Assuring that all rules and regulations concerning appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty in the Department are followed according to School and University policies is the responsibility of the Chair’s office. In addition, the Chair’s office has the responsibility to be as equitable and transparent as possible in all matters that involve appointment, promotion and tenure.

Faculty in the Department of Health Behavior are hired as tenure track or fixed-term. All faculty are vital to the success of the Department. Fixed-term faculty are either on the research or clinical track.

**TENURED/TENURE TRACK FACULTY**

**Faculty Promotion Guidelines**

**OVERVIEW:** These guidelines were developed to help members of the Department’s Appointments, Promotions and Tenure (APT) Committee gain insight into standards of excellence for scholars in our Department. In implementing the rules of the *Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure Manual* of the School of Public Health for promotion and tenure of faculty, the Department applies the criteria described herein. These criteria embody both the standards of the School and the particular mission, disciplines and history of the Department.

These departmental guidelines feature many examples of exemplary performance. **However, promotion and tenure should be based on highly individualized judgments of Health Behavior faculty accomplishment in scholarship, teaching, and service. No single dimension, criterion, or expectation should determine such judgments.** Rather, they should reflect the particular set of accomplishments of an individual candidate for promotion and tenure appraised within the broad framework of school and departmental expectations. The framework, however, will always embody a candidate’s contributions to the knowledge base and practice of public health and the disciplines on which these are based, the training and mentoring of future members of our profession and disciplines, and the health of the broader community.

Four primary areas are taken into consideration: 1) scholarly productivity; 2) support and funding of research; 3) teaching and mentoring; and 4) professional service/faculty engagement. In each area, the examples that follow illustrate the level of accomplishment that the Department considers worthy of promotion. **It should be understood that these examples are not meant to provide discreet criteria for meeting the standards and expectations.** Rather, the judgment that a candidate has met expectations for promotion will be based on the appraisal of the tenured professors within the Department that the quality, impact, and contribution of the work *as a whole* make the candidate worthy of promotion.

As the appraisal of performance in each of the four areas represents careful weighing of details of the candidate’s accomplishment in each area, so too will the overall appraisal of accomplishment across all four areas reflect the overall pattern of the individual’s particular strengths. In most successful cases, areas of particularly distinguished accomplishment will come to the fore. In all successful cases, the pattern of accomplishment will reflect overall scholarly distinction in light of Departmental expectations and standards for advancing the understanding or practice of public health.
Several specific considerations should be borne in mind in considering these guidelines. As with all
departments in the School, work in Health Behavior is fundamentally and increasingly multidisciplinary.
This interdisciplinarity can complicate appraisal of scholarship. Conventions in one area (e.g., the
relative weight accorded first, second or last authorship) may not be shared universally across
disciplines. The fundamentally collaborative nature of much of our work makes difficult the appraisal of
individuals’ contributions to it. The Department holds the view that its faculty should make distinctive
and substantive scholarly contributions to the projects and activities in which they collaborate. Typically,
this principle is reflected by first or second authorship of journal articles and by the role of principal
investigator of funded activities. We recognize, however, other worthy manifestations of distinctive and
substantive scholarly contributions and intend that they, too, be recognized in the highly individualized
appraisal of candidates for promotion that embodies the Department’s philosophy.

Among the types of scholarship common in public health, many faculty in Health Behavior focus on
research based in the gathering of original data (as opposed to analyses of existing data sources) and on
interventional research (as opposed to descriptive or etiological research). Both of these emphases—
original data and intervention research—may pose challenges to amassing a large number of
publications and are considered in appraisal of candidates for promotion within the Department.

