THE MENTEE

STUDENTS ADVISED:

YEAR NUMBER ADVISED

C. RESEARCH

PUBLICATIONS (PLEASE PUT IN NCBI FORMAT WITH PMID/PMCID)

PUT NCBI LINK HERE

A. PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATIONS (ONLY PUBLISHED OR IN PRESS)

List authors, title of the article, title of journal, DOI and/or PMID, Date published, and impact factor of the journal at the time the paper was published.

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

- B. PEER REVIEWED LETTERS/BRIEFS/EDITORIALS/REVIEWS:
List authors, title of the article, title of journal, DOI and/or PMID, Date published, and impact factor of the journal at the time the paper was published.

- C. PUBLICATIONS IN PREPARATION/IN REVIEW

- D. MONOGRAPHS/WHITE PAPERS/PROCEEDINGS:

- E. BOOKS/CHAPTERS

- F. MEDIA APPEARANCES
Title of piece / data / media outlet / website link

- G. STATISTICS:
 - a. h-index (all and in last 5 years)
 - b. number of citations (all and in last 5 years)

- H. POLICY CHANGE
List and describe any policies that have changed because of your academic work.

PRESENTATIONS

- A. INVESTIGATOR INITIATED PRESENTATIONS:
TITLE/DATE/CONFERENCE/CITY/ABSTRACT NUMBER

- B. INVITED PRESENTATIONS
TITLE/DATE/CONFERENCE/CITY

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

- A. ACTIVE GRANTS/CONTRACTS
YEAR/AGENCY/TITLE OF GRANT/ROLE ON GRANT/PERCENT EFFORT/
BRIEF DESCRIPTION

- B. COMPLETED GRANTS/CONTRACTS
YEAR/AGENCY/TITLE OF GRANT/ROLE ON GRANT/PERCENT EFFORT/
BRIEF DESCRIPTION

SPHTM Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Criteria

C. GRANT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED:
YEAR/AGENCY/TITLE OF GRANT/ROLE ON GRANT/PERCENT EFFORT/
BRIEF DESCRIPTION

ACTIVITIES IN ALIGNMENT WITH SCHOOL VISION: *“Optimal Health and Well-being for All”*

A. TEACHING

B. RESEARCH

C. SERVICE

D. OTHER