I. Overview
These Guidelines outline policies and procedures related to the granting of academic tenure and promotion within the School of Public Health at The University of Memphis. All candidates for tenure and promotion must meet Divisional, School, University, and Board of Trustees eligibility criteria in effect at the time of application. Tenure is the granting to a faculty member the expectancy of security and a guarantee of the right to academic freedom for the common good in his/her academic appointment. The granting of tenure is contingent upon demonstrated competence and fitness for membership in a collegiate community and at an acceptable level as long as the position is retained. Tenure is not to be viewed as a reward for long service, for loyalty to an institution, or simply as a means by which the services of certain professors may be obtained and/or extended. Rather, the granting of tenure is a certification of competence and trust in present and continued professionalism. It is awarded upon the recommendations of colleagues and administrators, and may be revoked only when stated causes for dismissal have been proven by due process. The acceptance of tenure implies a commitment on the part of the faculty member to academic pursuits and scholarly and professional performance of assigned duties.

Different academic ranks imply different levels of expectation in responsibility and achievement. Recommendation for promotion is an expression by faculty and administration that the applicant's performance in teaching, research, and service is consistent with expectations for the academic rank to which he or she is applying.

II. School History, Mission, and Structure
The University of Memphis received approval from the Board of Trustees to establish a Master of Public Health (MPH) program in August, 2006 and accepted its first students in the Fall of 2007 while housed within the Interdisciplinary Studies Program of the College of Arts and Sciences. Subsequently, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission approved the establishment of a School of Public Health (SPH) at The University of Memphis in November, 2007. The SPH became an independent entity of The University of Memphis in July, 2009.

The SPH is dedicated to excellence in education, research, and outreach to improve public health and promote health equity by generating knowledge and translating research discoveries in our community, our state, and throughout the world. The SPH seeks to create and nurture an environment conducive to interdisciplinary public health initiatives, with special emphasis on vulnerable populations who suffer disproportionately from illness and disability. Objectives include: 1) prepare future leaders in the field of public health by providing the highest quality educational opportunities in theories, approaches, methods, and other substantive issues pertinent to public health; 2) conduct innovative, rigorous, and multi-disciplinary research to prevent disease and injury, promote well-being, and foster overall physical and mental health; 3) stimulate collaboration with the community to develop effective partnerships in combating the health challenges in our communities, city, state, and region; and 4) inform public policy, disseminate health information, and increase awareness of public health concerns through disease surveillance, needs assessments, and program evaluation.
The SPH currently offers two master’s degrees, the Master of Public Health (MPH) and the Master of Health Administration (MHA). Approval from the Board of Trustees and Tennessee Higher Education Commission is being sought to launch PhD programs in Social and Behavioral Sciences, Health Systems and Services Research, and Epidemiology.

The MPH program integrates the academic study of public health theory and practice. It seeks to provide a stimulating academic environment in an urban setting that supports excellence and innovation in education, research, and service to enhance the lives and health of individuals, families, and communities in the Mid-South and beyond. Five concentrations are offered, including Biostatistics, Environmental Health, Epidemiology, Health Systems Management, and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The MHA program is fully accredited by the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education. The MHA program is designed to prepare students for professional administrative practice in a wide variety of healthcare organizations and entities. The MPH will become accredited when the SPH completes its accreditation review by the Council on Education in Public Health.

III. Mutual Obligations of the SPH and Its Faculty

It is recognized that the School and its faculty members have basic obligations to each other. These obligations are necessarily constrained by the availability of institutional resources. It is the responsibility of the Division Director, with review by the Dean, to determine how institutional resources can best be used to support goals of individual faculty members, the SPH, and the University.

The obligations of the School to its faculty members are to:

a. Protect the right of each faculty member to academic freedom; that is, the right to pursue knowledge, to write, and to speak freely as responsible citizens without institutionally imposed, arbitrary restrictions. A faculty member must be judged as a scholar, a teacher, and researcher on the basis of legitimate intellectual and professional criteria and not on his/her political views, religious beliefs, or other matters of personal preference.

b. Provide the intellectual and physical environment as well as appropriate time for scholarly growth and achievement.

c. Provide opportunity for academic advancement according to prescribed criteria and procedures.

d. Provide appropriate compensation for the services of its faculty members over specific periods of employment.