Finally, in contrast to reputed trends toward publication of the “least publishable unit,” the Department
encourages its faculty and students to publish their work so as to communicate ideas and findings in a
coherent, complete and meaningful manner. Proceeding in this way may reduce the total number of
publications while increasing the meaningfulness of the research or scholarship that is published

Performance Expectations for Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure

Criteria 1: Scholarly productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| By the time materials are prepared to support promotion to associate professor with tenure, candidates will have generated research and scholarship that is recognized as making valuable contributions to public health and/or the candidate’s discipline and is judged to be indicative of future contributions. In this judgment, the trajectory of productivity is considered along with the aggregate number and quality of publications. Generally, such scholarly contribution is manifest through publications in leading peer-reviewed journals. For multiple-authored papers, the individual is expected to make substantive and distinctive contributions to the scholarship of the work. | • A large number of publications (30-40 for an assistant professor) of which a substantial proportion are first or second-authored, and which are focused on a central theme or themes of the candidate’s research focus.  
• A substantial number of publications (20-30 for an assistant professor) that include a set of 5–10 that set out a thematic and important contribution to the field and are published in major or leading journals and to which the candidate has made strong and distinctive contribution.  
• A substantial number of publications (20-30 for an assistant professor) of which a substantial proportion are first, second, or last authored along with frequent requests to lecture on the substance of the candidate’s work at national or international meetings or peer institutions and/or along with requests to write chapters on the candidate’s work in major texts or edited volumes in the field. |

*Examples only, not strict codifications of expectations.
### Criteria 2: Research support and funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Success in developing and gaining substantial support for research and scholarly activities will be measured either through national research grants (such as those from the NIH) if such funding is available for a particular area of research and scholarship, and/or through other awards (e.g., fellowships) that indicate valuing of candidates’ work by their peers and that provide salary support to offset support committed by the Department. Given the variability in the “funding climate” for many areas of research, current level of funding is relatively less important than a record of research, applications for support, and awarded grants indicative of a long-term ability and commitment to gain support for research. Successful candidates should have experience as principal investigator, or equivalent, on at least one grant or externally funded project. | • Extensive support for the candidate’s research, reaching 50-70% of the candidate’s own salary, through participation in major projects or centers and in which the candidate’s role reflects scholarly activity, rather than simply technical service, to funded research projects. Experience as principal investigator on at least one grant.  
• Extensive support for candidates’ research, reaching 40-60% of a candidate’s own salary and with the candidate serving as principal investigator for some of this support.  
• A track record of funded grants and positively reviewed applications that provide a base for competitive revised or additional applications that also show strong likelihood for support of a substantial portion of the candidate’s salary over a period of a number of years. Experience as principal investigator on at least one grant.  
• Support for scholarly work of the candidate (including career development awards or fellowships) amounting to a substantial portion of the candidate’s salary. |

