This document describes the College of Nursing Criteria for Promotion and Tenure. These criteria are based upon the University of Iowa Operations Manual (statements in italics). In addition, criteria by rank are provided and considerations are offered for peer group guidance in decision-making. Performance in each area is evaluated in light of respective percentage of effort allocations.

**Overview of Promotions Criteria** taken from the UI Operations Manual III.10.2 as Edited for the College of Nursing.

The criteria for promotions include teaching, research, and other professional contributions. Since teaching and research are the central functions of the faculty, other professional contributions are considered subsidiary to these fundamental tasks. The length of service, whether long or short, does not constitute, of itself, a qualification for promotion nor the sole justification for the denial of same.

a. **Teaching.** The prime requisites for an effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, and independence; a willingness to consider suggestions and to cooperate in teaching activities; a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads to the development and strengthening of course content in the light of developments in the area of interest, as well as to improve methods of presenting material; a vital interest in teaching and working with students and, above all, the ability to stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm. The quality of teaching is admittedly difficult to evaluate. This evaluation is so important, however, that recommendations for promotion should include evidence drawn from such sources as the collective judgment of students, of student counselors and of colleagues who have visited the individual classes or who have been closely associated with the person’s teaching as supervisor or in some
other capacity, or who have taught the same students in subsequent courses. Academic counseling or advising of students should be recognized as an important component of the teaching process, and due credit should be given to faculty members who exert an unusual effort in this function.

b. Research. In most of the fields represented in the programs of the University, publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction. Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity. The candidate should pursue a definite, continuing program of studies, investigations or creative works.

c. Other professional contributions. From time to time, a faculty member is called upon to render major professional services to the University or to society in general. Such contributions should be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University and its effect on the development of the individual.

Qualifications Per Faculty Rank. UI Operations Manual III.10.4

Each academic unit is expected to develop detailed tenure and promotion criteria consistent with the following qualifications. If the pattern and practice in some units deviates markedly from these norms, such units may seek approval of the Executive Vice President and Provost for alternate criteria.

a. Assistant Professor.
   1) Promise of ability as a teacher.

   2) Holder of the doctorate or its equivalent.

   3) Promise of scholarly productivity, supported by publications or the equivalent.

b. Associate Professor
   1) Convincing evidence that the candidate is an effective teacher of, as appropriate, undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral, and professional students.
2) Demonstration of scholarly achievement supported by substantial publications of high quality, as appropriate to the discipline(s).

3) Departmental, collegiate, and/or University service and, if appropriate, professional service will be expected at an appropriate level.

4) The quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly/artistic accomplishment, and service should give unmistakable promise of promotion to full professor.

c. Professor.

1) Consistent record of high-quality teaching at all appropriate instructional levels, including successful guidance of doctoral graduate students to the completion of their degree programs, where applicable.

2) Continued scholarly achievement of high quality, accompanied by unmistakable evidence that the candidate is a nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholar in the chosen field.

3) The candidate should have a record of significant and effective service to the department, college, and/or the University and, if appropriate, to the profession.

Overview of Reappointment and Tenure Review (UI Operations Manual III. 10. 1. a. 4)

Promotion and Tenure review is one part of a review process conducted annually for probationary faculty. Evidence from annual probationary reviews and the three year review will be helpful to the peer group, as noted in the following discussion.

Reappointment Review. UI Operations Manual III.10.1.a. 4.h
Annual reviews of the performance of probationary faculty members should be made and a full-scale departmental-collegiate review shall be made during the reappointment review conducted in the third or fourth year of service, depending upon the collegiate norm.
Reappointment reviews should take into account the faculty member's proven teaching effectiveness and research productivity and potential.

Tenure Review. Operations Manual III.10.1 a.4.i
The criteria for promotions include teaching, research, and other professional contributions. Since teaching and research are the central functions of the faculty, other professional contributions are considered subsidiary to these fundamental tasks.

The first step in a tenure decision should be an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Only after an affirmative judgment as to teaching effectiveness is made should serious consideration be given to an evaluation of research competence. Unless a determination is made that the faculty member involved is an effective teacher, tenure is not and should not be granted. Only after an affirmative decision as to teaching effectiveness is made should consideration be given to research. And only after both of the basic criteria are satisfied is an affirmative tenure decision possible. The University is committed to the proposition that neither teaching nor research standing alone justifies the granting of tenure. In the absence of research, it is believed -- and strongly believed -- that teaching effectiveness will not be maintained for a lifetime career. Thus, while teaching effectiveness is the condition precedent to a consideration of the quality of research, in the absence of quality research, teaching effectiveness alone will not permit the granting of tenure.

