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All School of Public Health-Bloomington faculty shall undergo a formal review during the third year of appointment. This document provides the process and guidelines for such reviews and the criteria for evaluation of candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. The third-year review process is mandated by Indiana University-Bloomington. In addition to the process and guidelines described in this document, individual departments may wish to review faculty more frequently and may use the processes and guidelines described herein as the basis for these reviews.

Note: If the department lacks sufficient numbers of faculty who are of appropriate rank to comprise these review committees, faculty of appropriate rank and with related interests from other departments within the school are to be recruited by the Chairperson, following appropriate procedures, in order to reach the required membership on the committee.

I. PRE-TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE
Composition: The Pre-Tenure Review Committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members from within the candidate’s department. Committee membership shall be determined by departmental policy.

Charge: To serve in an advisory capacity to the Department Chair and in a mentoring capacity to candidates seeking tenure and, when relevant, promotion. The Department Chair shall appoint one person as chair. The committee will review the dossiers of pre-tenure faculty in their third year of employment in the School and assess their progress in relation to three areas—teaching, research/creative activities, and service—in accordance with the relevant criteria established by the School of Public Health-Bloomington. Each member will independently assess the dossier relative to the candidate’s progress in each of these areas. The committee will then meet to discuss the dossier of each candidate. Using the current School criteria and grading system, each candidate will be evaluated in each of the three areas. The committee will then provide a written detailed assessment of each candidate to the Department Chair. The committee shall use the approved third-year, pre-tenure ballot on which they indicate a recommendation regarding reappointment.

II. NON-TENURE TRACK (CLINICAL AND LECTURER RANKS) PROMOTION REVIEW COMMITTEE
Composition: The Non-Tenure Track (NTT) Promotion Review Committee shall consist of three members from the candidate’s home department. Two of these are to be tenured faculty members and one is to be a rank-eligible, NTT instructional faculty member. Committee membership shall be determined by departmental policy.

Charge: To serve in an advisory capacity to the Department Chair and in a mentoring capacity to candidates seeking promotion. NTT instructional faculty (Clinical and Lecturer ranks) are primarily responsible for teaching students in the School of Public Health-Bloomington. Clinical rank faculty are evaluated on excellence in the performance area of teaching and satisfactory performance in the area of
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service. Lecturer rank faculty are evaluated in the performance area of teaching. Each member will independently assess the candidate’s dossier relative to the candidate’s progress in the relevant areas. The committee will then meet to discuss the dossier of each candidate and offer suggestions and recommendations as needed to improve the NTT faculty member’s teaching for promotion and conversion to a long-term contract in their sixth year of service. They also provide a recommendation to the chair regarding reappointment, using the approved third-year review ballot.

III. CONFIDENTIALITY AND COMMUNICATION
All deliberations of the 3rd year Review Committees are confidential. Individual candidates shall be instructed not to contact committee members nor shall committee members directly contact candidate(s). Any concerns a candidate or committee member may have shall be directed to the Department Chair. The Review Committee’s letter of recommendation shall be made available to the candidate through the Department Chair.

IV. TENURE, PROMOTION, AND PERFORMANCE AREAS
*(verbatim excerpt from IUB Principles and Policies on Promotion and Tenure—approved by the Bloomington Faculty Council April 15, 2014)*

*Candidates for promotion and tenure are required to rate as Excellent in one performance area and at least Satisfactory/Effective in the other two. Candidates are required to choose a single performance area on which to predicate their application for tenure or promotion (although this decision does not rule out the possibility that performance in one or both of the other areas will also be assessed Excellent). Throughout the process, review committees and administrators should keep in mind that the dossier materials (including external letters) were compiled and submitted to make the case for tenure or promotion on the basis of Excellence in the one performance area chosen by the candidate. In exceptional instances, a candidate may present evidence of balanced strengths that promise excellent overall performance of comparable benefit to the University. Candidates preferring to be judged on the “balanced case” must be rated as Very Good in all three performance areas. As in instances where a candidate has selected a single performance area for tenure or promotion purposes, review committees and administrators should remain aware that dossier materials (including external letters) are collected and submitted to demonstrate the superior achievements of the candidate across performance areas.