### Criteria 3: Teaching and Mentoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| By the end of five years as an Assistant Professor, candidates will have demonstrated sustained, significant contributions to the Department’s teaching mission including the mentoring of graduate students. Candidates will be able to demonstrate the relevance to the Department’s teaching mission of the content taught, excellence of process (i.e., teaching methods), and impact on the Department’s students as well as, in some cases, those of other departments. In general faculty are expected to teach required and/or elective courses, to advise both master’s and doctoral students, to chair and serve on doctoral dissertation committees, and to provide | • The candidate: advises 1-2 master’s students per year; supports on grants 1 student per year; has served as chair of 1-2 doctoral dissertations; teaches the equivalent of one required course and one elective course per year.  
• Similar to above but, instead of teaching one required and one elective course per year, the candidate co-teaches several required and/or elective courses that serve a relatively large number of departmental graduate students.  
• In addition to teaching a required course, the candidate has a strong record of mentoring graduate students. The candidate has: chaired 2-3 successful doctoral dissertation committees; published with 5-6 departmental students and graduates; and advised/mentored a number of master’s students beyond what is required for the degree. Mentor 2-3 |
financial support from grants or other funding for graduate students. Faculty are also expected to advise master’s students in Capstone teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professional Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the end of five years as an assistant professor, candidates will have demonstrated competence in professional service by contributing to the work necessary for the operation of the Department of Health Behavior and to the work necessary for operation of the School of Public Health or the University, and will have contributed to the maintenance and growth of their profession.</td>
<td>• Candidate regularly serves on one departmental committee, one School of Public Health committee, and one University-wide committee or task force; regularly reviews manuscripts and conference abstracts; participates in a leadership role in one professional organization; has been invited to participate in a panel setting a research agenda in his or her area; and holds one-time membership on special editorial board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Service</strong></td>
<td>• Candidate regularly serves on one Department committee, one School of Public Health committee, and one University committee or task force; reviews manuscripts and conference abstracts; has been invited to participate in state-wide or nationally prominent activities based on his or her research area of expertise; has been invited to be on a working group to address a topic that builds the science around the candidate’s area of expertise; has participated on a conference planning committee; has served on the editorial board of a professional journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates are expected to demonstrate public service by providing contributions based on their expertise to the betterment of the broader community at the local, state or national level. The candidate can demonstrate public service at the local, state, national or international level. However, public service at the national and international level is not required at this career phase. Public service can be demonstrated through activities that build from the faculty member’s scholarly expertise to improve the health of the public and/or strengthen the field of public health.</td>
<td><strong>Public Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate could engage in one or more of the following types of activities: serve as a member of a task force; serve on local or state panels or commissions; provide testimony before legislative bodies; consult for local or state public agencies; offer continuing education lectures or courses; supervise student projects which yield primary results that benefit a local or state organization in improving the health of their clientele; or follow through with other work that assists local and state agencies in providing public health-related services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Performance Expectations for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor with Tenure**

**Criteria 1: Scholarly productivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| By the time of recommendation for promotion to full professor, candidates will have continued scholarly productivity through contributions to the professional and scholarly literature, presentations at national meetings, invitations to contribute to influential books and reports, and the like. Additionally, their accomplishments will have resulted in appreciable impact on public health or in the science and practice of a discipline. | Examples of Scholarly Productivity  
- A large number of publications (approximately 60) of which a substantial proportion are first or second authored and which are focused on a central theme or themes of the candidate’s research focus.  
- Somewhat fewer than 60 publications but, among them, a set of 10-15 that set out a thematic and important contribution to the discipline and are published in major or leading journals and to which candidates have made distinctive individual contributions.  
- Somewhat fewer than 60 publications of which a substantial proportion are first or second authored along with frequent requests to lecture or speak on the substance of the candidate’s work at national or international meetings or peer institutions and/or along with requests to write chapters on the candidate’s work in major texts or edited volumes in the field. |

The examples for this category are grouped into two areas: **Scholarly Productivity** and **Impact on the Field**. Both are needed for promotion to full professor.

**Examples of Impact on the Field**  
As documented through external letters of reference and the endorsement of the Department Chair:  
- Development and documentation of the value of methodological approaches that are adopted by others in the candidate’s field and credited with improving the research and scholarship in that area.  
- Development and evaluation of an intervention or intervention approach that is widely used and credited with improving public health.  
- Through national service (such as on advisory committees, leadership roles, etc.) and **based on areas of the candidate’s own research** and scholarship, promotion of approaches to public health problems that gain adoption and are credited with improving public health.  
- Original scholarly work that sets out a model or conceptual perspective that has clear and appreciable impact on research in the field and/or public health services and practice.
### Criteria 2: Research support and funding

**ASSOCIATE to FULL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sustained success of candidates in developing and gaining substantial support for their research and scholarly activities either through national research grants (such as those from the NIH) and/or through other awards (e.g., career development) that indicate valuing of candidates’ work by their peers and which provide salary support to offset support committed by the Department. Especially given variability in the “funding climate” for many areas of research, current level of funding is relatively less important than a strong record of research, applications for support, and award of a number of substantial grants indicative of a long-term ability and commitment to gain support for research. | • Extensive support for candidates’ research, including 50-70% of the candidate’s own salary and with the candidate serving as principal investigator for much of this support. Several current grants funded or several grant applications under submission, review, or re-review with clear basis for expectations of success in gaining funding are expected.  
• Extensive support for candidates’ research, including 40-60% of the candidate’s own salary, through major projects or centers, efforts in which the candidate’s role reflects scholarly activity, not just technical service, to funded research projects. Within such projects or centers, holding a leadership role indicative of major contributions to the success of the project or center and strong likelihood of continued support is expected.  
• Frequent and sustained career development or other support for scholarly work of candidates amounting to a substantial portion of candidates’ salary. |

