

## **Criterion VIII.B**

**The school shall have well-defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty, to evaluate competence and performance of faculty and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.**

### Expected Documentation

1. Inclusion of a faculty handbook or other written document which outlines faculty rules and regulations.
2. Description of provisions for faculty development, including identification of support for faculty categories other than regular full-time appointments.
3. Description of formal procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance.
4. A description of student course evaluation process and/or evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
5. Description of the emphasis given to community service activities in the promotion and tenure process.
6. Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met.

## **Criterion VIII.B – Faculty: Recruitment and Evaluation**

### **1. Faculty Handbook for the School of Public Health**

The SPH Faculty Handbook (available in the resource file and seen at <http://www.uic.edu/sph/downloads/revhandbk2.pdf>) augments the SPH Student Handbook (available in the resource file and seen at <http://www.uic.edu/sph/shandbook.htm>). For a complete understanding of the rights, responsibilities and rules governing faculty employment at the UIC School of Public Health, reference must be made to both documents.

### **2. Faculty Development**

Faculty development is accomplished through several different mechanisms such as, mentoring, teaching recognition, provision of incentives including resources and the granting of sabbaticals.

#### **Mentoring**

Mentoring of new faculty, at the assistant professor level, is the primary responsibility of the academic division. However, both the SPH Dean's Office and the campus as a whole bear responsibility and have programs in place to assist in the mentoring process. At the division level, for the new assistant professor, provisions such as a reduced initial teaching load and a lower expectation of campus and SPH committee service are made in order to facilitate professional progress. Additionally, division directors, who discuss the school's and divisions' criteria for promotion and tenure with the faculty member, closely monitor the progress of new faculty and may suggest a mentor within the division or a mentoring committee of faculty members from both inside and outside of the division. At the school level, faculty development is the responsibility of the senior associate dean, who holds periodic meetings with new faculty to monitor their progress toward achieving the school's standards. The dean also meets with each assistant professor periodically to discuss his/her progress. At the campus level, there is the UIC Faculty Mentoring Program (<http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaafaculty/facment.html>) sponsored by the Office of the Provost. This program, originally focused only on women junior faculty, includes all new tenure track faculty. At the beginning of each academic year, newly hired tenure track faculty and all tenured faculty are invited to participate in the Faculty Mentoring Program. Further, the campus promotion and tenure workshops are held annually to provide guidance to faculty regarding the process and the expectations for teaching, research and service. An important part of the promotion and tenure process at UIC is the midprobationary review. This review, which takes place during a tenure track faculty member's third year, is intended to provide an assessment of the faculty member's progress toward tenure. This timing is set so that the assessment is late enough to permit reasonable review but also early enough to give guidance that is helpful in preparing for the tenure review and decision.

Mentoring of faculty above the assistant professor level is accomplished primarily through annual review of faculty progress by the division director. The faculty members Annual

Performance Report (APR) is the evaluation instrument that forms the foundation of this review.

## **Faculty Recognition**

### Scholarly achievement recognition

The University Scholars Program is designed to identify outstanding members of the faculty and to provide each with a modest amount of funds annually for a defined number of years. The importance of these awards lies in the flexibility with which the funds may be spent. Recipients may use the funds at their discretion to enhance their scholarly work, except for salary rate increases, which are not permitted. The awards are not made for a specific project or proposal; rather, they are a symbol of the recipient's excellence and the University's commitment to foster outstanding people and their work. Therefore, the awards are made through nominations, not by application. Dr. Donald Hedeker, Professor of Biostatistics, was awarded the University Scholar award for 2000-2003.

### Teaching recognition

Documentation of teaching effectiveness is important on this campus and in the school. The promotion and tenure process has put more and more emphasis on teaching as a criterion for success. The school has implemented a more rigorous teaching evaluation process (see response to Criterion VIII.B.4), which includes reviews by students, peers and the division director.