The obligations of faculty members of the School are to:

a. Carry out duly assigned academic duties that represent an appropriate share of their division’s total academic responsibilities.

b. Teach with the highest levels of professional competence and with intellectual and ethical honesty.

c. Develop and improve their professional abilities and achievements in teaching, scholarship, research, and other aspects of their academic responsibilities.

d. Participate in advisory and committee assignments necessary to develop and sustain academic programs, advise students, and support the governance of the Division, School, and University.

1 Adapted from Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Policies and Procedures Memorandum Faculty-1 (www.jhsphs.edu/schoolpolicies/ppm_faculty_1.html).
e. Share one’s professional expertise in advisory or leadership capacities for the betterment of one’s academic discipline, the local community, and society at large.

IV. Mentorship of pre-tenure faculty
The Division Director will solicit a tenured faculty member to serve as a faculty mentor for tenure-track assistant professors. With the mutual agreement of the assistant professor and the faculty member, the mentor will regularly meet with the tenure-track assistant professor to advise them about tenure and promotion criteria and procedures. The assigned mentor may be changed at the request of either the mentee or mentor, with the permission of the Division Director. New SPH faculty entering at the level of Associate or Full Professor will be assigned a faculty “host” who will serve as a resource to help them acclimate to the SPH and University.

V. General criteria for tenure and promotion
It is crucial to the academic well-being of the SPH and The University of Memphis that high standards for tenure and promotion be maintained. The candidate’s particular knowledge and skills should be identified as relevant to the SPH’s fundamental academic responsibilities and goals. Major criteria for tenure and promotion are creative scholarship, research, teaching, and professional/university service, as follows:

a. Creative scholarship, defined as the substantive contribution of new knowledge, is a primary consideration for academic advancement. Scholarship shall involve public health-related research, practice, education, or any combination thereof. New knowledge can be useful and can influence the thought or work of others only if it is communicated or demonstrated in a form that can be passed on to peers in a given field of study, particularly in written form. While the quantity of a candidate’s publications or other scholarly products is a consideration in tenure and promotion decision, a given number of products is not by itself sufficient; the essence of creative scholarship is significance and quality as assessed by peer judgment.

Faculty in the School of Public Health are expected to maintain ongoing programs of research appropriate to their discipline within public health, including biostatistics; epidemiology; environmental health; health systems and services research; health administration; and social and behavioral sciences. Disciplinary research encompasses the processes of inquiry, integration, application, and teaching scholarship. The ideal candidate for tenure and promotion generates multiple types of scholarship, including:

Inquiry: This scholarship involves rigorous investigation aimed at the discovery of new knowledge within public health, in its broadest sense. Evidence of inquiry includes scholarly publications, funded research, and presentations at professional meetings.

Integration: The scholarship of integration makes meaningful connections between previously unrelated topics, facts, or observations, such as cross-disciplinary synthesis, an integrative framework, or methodological advances within a discipline. Integrative work is typically expected to result in scholarly publication or presentation.

Application: The scholarship of application applies intellectual expertise to help solve practical, public health-related problems. As an urban research university, a vital component of The University of Memphis’ mission is to generate scholarship that addresses the concerns of our metropolitan, state, and national communities. Such engaged scholarship (1) involves academic projects that engage faculty members and students in a sustained manner with community groups; (2) connects university outreach with community organizational goals; (3)
furthers productive relationships between the university and the community; and (4) results in need-inspired basic and applied research.

Faculty members typically work with community organizations, public health agencies, and lawmakers to apply their expertise to pressing problems and to build public health-related capacity. This engaged scholarship may result in peer reviewed publications, peer-reviewed collaborative reports, and external funding. In addition, products may include such materials as program evaluations, community-based participatory research program documents, content-based seminars and workshops, provision of technical assistance to organizations or policymakers, and process-focused interventions, which may not always involve a peer-reviewed publication but would often lead to a written product.