### Criteria 3: Teaching and mentoring

**ASSOCIATE to FULL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| By the time of proposed candidacy for promotion and similar to the Department’s criteria for promotion to tenured associate professor, candidates for promotion to full professor should demonstrate relevance to the Department’s teaching mission of the content they have taught, excellence of their teaching methods, and impact on graduate students both within and, in many cases, outside the Department. In general faculty are expected to teach required and/or elective courses, to advise both master’s and doctoral students, to chair and serve on doctoral dissertation committees, and to provide financial support from grants or other funding for graduate students. Faculty are | • Over a number of years (8-10), candidates have a sustained record of the equivalent of advising 1-2 master’s students per year; supporting on grants 1-2 student per year; teaching the equivalent of one required course and one elective course per year; and chairing 5-8 doctoral dissertations.  
• Candidates have a sustained record of contributing to the Department’s teaching mission by having taught required and elective courses, having an outstanding record of mentoring students evidenced by a number of co-publications with students, having won a mentoring award, or a long and consistent record of supporting graduate students on grants and who have worked on research projects with the candidate.  
• Candidates served as a master’s or doctoral program director for a number of years. In that role a candidate made substantial contributions to |
also expected to advise MPH Capstone teams.

improving the Department’s training program. In addition, the candidate taught required or elective courses, advised doctoral and master’s students, and mentored several students in various roles. Associate professors are also expected to participate in mentoring 2-3 Capstone Teams while in rank.

**Criteria 4: Service (to department, school, university, community)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Standards and Expectations</th>
<th>Examples of Profiles of Accomplishment Meeting Departmental Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The <em>professional and public service</em> of candidates being promoted from associate professor to full professor should reflect their years of experience in a university system and their national/international reputation for scholarship in a designated area. To demonstrate professional service, candidates should have participated on committees at the departmental, school and University levels, playing significant roles such as chairing committees or holding administrative positions. In addition to participating in activities that maintain the profession (e.g. reviewing manuscripts, abstracts, grant proposals; being on editorial boards; being members of professional organizations), candidates are expected at this phase in their careers to have prominent leadership roles in forwarding their profession/area of expertise. Additionally, candidates should be able to demonstrate evidence of mentoring of students, post-docs and/or junior faculty. Their public service should have implications beyond the local and state level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Service**

- Significant contributions to the work necessary for the operation of the Department of Health Behavior, School of Public Health, and University by serving on committees at all three levels and by taking leadership roles such as chairing committees, searches, task forces and/or serving in an administrative capacity such as the director of a program of study, director of recruitment and admissions, deputy chair, associate dean or center director. Additionally, some service to other universities is desirable (e.g., writing letters for faculty promotion, being on review committees for units at other universities, and serving on accreditation or educational review boards).

- In the area of service to their profession, the candidate is expected to participate routinely in activities for maintaining the profession (e.g. reviewing manuscripts, other scholarly documents, abstracts, and grant proposals; service on editorial boards; leadership in professional organizations). In addition to these activities, candidates are expected to have prominent leadership roles based on demonstrated recognition by others of their scholarship that is intended to forward the candidate’s profession/area of expertise. Such roles include: editor of a professional journal; president or officer of a professional organization; member of NIH, CDC or foundation advisory committees or study sections; member or chair of commissions, panels or task forces related to scholarship or setting scholarship agendas. Candidate should demonstrate evidence of actively mentoring students, post-docs, and/or junior faculty.

**Public Service**
Public service should have implications at the national or international level by demonstrating recognition of candidates’ expertise and scholarship.