Two campus programs recognize excellence in teaching. The first program, the UIC Excellence in Teaching Award sponsored by the Provost's office, provides a \$5000 increase to faculty salary and is restrictive in terms of the nomination procedure and eligibility. The second award, sponsored by The Council for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, is the Teaching Recognition Program. In this program, faculty is recognized for their teaching excellence with an increment to their salary (usually \$1,500). Excellence in teaching is determined by a campus wide review, by faculty, and by supporting documentation submitted by the applicant. The SPH has had winners of both awards, in 2003, Dr. Ronald Hershow was awarded the Excellence in Teaching Award and most recently Dr. Donald Hedeker in Biostatistics won one of the Teaching Recognition Awards.

At the school level, the Golden Apple Award is given annually by the Public Health Student Association to a faculty member in recognition of outstanding teaching and unusual service to students at SPH.

## **Faculty Incentives**

Incentives to promote scholarship, and possibly retraining, include travel funds to attend conferences, expenses for short courses, technology training, and seed monies for small pilot projects. Monies for these incentives have been available from the division, the school or the campus. Prior to the last few years' budget cuts, the Dean and the Senior Associate Dean had opportunity funds for this kind of support. The Dean's fund was used for larger scale initiatives that had some inter-division or inter-disciplinary aspects. One such example was the funding by the Dean (\$80,000 over 2 years) of an Environmental/Occupational

Epidemiology Center initiative. The Senior Associate Dean's opportunity funds provided support for several faculty to attend software workshops, to travel to meetings, and to conduct a small pilot study. The budget cuts resulted in the depletion of these opportunity funds but as the fiscal health of the SPH stabilizes, as we garner resources from other sources, these funds will be rebuilt and hopefully grown. In order to allow faculty some discretion in providing a personal balance between teaching and research, the divisions and the school allow faculty teaching buyouts when the faculty member has outside funding. This insures that faculty conducting research are less likely to "burn out" but that each faculty member contributes their expertise to the classroom and are available to the students. Each course buyout requires 20% salary coverage. It should be noted, however, that no faculty member can buy out all of his/her teaching responsibilities.

### **Sabbatical Leave**

The University of Illinois statutes provide that members of the faculty "may be granted a sabbatical leave of absence with pay for the purpose of study, research or other pursuit, the object of which is to increase the faculty member's usefulness to the university." These "leaves of absence are given to members of the faculty primarily for the purpose of enabling them to acquire additional knowledge and competency in their respective fields." Faculty who have completed six appointment years of full-time service are eligible for two semesters at half pay or one semester at full pay, and faculty who have completed eight appointment years of full-time service are eligible for two semesters at two-thirds salary or one semester at full pay. Interested faculty consults with their division director at least a year in advance as to the possibility of taking this leave. Approval of the leave begins with the division and includes the SPH dean, the UIC provost and finally, the board of trustees.

### **3. Evaluation of Faculty Competence and Performance**

Evaluation of the faculty is carried out primarily through the Annual Performance Report and the promotion and tenure review. However, the school developed a teaching evaluation program, a number of years ago, which provides additional review of the teaching component of faculty performance. Some elements of this program have been used successfully, while other elements have not proved as useful and will be re-evaluated.

Annual Performance Report (APR): At the end of each academic year, all faculty in groups A and B complete and submit online the Annual Performance Report (available in the Resource file). Once all faculty have completed their submissions, and the system is closed out, the Division Director, the Senior Associate Dean and the Dean have access to the individual faculty entries as well as a summary report (by division and the overall School. The report addresses the research, teaching and service components of faculty responsibility. The administration uses these reports to evaluate faculty performance for determination of merit salary increases and to monitor progress toward achieving tenure or promotion. Further, select data from the APR populates the individual faculty member's web profile.

