

Evaluation Criteria for Faculty Advancement of Tenure-Line and Clinical-Line Faculty

MASTER OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY OF PUGET SOUND

TACOMA, WASHINGTON

Submitted to the Professional Standards Committee November 11, 2021

Approved by the Professional Standards Committee Spring 2022

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
OVERVIEW	2
PROCEDURES	2
EVALUATION CRITERIA	2
TEACHING.....	2
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....	4
ADVISING	5
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE	5

Overview

The Master of Public Health Program is a multidisciplinary program that houses a diverse faculty. The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to tenure-line and clinical-line/on-going faculty members about criteria relevant to evaluation and advancement that are valued and expected, as relevant to our disciplines. Guidance is provided in sections for teaching, professional development, advising, and service. The guidelines are intended to complement the University of Puget Sound Faculty Code, By-Laws, and Faculty Evaluation Procedures & Criteria, and do not replace or supersede information provided in those documents.

Procedures

Procedural information is contained within university-level documents. Faculty members under review or those who are participating in reviews are expected to consult the appropriate document and become thoroughly familiar with information as follows:

Faculty Code:

- The University evaluation standards and criteria at different stages of the faculty member's career
- Timetable for faculty evaluation
- Faculty rights and responsibilities
- Appeal procedures

Professional Standards Committee Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures:

- Deadlines for submitting complete file including colleague letters and summary of deliberations to Dean's office
- Elaboration of University evaluation standards
- Standards for colleague evaluation letters and timing of their submission
- Process and associated deadlines for inclusion of letters from colleagues outside the department
- Pattern and documentation of class visitation for the purpose of observing teaching
- General guidelines for elements to include in the file including specific requirements for student feedback
- Timing of faculty evaluation meetings

Evaluation Criteria

Teaching

The Master of Public Health Program is committed to quality education for its students and to the preparation of students as public health professionals. Curricular goals address the goals of the University of Puget Sound, the needs of the public health profession, and accreditation requirements stated by the Council for Education in Public Health (CEPH). Course content, assignments, and student assessment should reflect these curricular goals. Effective teaching is demonstrated by the clarity, appropriateness, and efficacy of course materials, methods and presentations, and by successful learning outcomes. Contributions to teaching include the development and implementation of new courses and programs; the development of instructional materials, including applications of new technologies; and, field supervision of students. Activities should also align with Faculty as Teachers:

As teachers, faculty encourage the free pursuit of learning in students. They hold before their students the best scholarly standards of personal discipline. They demonstrate respect for the student as an individual, and serve as intellectual guides and counselors. Faculty make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that the evaluation of students reflects each student's academic achievement. Faculty respect the private nature of the relationship between instructor and student, avoid any exploitation of students for private advantage, acknowledge significant assistance from them, and protect their academic freedom. (Faculty Code, Part C, Section 2)

In addition to expectations of the university, programs of public health have faculty instructional effectiveness expectations and reporting specified by CEPH that guide teaching evaluation. The specific expectations from CEPH (Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health & Public Health Programs, 2016):

The school or program ensures that systems, policies and procedures are in place to document that all faculty (full-time and part-time) are current in their areas of instructional responsibility and in pedagogical methods.

The school or program establishes and consistently applies procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance in instruction.

The school or program supports professional development and advancement in instructional effectiveness.

All faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence and effectiveness in teaching, and faculty members should aim for consistent reflection and responsiveness in teaching as part of their career trajectory. The following areas and criteria shall be considered when evaluating teaching, as well as some non-exhaustive examples of how this may be demonstrated to provide guidance to faculty. These examples are not requirements or meant to be restrictive. Faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching in all areas.

Area 1. Subject matter mastery and credibility

- Working knowledge of content area
 - This may be demonstrated through continuing education and/or engagement in the discipline.
- Materials for course are current
 - This may be demonstrated through use of current statistics, literature, or data, as relevant to the course.

Area 2. Outcomes and assessment

- Clear connection between learning objectives and assessment
 - This may be demonstrated through a course map or listing for alignment of objectives and assessments.
- Explicit evaluation criteria utilized
 - This may be demonstrated through rubrics or grading metrics that are clearly presented to students.
- Constructive feedback is provided to students in a timely manner
 - This may be demonstrated through providing specific feedback to students in a supportive and constructive way that allows students to incorporate the feedback into future work in a timely manner.

Area 3. Course preparation and structure

- Explicit instructions and description of course structure is provided
 - This may be demonstrated through a clearly structured syllabus or other relevant ancillary documents.
- Course structure and organization enhances student learning
 - This may be demonstrated through the development of high-quality materials, such as lectures, group work, handouts, rubrics, homework assignments, that are professionally presented and align with the course objectives.

Area 4. Student engagement

- Course facilitates student participation

- This may be demonstrated through the use of a variety of methods of student engagement in the classroom, which may include experiential learning, small group work, presentations, and problem-based learning.
- Course provides opportunities for students to apply course content to the field of public health
 - This may be demonstrated through the use of assignments and materials that demonstrate the connection between course content and public health practice.

Area 5. Communication

- Presents course material and interacts with students in a culturally appropriate manner
 - This may be demonstrated through discussions of sensitive material with tact and respect and through the incorporation of culturally diverse topics in the classroom as appropriate to public health.
- Available to students outside of class hours
 - This may be demonstrated through clear instructions for how to communicate and meet with the course instructor.