---

### FIXED TERM FACULTY

**Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion and Annual Expectations**

07/17/2013

**Overview:** Fixed-term faculty (FTF) are vital to the success of the Department of Health Behavior. Clinical track appointments serve the Department and the School primarily through teaching and/or public health practice. Those in the research track primarily conduct either their own research or support other faculty research projects. In addition to their primary duties, FTF also may further the departmental mission through directing and serving on dissertation committees, leading and serving as members of administrative committees at the Departmental, School, and University levels, advising students, and serving as representatives of the Department through their participation in regional, national, and international professional associations and meetings. Through their diverse activities, FTF enhance the visibility, productivity, and scope of professional activity of the Department.

**Process for Appointments and Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty**
Fixed-term faculty may be appointed in either the Clinical or Research track at the Assistant, Associate or Professor ranks. Appointments may last for a term of anywhere from one to five years; 1-3 year appointments are standard. At the same time, fixed-term faculty at UNC-Chapel Hill are at-will employees, meaning that they are subject to discontinuation at the Chair’s discretion even prior to the end of their appointment period. Appointments and reappointments of FTF at the lecturer or assistant level are reviewed administratively within the Department, School and University but not by the School’s APT committee. Appointments, reappointments, and promotions of fixed-term faculty are reviewed by the Department’s APT committee, which makes recommendations to the Chair. Fixed-term faculty appointments at the associate professor level and above are also reviewed by the School’s APT committee.

Promotions to the rank of Research or Clinical Associate Professor and above are reviewed by the both the departmental and school-wide APT committees. Decisions regarding the promotion of fixed term faculty are separate from decisions regarding their employment. Candidates for promotion should refer to the School’s APT manual and the Department’s HR consultant for the most current guidance on how to format promotion materials. It is expected that the Chair and the department APT committee will provide necessary guidance and mentoring to fixed-term faculty. The chair will make available to each faculty member copies of the University, School and Department criteria and processes for promotion at time of initial appointment.

The review process for promotion of fixed term faculty is parallel to that for tenure track faculty. Negative decision on promotion may occur at the Department or School levels. In the case of a negative recommendation for promotion at the department level, the Chair informs the faculty member in writing after consultation with the Dean and the School’s head of H.R.

In the case of a positive recommendation for promotion, the Chair, after consultation with the Department’s APT committee and the tenured full professors, forwards the positive recommendation to the Dean. After review and approval by the appropriate University offices and committees, the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost will send the faculty member a formal appointment letter.

**Faculty Development and Yearly Review**

The primary responsibility to facilitate the career development of faculty rests with the Chair, supported by mentorship of each member of the faculty by an assigned faculty mentor at a higher rank. The Chair is available to members of the faculty for advice and consultation at the initiative of each faculty member.

As with tenure track faculty, fixed-term faculty meet annually with the department chair to review their past year’s work and to discuss responsibilities for the coming year. These meetings usually occur in May or June. All faculty are expected to participate in such an annual review meeting with the Chair. Comments are provided by the Chair during and after the review meeting which serve as an element in recommendations for salary raises. In addition, if FTF elect to be reviewed in the fall, they may request a Fall Faculty Review by the HB APT.

**Annual Departmental Expectations**

Regardless of source or amount of external support or type of appointment, all faculty are expected to contribute to the general functioning of the Department through attendance at faculty meetings, giving
occasional lectures in courses in their areas of expertise, mentoring students and more junior faculty in their areas, etc.

On an individual basis, the Chair may negotiate with a fixed term faculty member for additional and substantial service to the Department such as in teaching a course, coordinating an instructional program, etc. As compensation for such service, the Chair and the individual faculty member will negotiate a fair percentage of the faculty member’s salary to be paid from Departmental funds.