In summary, The University of Iowa is both a teaching and research institution, as all good universities are. Unless both tasks are accomplished, the University's vitality will be sapped and neither function will be performed well. As noted, the two functions cannot be separated. Unless a faculty member is able and willing to permit her or his ideas to be evaluated by peers, the faculty member is not performing fully the function assigned, and effective teaching is unlikely to continue.
Teaching Criteria

Faculty activities that constitute teaching are delineated in the University of Iowa Operations manual. These activities are followed by sources of evidence that are used to evaluate teaching effectiveness in the College of Nursing. Guidance for Peer Groups in interpreting/evaluating the evidence is also provided.

Faculty members teach a wide variety and types of courses at the University. Teaching of courses includes the preparation of course syllabi, classroom materials, class lectures, and discussion topics, and student assignments such as papers and projects. Faculty also prepare and administer examinations, evaluate student work, train and supervise the work of teaching assistants, continuously read in their field to include up-to-date material and information in their classes, and meet their students outside of class to advise, help, and guide them in their course work. Teaching also includes the mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research settings.

Other important teaching efforts include faculty initiatives to improve instruction through the design and revision of the curriculum, the creation of new courses, the revision of existing courses, and supervision of the creative work and research of students.

Sources of Evidence:
Primary sources of evidence for teaching effectiveness include:

1) Student evaluations for all courses [both numerical and open-ended comments].

2) Peer observations of teaching using Collegiate approved rubrics.

3) Annual Administrative evaluations of teaching.
4) Teaching portfolio [including syllabus].

5) Successful mentoring of student research and scholarship (e.g., DNP capstone projects).

Additional evidence for teaching effectiveness include:

6) Contributions to design and revision of the curriculum.

7) Teaching awards.

8) Professional development in teaching, such as teaching given through workshops or seminars.

9) Book or book chapters that are primarily a review of extant literature.

Peer Group Guidance for Evaluating Evidence

Student perceptions are an important consideration in the evaluation of teaching. Student evaluations provide these perceptions. When interpreting student evaluations, factors likely to affect student evaluations for specific courses should be taken into account. For example, student evaluations tend to be less favorable for required courses as opposed to elective courses. Student evaluations also tend to be less favorable for larger courses as opposed to smaller classes.

The College of Nursing files all student evaluations and provides anonymous Collegiate norms for scrutiny in the evaluation of teaching. When possible, evaluations of a faculty member teaching a course should be compared to evaluations of other College faculty members for the same course, taught at different times. The evaluations of the candidate for promotion will be compared with the evaluations of faculty members at or above the rank to which promotion is being considered. Evaluation scores of the candidate should be approximately equivalent to those of higher rank. Evaluation scores are expected to be consistently excellent or show a record of improvement over time.
Mentoring expectations for members of the faculty vary according to rank. That is, candidates for promotion from assistant to associate professor are expected to devote less effort to mentoring student research than faculty members with tenure. Thus, establishing a research agenda in the first few years is more important for junior faculty than advising doctoral dissertations. Faculty at the rank of assistant professor, however, should contribute to mentoring student research to the extent appropriate. For example, assistant professors may serve as mentors as a member of a student’s dissertation committee or they may serve as mentors through research mentoring of students, such as young scientists or honors students, as part of an experience in a student preceptorship or practicum experience.

Candidates for promotion from associate professor to professor are expected to demonstrate success as a mentor of student research where adequate enrollments permit. Additional examples of student mentorship include advising doctoral dissertations, mentoring successful student grant applications, such as an NIH F31 or external pilot funds, advising students for presentations and publications, and mentoring post-doctoral fellows and career development awards.

Research/ Scholarship Criteria

The Research/Scholarship Criteria from the University of Iowa Operations manual are provided followed by sources of evidence.

*Research*. In most of the fields represented in the programs of the University, *publications in media of quality are expected as evidence of scholarly interest pursued independently of supervision or direction*. Quality of production is considered more important than mere quantity. The candidate should pursue a definite, continuing program of studies, investigations or creative works.

Sources of Evidence
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Primary:

1) Peer reviewed data-based articles in high quality journals that advance the science.

2) Sustained pattern of substantial funding for scholarship, appropriate to rank.

Secondary:

3) Refereed conference presentations/posters.

4) Articles in conference proceedings.