Often, application research is more difficult to assess than more traditional scholarship that can be measured relatively more straightforwardly by the number of and quality of peer-reviewed products, such as journal articles. However, a similar level of critique can be applied to the scholarship of application as measured by impact on the agency and/or community, scope of the project, originality of design and methodology, generalizability of the results, connection to a broader literature and/or theoretical frame, visibility gained for the researcher, School, and University through the dissemination process, significance of the work to the discipline, and peer review processes. The burden of responsibility is placed on the candidate to present documentation that supports such assessments.

**Teaching Scholarship**: This scholarship focuses on transforming and extending knowledge about pedagogy, including appropriate textbooks, educational articles, and presentations about public health education. The scholarship of teaching is not equivalent to teaching. Conversely, classroom teaching and staying current in the discipline are not relevant criteria for teaching scholarship. Evidence of teaching scholarship includes professional publications, funded research, and presentations at professional meetings. Other products of teaching scholarship also may be submitted for consideration, such as novel instructional technologies.

b. **Teaching effectiveness** is also an important criterion. Teaching encompasses classroom instruction, independent study direction, development of courses, concentrations, and programs, and mentoring students in research and academic projects such as internship experiences. Effectiveness in teaching requires having an objective, current, accurate, and balanced command of the field being taught, the ability to communicate one's knowledge, and the willingness to interact and exchange views with students at the highest levels of intellectual integrity. Effectiveness in teaching also is evidenced by the fostering of intellectual stimulation and inspiration. Neither tenure nor promotion will receive favorable consideration in the absence of clear, convincing, and continuing evidence of an acceptable level of effective teaching.

Since evaluation of teaching is a qualitative process, multiple sources of evidence will be employed. The candidate should organize, record, and exhibit evidence of his/her teaching efforts in such a manner that colleagues are able to assess his/her insights and achievements in instruction. Included should be a self-assessment of the candidate’s command of the subject matter, ability to organize and present material in a logical, thoughtful, and meaningful manner, and the performance of students. Student evaluations are an integral part of documenting teaching effectiveness. The assessment instruments used to document student perceptions of teaching effectiveness must be University approved, such as SETE and SIRS.
Additionally, candidates also can provide evidence of a record of teaching effectiveness through documentation of teaching awards received; course designs disseminated to others in the field; updated syllabi; class products and capstone reports; use of electronic innovations or other creative use of software or audiovisual materials; written critiques from peer evaluators or former students; and activities related to continuing education, including short courses, workshops, symposia, and professional development seminars. Evidence that demonstrates the candidate’s ability to foster student learning, creativity, and competence as a professional is especially helpful to the assessment process. Each candidate is encouraged to supply any additional data which he or she deems appropriate as evidence of teaching effectiveness and, if applicable, may include supporting documentation about the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at other institutions.

c. Service to the profession and university is the third major criterion for tenure and promotion. The candidate is expected to demonstrate excellence in discharging professional service responsibilities in the community, at various levels of government, to professional organizations, and to the global community. The candidate’s competence and integrity, national and international reputation as a consultant and advisor, election to relevant professional societies, and appointment to professional service committees constitute important criteria for promotion. In addition, the candidate is expected to provide service and leadership to the Division, School, and University, in administrative and advisory roles.

Three formal processes are used by the School of Public Health to make tenure and promotion decisions. As described in Sections VI, VII, and VIII, these processes include annual reviews/evaluations, mid-tenure review, and final tenure and promotion review.

VI. Annual Review/Evaluation
The Division Director evaluates all faculty members annually and the results are used for decisions relating to tenure and promotion. The review will consider performance in all areas outlined on the Faculty Evaluation and Planning document including teaching, advising/mentoring, scholarship/creative activities, external support, outreach, and service. The review should assess the faculty member’s accomplishments during the prior calendar year and establish a plan of activities for the forthcoming year, or longer if appropriate. Copies of the annual reviews will be included in the tenure/promotion dossier. Correction of any weaknesses cited in an annual review will be documented in the faculty member’s personnel file.