If research or other creative activity is the primary criterion for tenure, the faculty member should be discernibly well on the way toward achieving a national and/or international reputation for excellence in research or creative work in his or her field, or across fields and disciplines. In addition, a comprehensive plan of future research of high merit should be evident. Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly merit may be either a single work or project of considerable importance or a series of studies or projects constituting a general program of worthwhile research or creative/performative output. The candidate should possess a definite continuing program of studies, investigations, or creative works. Candidates for promotion to full professor on the basis of research/creative activity should have achieved a position of national and/or international leadership and prominence in the field(s), with a documented and robust record of achievement and distinction. Again, quality of research, scholarship, and creative output is less pertinent than quality and impact, though it is expected that research/creative accomplishments since achieving the rank of associate professor will be exemplary enough in character and breadth to justify promotion at a university of top rank.
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If teaching is the primary criterion for tenure, the candidate’s pedagogical aptitude and instructional impact should be demonstrably superior to that of effective teachers at Indiana University Bloomington and other major institutions. Indicators of such excellence would reasonably include development of instructional/curricular materials, pedagogical publications (e.g., textbooks) and presentations; active engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning (papers/books about teaching); and participation in national conferences on teaching. Promotion to full professor based on teaching should entail exceptional pedagogical, curricular, and instructional innovations while in rank as an associate professor; new publications that actively and creatively engage the scholarship of teaching and learning; regular participation in workshops, conferences, and invited talks devoted to teaching and pedagogy; mastery over the technologies and methodologies of modern classroom presentation and management; and, wherever feasible, demonstrated ability to direct the studies of advanced students. Moreover, the faculty member seeking full rank should have a national and/or international reputation as a leader in the practice and study of teaching.

If service to the University, profession, state, and/or community is the primary criterion for tenure, distinguished contributions must be evident. The evaluation of the service should be in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed and its relation to the general welfare of the University. Candidates seeking promotion to full professor on the basis of excellence in service must provide evidence for national and/or international visibility and stature resulting from service activities (even abundant local committee work is not enough). Such distinguished contributions could be administrative and institutional in nature, or evidenced through superlative work in a (inter)disciplinary endeavor, governmental organization, or some other entity or cause with national and/or international reach and relevance.

*School of Public Health Clarification regarding non-tenure eligible faculty: Faculty in non-tenure eligible ranks (e.g., clinical assistant professors and lecturers) who are candidates for promotion are required to demonstrate excellence in the performance area of teaching and to be rated as at least satisfactory in the performance area of service. Faculty in these ranks are not evaluated in the research performance area.

V. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION
(verbatim excerpt from IUB Principles and Policies on Promotion and Tenure—approved by the Bloomington Faculty Council April 15, 2014)

A candidate’s proficiency in the performance areas of Research/Creative Activity and Service is rated in accordance with four categories: Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. In assessing competence in Teaching, the categories are: Excellent, Very Good, Effective, and Ineffective.

VI. DEFINITION OF “PERFORMANCE IN RANK”

For candidates being considered for tenure, the period of time for which they are considered to be “in rank” includes the time between the receipt of a candidate’s highest academic degree through the academic year in which a candidate is being reviewed, with special attention paid to their performance since joining the faculty of the School of Public Health.

For candidates being considered for promotion from clinical assistant professor to clinical associate professor or lecturer to senior lecturer, the period of time for which they are considered to be “in

Approved by SPH-B Academic Council 12/12/14
rank” includes the time between the receipt of a candidate’s highest academic degree through the academic year in which a candidate is being reviewed, with special consideration of their performance since joining the faculty of the School of Public Health.

**VII. CANDIDATE’S STATEMENT**
A critically important component of the dossier is the candidate’s personal statement. This is not a restatement of the curriculum vitae, but rather a narrative overview of the candidate’s career -- highlighting major themes, new directions (beyond the dissertation), and future plans. The prose should be understandable to a non-specialist without sacrificing the sense of what makes this work distinctive, innovative, and influential. Discussion of the appropriateness and stature of publication outlets and artistic venues should be included.

**VIII. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**
A basic tenet of the School of Public Health-Bloomington is that faculty being considered for promotion or tenure in the area of research will present evidence that demonstrates their engagement with research in each of the following ways:

**Articulated Research Program.** Faculty should have a clearly articulated program of research, with defined areas of inquiry and methodological rigor which demonstrates a plan for the pursuit of a cohesive research program. This program of research should be consistent with the mission of the school and address issues which are relevant to the health of populations.

**Refereed Research Dissemination.** Faculty will demonstrate success with the dissemination of research in peer-reviewed publications and refereed forms of dissemination at scientific meetings. While other (non-refereed) forms of research dissemination are also acceptable particularly when reflective of activities toward the translation of research, refereed products remain an essential component of a productive and visible research program.

**Research Funding.** Faculty will demonstrate efforts to secure extramural funding for research in ways that facilitate the advancement and sustainability of one’s research program. This funding can be pursued from a variety of forms, from state and federal funding to more private and foundation sources.

**Research Translation.** To effectively facilitate improvements in the health status of individuals, communities, and/or populations necessitates that public health research has translational capacity for a wide range of constituents and organizations. To that end, it is expected that faculty will demonstrate efforts to translate research in ways that contribute to the advancement of knowledge and health.