Professional Development

Professional development in public health takes many forms. Continued professional development is important to assure that: teaching is informed by recent and evidence-based research, there is engagement with new professional practices, habits of intellectual inquiry are modelled, and contributions are being made to the professional community that advances public health knowledge. Each faculty member may emphasize or focus on different professional growth activities, and the activities in the areas listed in this section are meant to be illustrative and non-exhaustive. Faculty do not need to contribute in all three areas, but clinical-line or on-going faculty must demonstrate proficiency in at least one area and tenure-line faculty must demonstrate proficiency in at least two areas. There is no emphasis placed more highly on any one type of activity within an area, nor is there a view on types of scholarship being more favorable (e.g. quantitative vs. qualitative). The program emphasizes that professional development activities should be based on a cohesive plan and have a clear contribution to public health and scientific communities. Activities should also align with Faculty as Scholars as described in the Faculty Code.

In addition to professional development expectations of the university, programs of public health have faculty scholarship expectations and reporting specified by CEPH that guide professional development evaluation. The specific expectations from CEPH (Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health & Public Health Programs, 2016):

The school or program has policies and practices in place to support faculty involvement in scholarly activities. As many faculty as possible are involved in research and scholarly activity in some form, whether funded or unfunded. Ongoing participation in research and scholarly activity ensures that faculty are relevant and current in their field of expertise, that their work is peer reviewed and that they are content experts.

The types and extent of faculty research align with university and school or program missions and relate to the types of degrees offered. For example, when doctoral degrees are offered, the school or program's research portfolio in those areas take on greater importance. All types of research are valuable, whether conducted with the purpose of improving public health practice or for generating new knowledge.

Faculty integrate research and scholarship with their instructional activities. Research allows faculty to bring real-world examples into the classroom to update and inspire teaching and provides opportunities for students to engage in research activities, if desired or appropriate for the degree program.

There are suggested items that align with each area, but these are non-exhaustive examples of how this may be demonstrated to provide guidance to faculty. These examples are not requirements or meant to be restrictive.

Area 1. Continued or advanced study

- Non peer-reviewed research or scholarship publications (e.g. white papers, policy papers, technical guidance documents)
- Presenting research in university or professional settings
- Mentoring student research (which may have a variety of outputs or may overlap with peer-reviewed research)
- Publishing book reviews

Area 2. Peer-reviewed research

- Publications in peer-reviewed journals
- Authoring or editing peer-reviewed book chapters or books
- Research proposals funded by peer-review

Area 3. Participation in research activities for professional societies or organizations

- Serving as a grant reviewer
- Reviewing manuscripts for journals and presses
- Serving on an editorial board/as an associate editor/editor of a professional journal

Advising

The Master of Public Health Program comprises students enrolled in the MPH degree. The requirements for the MPH degree are largely prescribed by the accreditation standards set by the Council for Education in Public Health, and students have relatively set course trajectories with options only for special topics courses. All academic advising is handled by the Program Director. Career advising is handled formally in specific courses (e.g. Public Health Professionalism and Ethics; Public Health Leadership and Interprofessional Practice) and informally on individual faculty-student basis. All faculty in the program are expected to:

- Participate in the program-level new student orientation
- Be available to students for ad hoc career and professional advising to students in their respective areas of expertise

University and Community Service

Academic and professional service is essential to creating an environment that supports scholarly excellence and meets the internal operational needs of the Program and University. In addition to service on campus, faculty members often contribute to their professions and disciplines through professional and community leadership and service in professional organizations, interdisciplinary activities, and community activities. Activities should also align with Faculty as Colleagues as described in the Faculty Code.

In addition to professional development expectations of the university, programs of public health have faculty service expectations and reporting specified by CEPH that guide service evaluation. The specific expectations from CEPH (Accreditation Criteria for Schools of Public Health & Public Health Programs, 2016):

The school or program defines expectations regarding faculty extramural service activity. Participation in internal university committees is not within the definition of this section. Service as described here refers to contributions of professional expertise to the community, including professional practice. It is

an explicit activity undertaken for the benefit of the greater society, over and beyond what is accomplished through instruction and research.

As many faculty as possible are actively engaged with the community through communication, collaboration, consultation, provision of technical assistance and other means of sharing the school or program's professional knowledge and skills. Faculty engage in service by consulting with public or private organizations on issues relevant to public health; providing testimony or technical support to administrative, legislative and judicial bodies; serving as board members and officers of professional associations; reviewing grant applications; and serving as members of community-based organizations, community advisory boards or other groups. While these activities may generate revenue, the value of faculty service is not measured in financial terms.

Service is of three types: (1) service to the institution; (2) service to the discipline; and (3) service to the external community through community engagement. Faculty members are expected to participate in service to the institution (type 1) and at least one of service to the discipline (type 2) or service to external communities through community engagement (type 3). Service activities may include, but are not limited to the following:

Type 1. Service to the Institution

- Participating in accreditation and program review functions
- Participating in new student recruitment through activities that include admissions review and program information sessions
- Participating in program-level committees
- Participating in university-level committees

Type 2. Service to the Discipline

- Participating as a committee member in a professional organization
- Participating in ad hoc support to a professional organization (e.g. abstract reviewer for conference)
- Appointment or election as an officer in professional organization, board, or committee

Type 3. Service to External Communities through Community Engagement

- Consulting and providing technical assistance to public and private organizations
- Informing general audiences through seminars, conferences, and lectures
- Writing summaries of research, policy analyses, and position papers for the general public and targeted audiences
- Serving as an expert for the press or media
- Providing leadership in or making significant contributions to economic and community development activities