The review process begins with the submission of an updated curriculum vitae. Faculty members will append supportive documentation as well as a thoughtful summary that documents both their accomplishments and forthcoming plans. The performance summary should include an explanation of how these activities support the Division, School and University missions. The Division Director will provide explicit feedback to each tenure-track faculty member regarding progress toward tenure and promotion. This will include comments on teaching, research, and service. Faculty members may formally respond to any aspect of the evaluation by commenting on their Evaluation and Planning form before signing and returning the form to the Division Director. The Division Director’s signature on the planning report indicates approval of the faculty member’s plan. The Division Director then submits the report to the Dean.

Full-time faculty members receive one-year, renewable contracts during the probationary period. The Division Director will recommend regular renewal of these contracts unless performance in teaching, research, or service is unsatisfactory. Procedures related to non-renewal of contracts will be consistent with the policies and procedures described in the faculty
As faculty members begin the final year of a probationary period, they must make application for tenure. If they have not already attained the rank of associate professor, they will also be considered for promotion. Exceptions to the minimum probationary period are discussed in the faculty handbook. Faculty members who have not been promoted to associate professor and approved for tenure will not have their contracts renewed at the end of the probationary period. However, they will be rehired for the following year on a one-year, nonrenewable contract.

VII. Mid-tenure Review
The SPH will conduct a major midterm evaluation of untenured faculty in tenure-track positions. The purpose of this review is to provide faculty members with information about the status of their progress toward tenure and promotion. This evaluation will be held in the Spring semester of the faculty member’s third year unless the faculty member negotiates a different arrangement with the Division Director and Dean (see Section XII, Stopping the Tenure Clock). The SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee will conduct the mid-tenure evaluation. Regulations regarding the composition and functioning of the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee are detailed below in Section XI, Composition and Functioning of the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The faculty member will present documentation of his/her contributions and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with Divisional, School, and University guidelines. Documentation, at a minimum, should include the faculty member’s curriculum vitae; products such as course syllabi and materials; student evaluations; copies of published works; and, written reviews and evaluations by qualified peers of unpublished or ongoing research/outreach efforts and service activities. Although the midterm evaluation mirrors the promotion/tenure process, external peer review, at this stage, is at the candidate’s discretion. If the candidate chooses to solicit a review by evaluators with expertise in the candidate’s areas of study, the candidate will choose no more than two external reviewers.

The SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee will review these documents and prepare a written review. The Chair of the T&P Committee and the candidate’s Division Director will hold a feedback meeting with the faculty member under review. The session should serve as a dialogue between the faculty member, Division Director, and T&P Chair about the faculty member’s career goals, clarification of expectations, development of realistic plans to improve any areas of concern, and generation of suggestions about the tenure and promotion dossier to highlight achievements. The faculty member under review may write a statement in response to the reports to correct inaccuracies and/or clarify concerns. Once the feedback session is completed, the Chair of the T&P Committee will forward to the Dean the faculty member’s dossier and annual performance reviews, the written review, and the faculty member’s written response.

VIII. Criteria for Tenure or Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
It is University policy that promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires a terminal degree appropriate to the discipline and evidence of research productivity, teaching effectiveness, and professional and institutional service. The University believes that the high status of tenure can only be merited by colleagues whose accomplishments fulfill, at a minimum, the requirements for the rank of Associate Professor. As such, for those at the rank of Assistant Professor, the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee will recommend either tenure and promotion to Associate Professorship, or neither. Importantly, individuals considered at this rank have demonstrated potential for eventual promotion to Professor. Promotion and tenure, when granted, will normally take effect at the beginning of the seventh year of appointment.
A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or an Associate Professor being considered for tenure is expected to meet the following criteria:

a. **Length of service**: At the time of application, candidates are expected to have completed at least five-years time in rank at the level of Assistant Professor, unless otherwise prescribed in writing and approved by the Dean and Provost.

b. **Appropriate degree**: The candidates must possess the appropriate terminal degree from an accredited institution in his/her instructional discipline or related area.

c. **Teaching**: The candidate must demonstrate that he/she is an effective teacher and is likely to remain so throughout his/her career. Student evaluations will be an integral part of documenting teaching effectiveness. Candidates for tenure and promotion at the level of Associate Professor must include students' assessments from all classes taught during the probationary period in the dossier. Other appropriate documentation to document teaching effectiveness is detailed in Section V (General Criteria for Tenure and Promotion).