Promotion and Tenure Review: At the end of the academic year, a faculty member who wants to be considered for promotion or tenure should discuss this with his or her division director and assist in the initiation of the process. Any tenured or tenure track faculty member who wishes to pursue this process may participate. In the fall of the subsequent

academic year, the promotion and tenure papers, which include information on teaching, research and community service activities, are prepared. These then are reviewed by division faculty members who have at least the rank and tenure status that the candidate is seeking. A vote and recommendation are made by this review committee. Following this review, the papers are reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee of the SPH Executive Committee, who provide advice to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee members, who are at least at the same rank and tenure status the candidate seeks, vote and make a recommendation to the dean. Campus review follows the SPH process and includes review by a campus wide promotion and tenure committee that makes recommendations to the provost. The provost makes recommendations to the chancellor and the chancellor makes recommendations to the board of trustees.

A rigorous evaluation and subsequent revision of the SPH promotion and tenure guidelines was undertaken during the 2003/2004 academic year by the SPH Promotion and Tenure Committee. This effort resulted in guidelines (located in the resource file) that include the scholarship of practice as being of equal value in promotion and tenure decisions as the scholarship of research.

Teaching Evaluation: As described below, in the response to Criterion VIII.B.4, the evaluation of each faculty member includes student evaluation of faculty performance, evaluation of advising, and possible peer review. The peer reviews are timed to coincide with the Mid-Probationary Tenure Review and the Tenure Review.

#### **4. Student Evaluation of Teaching and Advising**

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is a crucial aspect of faculty review both for purposes of promotion and tenure and for annual performance evaluation. Teaching, the major responsibility of faculty in the school and the university as a whole, requires a multidimensional evaluation approach.

- Course Evaluation Questionnaires (CEQs)
- Student Evaluation of Advising (both academic and research)
- Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching

The CEQs, as of Fall, 2005, are entirely administered online and are completed by students near the end of the semester. SPH utilizes the online survey system developed by the Center for the Advancement of Distance Education (CADE). This system deploys surveys to the students' email account and sends out periodic reminders to those students who have not completed the CEQs (over a 3 week period). Once the evaluation timeframe ends, faculty receives their results electronically, which allows them to review their course feedback in a timely fashion enabling them to modify their course prior to its next offering.

Student evaluation of advising, formerly a paper-based system, now is administered online using the same online survey system as the CEQs use. All graduating students are surveyed at the time of graduation. When the evaluation timeframe ends, the faculty member, the Division Directors and the Senior Associate Dean have access to the responses (but, of

course not the name of the respondent). This information is used by the administration in evaluating/mentoring faculty and by the faculty member for self-improvement.

Finally, at the point of promotion, faculty must undergo a peer evaluation of their classroom teaching. The documents for this peer evaluation are in Appendix VIII.B.4. Several years ago a periodic peer review of all faculty (post tenure) teaching was implemented as there was discussion about formalizing post tenure review (including, but not limited to, teaching) campus-wide. That campus process was never implemented and the SPH post-tenure review of teaching has not been utilized in several years. An overall review of faculty evaluation will take place during the 06/07 academic year and at that time a determination of whether the post-tenure review of faculty teaching will be part of the future teaching evaluation process.

## **5. Community Service in Promotion and Tenure**

All faculty members are expected to participate in community service activities. The UIC SPH's commitment to community service is highlighted in Criterion VII. The annual Performance Report completed by faculty provides details related to their community service.

The promotion and tenure process at UIC has increased the emphasis on a faculty member's service component. A promotion and tenure task force revised the promotion and tenure papers considerably ten years ago. The section on service has been expanded and the emphasis at time of review has been increased. Additionally, a section was added to the papers in which a college can present "norms" or "standards" for promotion that are particular for the discipline. SPH emphasizes the importance of community service in this section of the promotion and tenure papers.

## **6. Assessment**

The school has several mechanisms for support of faculty development. Currently faculty are evaluated through the CEQs, the annual performance report (APR), and the advisor surveys. Further, faculty going up for their mid-probationary review or for promotion are required to have peer review of their classroom teaching. Faculty community service is included in the evaluation for promotion. This criterion is met.