The School of Public Health-Bloomington includes a diverse range of academic disciplines and faculty are likely to present broad forms of evidence to demonstrate how their research program makes contributions to the broader goals of public health. Therefore, for each of the four basic categories presented above, examples of indicators of one’s contributions in the area of research may include but are not limited to:

**Articulated Research Program**
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• demonstrating an articulated and clear program of research that is consistent with the mission of the school and that addresses issues of relevance to the health of populations,
• receiving awards, honors, or other forms of recognition from peers for one’s research program and its contributions,
• developing and/or applying innovative methodological and/or analytical techniques,
• demonstrating success in engaging students in research,
• demonstrating success in developing innovative mechanisms to support research (e.g., centers, institutes, colloquia series).

Refereed Research Dissemination
• publishing research in high-quality referred journals,
• disseminating research via refereed activities at scientific meetings,
• receiving awards or honors for publications and presentations,
• demonstrating stature in one’s field via invited publications and presentations,
• engaging students in research dissemination,
• serving as an editor of a refereed journal or book.

Research Funding
• demonstrating efforts to secure extramural funding for one’s research (including federal, state, private, foundation and others forms of extramural support),
• success in securing funding for one’s research,
• demonstrating success in mentoring students in the development of funding applications or success in obtaining research-related funding for students.

Research Translation
• publishing research and creative activities in non-refereed venues such as books, book chapters, monographs, technical reports, and other forms of scholarly communication that seek to disseminate research beyond scientific audiences and that are recognized as valuable in one’s discipline and that seek to disseminate research beyond,
• conducting, or translating, research or evaluation activities in partnership with public or private entities in ways that inform public health practice, public health policy, or knowledge of the general population,
• incorporating research findings into other academic activities, including teaching, service, and practice,
• developing statistical models or software for use in research,
• producing statistical, laboratory, or other research material in electronic media,
• obtaining patents or royalties,
• developing, implementing or evaluating community interventions,
• demonstrating leadership in the research-based activities within one’s field and/or professional external organizations and research journals,
• participating in the development and/or involvement in research based center, institute, seminar, colloquium, or working group.

IX. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING
A basic tenet of the School of Public Health-Bloomington is that faculty will contribute to the school’s academic mission through teaching mastery and engaged teaching-related activities that are grounded in contemporary knowledge within one’s discipline and based upon recognized pedagogical strategies and methods. The school assumes that faculty will demonstrate active contributions in five
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teaching-related areas:

**Teaching mastery.** Teaching mastery requires that teachers possess a high level of experience and expertise unique to their discipline; can implement pedagogical strategies to accurately assess student attainment of learning outcomes; are able to make connections with their students in the classroom; and inspire and stimulate student learning and achievement.

**Student development and mentoring.** The development and mentoring of students, particularly graduate students, is essential. Student development integrates both in-class and out-of-class experiences for students that expand student learning and enhances the quality of student life. Effective and equitable mentors guide, counsel, and coach mentees to greater levels of effectiveness, productivity, and development (School of Public Health-Bloomington Teaching Excellence Program, Faculty Mentor Handbook).

**Contributions to curricular processes.** Faculty hold the primary responsibility for the effective development, implementation, and evaluation of curricular matters within the school. In order to realize the promise of a diverse and multidisciplinary faculty in designing and maintaining a curriculum that maximizes student achievement and career success, the active engagement of faculty in the curricular processes of the school is essential.

**Community engagement through teaching.** Community engagement or service learning integrates instruction and student learning outcomes and strategies with community service and the advancement of professional practice. Experiential education enriches student growth through the development of community/civic responsibility. Faculty also engage with the community in programs that support the professional development of their discipline-specific workforce.

**Professional and pedagogical development.** Participation in a reflective practice of professional and pedagogical development (e.g., workshops, programs, seminars) is essential for teaching excellence. Critically reflective teachers engage in pedagogical scholarship as a way of continuously improving their teaching practice and contributing to the teaching practices of others. Such scholarship includes engagement with students, peers, professional organizations resulting in enhanced teaching practices in the classroom. Pedagogical research, presentations, publications, and textbooks contribute to a teacher’s national and international reputation in teaching.