d. **Research/Scholarship**: Candidates must provide evidence of at least regional recognition through seminal publications and/or research reports and participation in professional meetings at the regional, national, or international level. There must be evidence of sustained productivity of high quality scholarship. The candidate is expected to have a consistent record of publication since his or her appointment at The University of Memphis, such as peer-reviewed articles, referred book chapters, monographs, edited books or journals, books, or other equivalent forms of independent scholarship, with at least a portion of these publications as first- or senior-author. Publications designed as “In press” will be accepted if accompanied by written confirmation from the editor or publisher. It will be the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate such equivalence and the seminal nature of the publications submitted for consideration. Candidates may present a case to substitute alternate scholarly work but will have to support the case that the product is especially significant, such as having a major impact or originality, to warrant such a substitution. The candidate also must demonstrate strong potential for future professional growth and development and sustained scholarly productivity throughout his/her career.

**Service**: Candidates must provide evidence of service at the Divisional, School, and University levels. Because the SPH has a special role in the broader community beyond the University, candidates must provide evidence of participation in professional service and practice activities to the community and/or profession.

**IX. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

Individuals considered for promotion from associate to full professor should clearly be leading scholars and educators whose national and international stature can serve as a standard for professional achievement. The body of the candidate's work should reflect a discernable pattern of intellectual development and growth and indicate that this high level of scholarly productivity will be sustained.

A candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to meet the following criteria:

a. **Length of service**: At the time of application, candidates are expected to have completed 10 years of professional experience in the instructional discipline or a related area, unless otherwise prescribed in writing and approved by the Dean and Provost.
b. **Appropriate degree:** Candidates must possess the appropriate terminal degree from an accredited institution in his/her instructional discipline or related area.

c. **Teaching:** Candidates must demonstrate that he/she is an effective teacher and is likely to remain so throughout his/her career. Student evaluations will be an integral part of documenting teaching effectiveness. Other appropriate documentation to document teaching effectiveness is detailed in Section V (General Criteria for Tenure and Promotion).

d. **Research/Scholarship:** Candidates must provide evidence of national and/or international recognition through seminal publications and/or research reports and participation in professional meetings at the national or international level. There must be evidence of sustained productivity of high quality scholarship. The candidate is expected to have a consistent record of publication since his or her appointment at The University of Memphis, such as peer-reviewed articles, referred book chapters, monographs, edited books or journals, books, or other equivalent forms of independent scholarship, with at least a portion of these publications as first- or senior-author. It will be the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate such equivalence and the seminal nature of the publications submitted for consideration. Candidates may present a case to substitute alternate scholarly work but will have to support the case that the product is especially significant, such as having a major impact or originality, to warrant such a substitution. The candidate also must demonstrate strong potential for future professional growth and development and sustained scholarly productivity throughout his/her career.

**Service:** Candidates must provide evidence of service and leadership at the Divisional, School, and University levels. Because the SPH has a special role in the broader community beyond the University, candidates must provide evidence of participation and leadership in professional service and practice activities to the community and in the profession. Examples include invited participation on regional and national advisory boards, committee leadership, journal editorial positions, leadership positions in professional organizations, or service as a grant reviewer for national agencies and foundations.

**X. Application Process**

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should not only be familiar with the School's guidelines, but also with the University's tenure and promotion policies described in the Faculty Handbook ([www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2008FHB_TOC.htm](http://www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2008FHB_TOC.htm)).

The candidate should notify the Division Director of the intent to apply for tenure and/or promotion no later than **May 1**. Such early notification will assure that review procedures are initiated in a timely fashion. The application letter should be concise yet present the rationale to support the requested change. The candidate applying for tenure and/or promotion will provide adequate evidence that he or she meets the criteria for tenure and/or promotion.