Such individual arrangements for payment of fixed term faculty from Departmental funds will be on a year-to-year basis with no commitment beyond the year of the agreement. Annually, the Chair will deliver a “state of the department” report to the faculty. That report will include an anonymized update of the percentages of all faculty members’ salaries paid by Departmental funds, aggregated into the following four groupings: Tenure track Assistant Professors, Tenure track/tenured Associate Professors, Tenured Full Professors, and Fixed Term faculty (all ranks presented together). Moreover, at all milestones for the faculty (e.g., contract renewal, reappointment, promotion, 5-year post-tenure review), the percentage effort covered by the department will be shared with APT members for all fixed term faculty (similar to the way it will be done for tenure track/tenured.

Criteria for Promotion
Because of the variety of appointment types and the possibility of differing job expectations (e.g., clinical versus research track, leading one’s own research projects versus working on others’ research projects, teaching one or several courses, etc.) it is difficult to specify promotion criteria for fixed-term faculty. In general, however, the criteria entail scholarly contributions to the field and gaining support for one’s research or other work.

Scholarly productivity
In general, fixed-term faculty, particularly those in the research track, are expected to publish in the professional scientific literature. The number of publications and other forms of scholarly productivity depends on the nature of the appointment and the specific expectations of the Department as stated by the Department Chair in the faculty member’s contract letter and annual review meetings.

For example, some research track faculty may be expected to lead major externally funded grants and, so, serve as first authors of major publications emerging from those grants. Others may be expected to serve as research directors of projects that are led by others, in which case expectations for leadership roles in research publications may be relaxed. In other cases, development of technical reports, resources for the field (e.g., curricula or training manuals and protocols), or policy materials may be the reasonable products of endeavors. For those on the clinical track, development of publications, reports, or other materials guiding improvement of practice may be expected.

Cutting across all areas of publication or dissemination of work, it is expected that those proposed for promotion to the rank of associate professor will be able to document recognition for the excellence of their work, be that in peer reviewed journals, widely used practice materials, or reports and documents that are highly valued among their intended audiences. For those proposed for promotion to full professor, documentation of recognition of leadership in one’s area of expertise (e.g., among others in the field, those contracting for services, or funding agencies) is also expected.
Because of the varied nature of these criteria and corresponding job expectations, it is critical that individual faculty receive clear specification of their job expectations and criteria for promotion through their annual meetings and communications with the Department Chair.

**Research Support**

As indicated above, expectations of both tenure track and fixed term faculty are discussed with the Department Chair at each faculty member’s annual review meeting. In general, fixed term faculty on the research track are expected to apply for grants either as principal investigators or as co-investigators with other faculty. Fixed term faculty on the clinical track may be required to participate in grant applications or other types of contracts or applications for external funding of work, depending on the nature of their appointment. The specific amount of funding required of each fixed term faculty member is determined annually in consultation with the Department Chair. A general expectation is that fixed term faculty cover 90-95% of their salary from outside sources, and would receive a buyout of effort for teaching a course or performing significant departmental service as determined by the Chair. The percentage of salary coverage for teaching and service activities will vary according to agreed upon duties, as assigned by the Chair, together with years in the Department, historical levels of funding, etc.

In addition to amount of funding, it is expected that those seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor will be able to document their serving in central or critical roles within their funded projects, and that those seeking promotion to the rank of full professor will be able to document major roles in funded projects, often as principal investigator or program director but also, as appropriate, in other roles reflecting high levels of scholarly or professional accomplishment and responsibility.
ALL FACULTY

Schedule of reappointments, promotions and post tenure review

Each spring, before the Department Chair meets with faculty for their end-of-year reviews, the Department’s HR consultant sends an update to the Chair detailing all APT actions scheduled to occur in the coming academic year (including post tenure reviews, reappointments, and promotions to associate or full professor). The Chair works with the HR consultant and the faculty to ensure that all deadlines are met.