The School of Public Health-Bloomington includes a diverse range of academic disciplines and faculty are likely to present broad forms of evidence to demonstrate how their teaching activities make contributions to the broader goals of public health and the school. Therefore, for the five basic categories of expectation presented above, examples of indicators of one’s contributions in the area of teaching may include but are not limited to:

**Teaching Mastery**
- demonstrating mastery in teaching as reflected in student evaluations, students’ work and accomplishments.
- demonstrating successful or innovative teaching, course development or assessment strategies.
- receiving awards or honors for teaching effectiveness.
- contributing significantly to pedagogical revisions in a discipline through new curriculum, courses, or teaching approaches and innovations.
- creating syllabi, learning activities, and assessments, and other pedagogical strategies that are centered around student learning outcomes.
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Student Development and Mentoring

- demonstrating a commitment to student development and mentoring through service and leadership on advisory and research committees.
- creating and promoting opportunities which involve students in the research, presentation, and publication process.
- providing mentoring in teaching, including AI, TA, and GA appointments.
- providing advice, tutoring, sponsorship, and other forms of support to guide, counsel, and coach students to greater levels of effectiveness, productivity, and development.

Contributions to Curricular Processes

- providing leadership and other substantive contributions to the curricular activities of one’s department, school, campus or university.
- contributing to curricular advancement, including course enhancement and new course development critical to the teaching missions of the department and school.
- mentoring colleagues in the development of teaching skills and in the area of pedagogical designs.
- developing teaching materials available for use by others (e.g., text books, book chapters, online materials etc.)
- receiving instructional development grants and/or contracts.

Community Engagement through Teaching

- contributing to the school’s efforts to educate (e.g., continuing education, workforce development activities) professionals and others within organizations in ways that build the capacity of such entities to promote the health of the public and the better good.
- engaging students in service-learning and other contemporary forms of practice- or community-engaged teaching.
- delivering non-university lectures/presentations.

Professional Development

- demonstrating a commitment to one’s teaching excellence through participation in workshops, seminars, or courses on teaching/subject area.
- reflecting on teaching practice in CITL consultations, personal journals, published papers, etc. to improve teaching skills and documenting outcomes of this effort.
- delivering pedagogical conference presentations.
- engaging in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) and other professional development efforts.
- engaging in pedagogical research resulting in presentations and publications.
- contributing to teaching excellence in one’s department or school through activities (e.g. mentoring junior faculty in the area of teaching).
- contributing to significant pedagogical advancement through leadership in the department and/or school.

X. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE
A basic tenet of the School of Public Health-Bloomington is that all faculty will contribute to the school’s service mission. Given that service activities in a school of public health encompass not only those that are intended to advance the academic environment, but also those that advance public health practice and that influence the activities of professional practice-based organizations, the school assumes that
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all faculty will demonstrate active contributions in three areas:

**Academic service.** An effective academic environment requires that all faculty are attentive to both the rights and responsibilities of faculty governance, and as such are actively engaged in the affairs of one’s department, school, and university.

**Practice-based service.** As a faculty member in a school of public health, faculty are expected to contribute to the advancement of practice in areas specific to their expertise and/or discipline.

**Service to professional organizations.** Professional societies and associations play an integral role in advancing the disciplines upon which they are focused and as such, faculty are expected to be engaged with the organizations specific to their discipline or areas of expertise and should demonstrate progressively increasing contributions to such organizations over the course of their career.

The School of Public Health-Bloomington includes a diverse range of academic disciplines and faculty are likely to present broad forms of evidence to demonstrate how their service activities make contributions to the broader goals of public health and the school. Therefore, for each of the three basic categories of expectation presented above, examples of indicators of one’s contributions in the area of service may include but are not limited to:

**Academic Service**
- contributing to the activities of committees at the level of one’s department, the school, the campus, or the university, through membership and leadership.
- serving in an advisory role to student organizations in one’s department or the school, campus or university.
- participating as a member on student committees in ways that are not reflected, or that are complementary to, one’s teaching activities.
- receiving awards for one’s contributions to academic service.
- serving in an administrative role in the department, school or university level.

**Practice-Based Service**
- promoting the health of the public by membership, leadership, and other contributions to the activities of practice-based organizations.
- providing consultation, technical assistance, continuing education, and other forms of capacity development to practice-based organizations.
- delivering services, care, or other specific forms of support to practice-based entities that are related to one’s specific area of expertise (e.g., athletic training provision, CPR training).

**Service to Professional Organizations**
- providing substantive contributions to the governance activities of professional organizations (e.g., committee membership, board membership, serving as an organizational officer).
- contributing to the professional development activities of organizations, including those related to scientific and professional conferences or meetings, policy development, and other activities related to the mission of a specific organization.
- demonstrating efforts to engage students in the activities of professional organizations.
- demonstrating service to professional organizations as evidenced through the receipt of awards or honors.
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# XI. TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Obtain an annual review with department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Obtain an annual review with department chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester</td>
<td>Review committees are constituted, using approved departmental procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December/January</td>
<td>Completed SPH e-dossier due. Check specific departmental date for due date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Individual committee members review SPH e-dossiers. Committee meets and discusses SPH e-dossier. A vote is taken and included in the letter that is provided to the chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Results of third-year review returned to candidate by department chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>