The candidate should compile **two copies** of his/her dossier, both conforming to University standards, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook and also in this section, below. The first copy should be a complete version of the dossier, containing examples of scholarly and/or creative activities. The second copy, to be forwarded to the Provost's Office, should contain all material in the complete dossier, with the exception that examples of scholarly and/or creative activities are excluded. Materials in the dossiers do not have to be numbered by page; however, they should be assembled in the order as specified below.
The list of suggested materials, below, represents only the minimum documentation requirements; the candidate will assemble all documents that he/she believes strengthens and supports the application. The candidate is advised to give careful thought to assembling and organizing the documents since it is the dossier that will represent the candidate’s accomplishments and potential throughout the many levels of the evaluation process. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice from the Division Director and colleagues, especially those who have served on tenure and promotion committees, on what to include or how to organize the materials. The University also may offer tenure and promotion workshops that might prove helpful to the candidate. However, the responsibility for the quality of the dossier rests with the candidate.

Following University guidelines, the candidate should assemble his/her dossier materials in a three-ring notebook that is organized in the following manner:
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Tab I. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
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Appointment History

Tab II. SCHOOL RECOMMENDATION
Statement from the Dean
Statement from the School Committee

Tab III. DIVISIONAL RECOMMENDATION
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Tab IV. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS
Copy of Solicitation Letter to External Evaluators
Summary of Credentials of External Evaluators
External Peer Evaluations

Tab V. INTERNAL EVALUATIONS
Initial Appointment Letter
Annual Evaluations
Mid-term Evaluation by Division and any candidate response
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Summary of Teaching Responsibilities/Philosophy (normally two to three pages)
Summary of Student Evaluations
Peer Evaluation(s) of Teaching
Honors and Awards

Tab VII. Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
Brief Summary of Accomplishments and Plans (normally two to three pages)
Internal Grants and Contracts
External Grants and Contracts
Peer Evaluation(s) of Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
Honors and Awards

Tab VIII. SERVICE/OUTREACH/ADVISING/MENTORING/ADMINISTRATION
Brief Summary of Responsibilities and Accomplishments
Internal Grants and Contracts
External Grants and Contracts
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The candidate submits the two copies of the dossier to the Division Director, who will review and forward them to the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee. Once a candidate’s dossier has been submitted to the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee for evaluation, nothing may be added or removed from it by anyone.

In conducting its evaluation, the Committee will use the materials submitted by the candidate and will seek comments on the candidate’s qualifications from academic and professional peers, and if applicable, recognized practitioners knowledgeable in the candidate’s area of applied research. A minimum of four (4) evaluators who are recognized for their expertise in the candidate’s areas of study and who are outside The University of Memphis will be asked to comment on the curriculum vitae, and, as appropriate, evidence of professional work of the candidate. More than four external reviewers may be solicited at the discretion of the Division Director and/or the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee. The external reviewers will be informed that their letters, under Tennessee law, are subject to the Open Review Law and therefore are not confidential. All external review letters received will be included in the candidate’s package. The candidate will not have access to the letters until the process is completed.

Only one of the external reviewers may have had a connection with the candidate as a major advisor or collaborator. The four external reviewers will be chosen from the list developed by the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee. The candidate is encouraged to submit a list of potential reviewers to the Committee for consideration. No more than two of the reviewers, however, should be selected from the candidate’s list. The Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair and Division Director will make a final determination regarding the reviewers. As part of the dossier, the candidate may comment on the list of reviewers.

Since all four of the peer evaluations must be incorporated in a dossier, the Committee Chair will need to solicit reviewers early in the process and monitor their responsiveness to the calendar requirements. The Committee Chair will include in his/her report the rationale for the choice of the external reviewers. The reviewer’s curriculum vitae may be included for this purpose.

XI. Composition and Functioning of the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee
The School of Public Health Tenure and Promotion Committee will consist of all tenured full-time faculty within the School, except for the Dean and the Director of the Division (Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Environmental Sciences, Health Research Services, and Social and Behavioral Sciences) of which the candidate is a member. The Dean and the candidate’s Division Director will provide independent assessments of the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. Only faculty with a rank equal to or higher than that to which the candidate aspires will serve on the committee and vote on the application. A faculty member who is the spouse of the candidate may not vote on the application.