Voting process for APT decisions on promotion, tenure or continuation

03/25/2014

For tenure and tenure track appointments the following process is used:
A full meeting of the Department’s APT committee is scheduled for votes on tenure track or tenured faculty. The required materials for each faculty member being reviewed are sent via email to the APT committee in advance of the meeting. (Materials to be circulated differ for reappointments and promotions and are detailed in the SPH APT manual). At the meeting there is an open discussion of each faculty’s packet using the Department Guidelines as the benchmark for evaluating each faculty member. Following the discussion, each APT member is asked to vote using a paper ballot. The ballot includes the options to Approve, Reject, or to Abstain from voting as well as a section to provide comments. A vote to Reject or to Abstain requires a brief explanation to be recorded on the ballot by the voting member. Each voting member of the APT signs the completed ballot and turns it into the Chair. Votes of individual members are not known by the rest of the APT but the Chair is able to see how each person voted. The Chair includes the votes, a summary of the discussion and a summary of the reasons indicated for a vote to Reject or Abstain in his/her recommendation letter to the Dean’s office.

For Fixed term reappointments the following process is used:
A full meeting of the APT may be scheduled for votes on fixed term faculty or materials may be sent around to the committee via email and an email vote taken. The Chair will use his/her discretion to decide if a face-to-face or email discussion is the preferred option. The annual Fall Faculty Review (FFR) provides the APT with the opportunity to carefully review and discuss all fixed term faculty that are participating in the Department’s mentoring program. Discussions that occur at the FFR will help the Chair determine if a face-to-face meeting is required.

The following materials are circulated to the APT for fixed term reappointments prior to the meeting: 1) the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae; 2) a spreadsheet documenting current and projected effort levels (provided by the Department’s business office); and 3) the most recent appointment or reappointment letter for the faculty member. If a face-to-face meeting occurs, there is an open discussion of the faculty’s packet using the Department Guidelines as the benchmark for evaluating each faculty member. Following the discussion, each APT member is asked to vote using a paper ballot. The ballot includes the options to Approve, Reject, or to Abstain from voting as well as a section to provide comments. A vote to Reject or to Abstain requires a brief explanation by the voting member recorded on the ballot. Each voting member of the APT signs the completed ballot and turns it into the Chair. Votes of individual members are not known by the rest of the APT but the Chair is able to see how each person voted. The Chair includes the votes, a summary of the discussion and a summary of the reasons indicated for a vote to Reject or Abstain in his/her recommendation letter to the Dean’s office.
Post tenure review of tenured full professors. Tenured full professors undergo post-tenure review (PTR) once every five years. The protocol for the post-tenure review process is delineated in the SPH’s APT guidelines. A peer evaluation of teaching is required for PTR; therefore, the chair needs to be certain to arrange for a peer teaching evaluation when PTR is pending. The faculty undergoing PTR completes the required documentation and the Chair selects two faculty members to review the documentation and conduct the post-tenure review. The two reviewers analyze the documentation provided by the faculty member being reviewed and write a report for the Department Chair. The Chair sends out the documentation provided by the faculty being reviewed and the reviewers to the Department’s APT and asks for a vote. The ballot includes the options to Approve, Reject, or to Abstain from voting as well as a section to provide comments. A vote to Reject or to Abstain requires a brief explanation by the voting member recorded on the ballot. Each voting member of the APT signs the completed ballot and turns it into the Chair. Votes of individual members are not known by the rest of the APT but the Chair is able to see how each person voted. The Chair includes the votes, a summary of the discussion and a summary of the reasons indicated for a vote to Reject or Abstain in his/her recommendation letter to the Dean’s office.

Adjunct appointments
When an adjunct faculty member is being considered for reappointment, the Chair’s office sends an email to the APT with a current curriculum vitae of the faculty under consideration for reappointment and a request to vote via email with the options to Approve, Reject, or Abstain. Faculty are requested not to copy each other on the email votes. Votes of individual members are not known by the rest of the APT but the Chair is able to see how each person voted. The Chair includes the votes, a summary of the discussion and a summary of the reasons indicated for a vote to Reject or Abstain in his/her recommendation letter to the Dean’s office.