When there are fewer than three qualified voting SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee faculty members with expertise in the candidate’s discipline (Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Environmental
Sciences, Health Research Services, or Social and Behavioral Sciences), the Dean, in consultation with the candidate and the candidate’s Division Director, will invite faculty members from other units who have research and teaching expertise consistent with the public health discipline, to serve as ad hoc voting members of the committee. Ad hoc committee members from outside the SPH must: 1) be full-time faculty with a rank equal to or higher than that to which the candidate aspires, 2) conduct scholarship and/or teaching in a disciplinary area similar to that of the candidate, and 3) be from other units best positioned to evaluate the candidate.

Both the candidate and SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee will submit a list of potential outside members to the candidate’s Division Director. The final membership list will be developed by the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee and Division Director. The Division Director will include in his/her report to the Dean the rationale for the choice of committee members outside the division. The outside members’ curriculum vitae may be included for this purpose. Even when the requisite number of tenured faculty is available, the Division Director, in consultation with the candidate and the tenured faculty of the SPH, may appoint additional members to the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The Dean will appoint the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for no less than one academic year. The chairperson’s responsibilities will include: presiding over meetings of the Committee; tallying the secret ballots submitted by Committee members during the tenure and promotion deliberation; preparing the formal recommendation report with its rationale; and, submitting the Committee’s report and candidate’s materials to the Division Director in accordance with the School calendar.

A quorum, consisting of two-thirds of the members and no fewer than three members, must be present for the Committee to convene and deliberate. The vote is taken and counted after the deliberations of each respective candidate; the Committee Chairperson will call for the vote. To vote on tenure and promotion, a member of the Committee must have examined the candidate’s dossier and taken part in the Committee’s discussion of that candidate. When a SPH faculty member serves on the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, he or she votes at the School level.

Faculty members on leave for the Fall semester may participate in the voting process only if they have had the opportunity to fully evaluate the candidate’s dossier and are present for the committee meetings. Members of the committee who are candidates for promotion will absent themselves from the discussions and votes regarding their own candidacy.

The written report of the Committee will be drafted by the Chairperson and reviewed and approved by all committee members. Any member of the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee may submit a minority statement on any candidate. The minority report shall include sufficient information explaining the opposing vote so that reviewers at the next levels can better understand the opposing evaluations. All statements will be appended to the candidate’s dossier and forwarded to the Division Director. The SPH Committee’s report will include, at a minimum, information pertaining to the nature and quality of the candidate’s scholarly activity, his/her potential for continuing scholarly growth and development, and a statement regarding the candidate’s impact upon the mission of the Division, School, and University. The assessment of scholarly activity should address the nature and scope of the outlets where the candidate’s productions have appeared, including such features as refereed or non-refereed; invited or submitted; local, regional, national or international; disciplinary, interdisciplinary; and, type of format, public forum, written report, formal presentation, and so on.
The candidate’s Division Director will conduct an independent evaluation of the candidate and prepare a written recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. In this report, the Division Director will assess the nature and quality of the candidate’s scholarly growth and development, potential, and the candidate’s impact on the mission of the Division, School, and University. The Director will forward the candidate’s materials and the respective recommendations to the Dean. The Dean will independently review the candidate’s package and recommendations from the Division Director and SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee, and will make a recommendation to the Provost. Note: If the Division Director is being considered for tenure and/or promotion, the recommendation of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will go directly to the Dean. The Division Director will notify applicants of progress-to-date during this review process.

XII. Procedures to stop the tenure clock
The School of Public Health adheres to University guidelines in decisions about extending a faculty member’s probationary period, as described in the Faculty Handbook (www.memphis.edu/facultyhandbook/2008FHB_TOC.htm) and summarized here:

A faculty member in a tenure-track appointment may request an extension of the probationary period when circumstances exist which interrupt the faculty member's normal progress toward building a case for tenure. In such cases, the faculty member must submit a request for a one-year extension that demonstrates that circumstances reasonably warrant extension. Reasons for extension will typically be related to a personal or family situation requiring attention and commitment that consumes the time and energy normally allocated to faculty duties and professional development. Examples may include, but are not limited to, childbirth or adoption, care of dependents, medical conditions or obligation, physical disasters or disruptions, or similar circumstances which require a fundamental alteration of one's professional life. In all cases, the intent of this policy is to serve the best interests of the University while providing neither preference nor adverse effect to a faculty member's process of developing a case for tenure.

Faculty seeking an extension of the probationary period must submit a request, in writing, which addresses the policy considerations described above. This request must be submitted by the date established by the Provost for the commencement of annual tenure review. The request is to be submitted to the Division Director for consideration and recommendation. The Division Director’s recommendation is forwarded to the Dean for consideration and recommendation; then to the Provost for consideration and recommendation; and finally to the President for approval or denial. The President will notify the faculty member, in writing, of the decision to approve or deny the request for extension within one month of submission. Requests for extensions of the probationary period based on a faculty member's health or care for an immediate family member should also be submitted to the Office of Legal Counsel for review. If approved, extensions of the probationary period are granted for one year. One additional extension of one year may be granted for a maximum of two years of total extension. The requests for an additional extension follow the same procedure and are subject to the same consideration as the original extension. A leave of absence will not be granted retroactively.

XIII. Modification of T & P Guidelines
On a regular basis, faculty will review the tenure and promotion guidelines to determine if modifications are necessary. A SPH faculty member can raise issues and call for revisions of the guidelines at any time. All faculty members will participate in the discussions of revisions but only tenured faculty will vote on final modifications to the guidelines. Adoption of the
amendments will reflect the discussions, and the guidelines will reflect the date the guidelines are formally revised.

XIV. Flowchart of Procedures and General Schedule

The SPH will outline the various due dates to which the candidate and University officials will adhere. For general information about the procedural steps and assignment of responsibilities to be followed in the School and Division, refer to the outline included in the flowcharts below.

The following hierarchy of decision-making will be followed in the tenure and promotion review process:

i. The SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee will review a candidate’s dossier and forward a recommendation to the Dean.

ii. The Division Director will review a candidate’s file and forward a recommendation to the Dean.

iii. The Dean will review the candidate’s file and recommendations of both the SPH Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Division Director and will forward a recommendation to the Provost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Notify Division Director of Intent to apply for Tenure and/or Promotion</td>
<td>May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Division Director</td>
<td>Notify faculty to form SPH T&amp;P committee and elect a chair; If insufficient size, identify additional committee members (in consultation with candidate and T&amp;P Committee)</td>
<td>Late Spring Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Candidate; SPH T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>Independently develop a list of potential external reviewers</td>
<td>Late Spring Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Division Director</td>
<td>In consultation with T&amp;P Committee, finalize list of reviewers and solicit their agreement to review the candidate’s materials</td>
<td>May 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Develop packet of research materials and vitae to submit to external reviewers</td>
<td>May 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chair, T and P Committee</td>
<td>Send letter, candidate’s materials, and SPH T&amp;P Guidelines to reviewers (follow School Calendar for due date of the reviewers’ recommendations)</td>
<td>June 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Dossier (following University,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>School, and Division [if appropriate] guidelines and calendar; submit to Division Director</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chair, T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>Collect all materials (Candidate’s Dossier, External Review Letters and Vitae, and Director Letter); Submit to School T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chair, T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>Schedule and lead School T&amp;P Committee review meetings; draft committee recommendation for member review; finalize; submit Committee Recommendation with all materials to the Dean.</td>
<td>September/October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Independently review candidate’s dossier and reviews and provide recommendation; provide rationale for selection of external reviewers (and outside members of the School T&amp;P committee, if applicable); Submit to the Provost.</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following chart lists steps to be taken for the mid-tenure review process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chair of SPH T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>Send memo to eligible faculty with instructions and guidelines for review</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate submits dossier to T&amp;P chair</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chair of SPH T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>T&amp;P chair submits dossier with instructions and assessment form to T&amp;P committee members</td>
<td>February 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T&amp;P Committee</td>
<td>T&amp;P Committee meets and evaluates progress of candidate towards tenure</td>
<td>Late February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T&amp;P Chair</td>
<td>Chair prepares written report of evaluation and submits report to Dean</td>
<td>March 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T&amp;P Chair, Division Director, and Dean</td>
<td>The T&amp;P Chair, Division Director, and Dean meet with candidate to discuss evaluation and make recommendations for any needed changes</td>
<td>End of March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Candidate</td>
<td>Candidate writes statement in response to report from T &amp; P Committee</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>