5) Application and translation of scholarship.

6) Other modes of scholarship dissemination.

Considerations for Peer Group Guidance

_Evaluation of books and book chapters_ poses unique questions. Books and book chapters are not included as evidence because books in nursing generally are textbooks and do not extend beyond synthesis of existing literature. The University Operations Manual identifies textbooks as contributions to teaching [for Tenure Track Faculty]. However, books that contribute new knowledge, methods, or theories could be considered as evidence of scholarship. Textbooks and chapters are considered as professional productivity for Clinical Track faculty only.

_Evaluation of the scholarship_ includes criteria of quality and productivity. Evidence must be presented to demonstrate high quality, independence [from supervision/direction], and continuous productivity in scholarship, with growth in research leadership as a faculty member progresses to higher ranks. There should be documented evidence that the research program is achieving [Associate Professor] or has achieved [Professor] national/international recognition.
The College does not have any absolute quantitative standards for publication metrics. Instead, primary consideration is given to the quality of publications, the demonstrated or potential impact of the publications, and the faculty member's trend in publishing productivity.

Assessing quality over quantity
The number of publications alone is not sufficient to indicate level of productivity. Quantitative metrics [total numbers of] publications require interpretation. The College of Nursing shares the growing concern with publication overproduction, typified by work that is preliminary (embryonic) or of low quality. This type of publication is likely to be divided to garner the largest possible number of publications and to conform to the 'smallest publishable unit' format" (Harley and Acord 2011).

Faculty members enter the college with varied publication portfolios and their pattern of research and publishing continues to vary throughout their careers. Those members of the faculty coming to the college from fellow-focused post-doctoral programs, career development awards, or extensive prior clinical research experience usually have more publications than those who have recently graduated from doctoral programs. Those on large research teams with senior investigators are likely to have greater number of publications annually than will faculty working in smaller or more junior teams. Last, faculty members who publish comprehensive, robust and high quality articles often have fewer publications than those who publish partial, premature, or repetitive results.

Faculty with varied percentage work effort allocation for scholarship might have different publication trajectories. Faculty with less than 40% effort allocated for scholarship may demonstrate a lower level of productivity than those with a standard allocation. However, the inverse is not necessarily true. That is, faculty with a greater work effort allocation may not, in fact, have higher numbers of publications if their additional effort is dedicated to grants management or administration of training programs.

Demonstrated or Potential Impact
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The entire scholarship record will be considered in promotion reviews. This record is particularly important in assessing the impact of the faculty candidate’s efforts. However, the data must be carefully interpreted using several major considerations. The first such consideration is numerical determination of dissemination. Because it is easy to obtain information on citations of peer-reviewed articles, citation metrics and journal impact factors have become common [although imperfect] means of quantifying scholarly impact at academic institutions. Their interpretation is difficult. In general, faculty members with a history of articles being published with high citation metrics and whose articles appear in high impact journals tend to be viewed as publishing high quality articles. In contrast, a paper that has never been cited by anyone several years after its publication is unlikely to have made a significant contribution to knowledge. However, it is possible for faculty members to publish high impact papers with low citation frequencies and to publish in journals with modest impact factors.

Journal selection by authors influences the possibility of obtaining numerical determination of dissemination. Faculty members might rightly choose to publish in practice-oriented journals if the practice-oriented audience is the most appropriate target group (Aitken 2009). Peer-reviewed publications that are practice-oriented often have low citation frequencies even if they are read and used often. The quality of such publications is, therefore, not quantifiable by conventional citation metrics alone, since these articles are primarily read by practitioners or educators who publish less often, thus accounting for the low citation frequency. It is also important to note that focused articles, especially in specialty areas of investigation, will generally have far lower citation frequencies than will review articles, meta-analyses, methods papers, or articles that establish incidence/prevalence or cost.

Other points for consideration have been noted in the literature. Some authors discuss interpretations according to faculty member rank. For example, according to Aitken (2009), the publication record of Assistant Professors who experience a significant lag in publishing after beginning the tenure-track appointment might be too new for a citation record to be meaningful. For this reason, a strong citation frequency may be a more reliable indicator of
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cumulative impact for candidates reviewed for Full Professor (Hack, Crooks, Plohman, & Keprone, 2010).

The quality of journals in which faculty members publish is important to consider. Evaluation of a journal quality might consist of quantitative measures, such as the journal's impact factor score, published rankings of journal quality based on surveys of researchers in a particular area, or perspectives on journal quality by peer members or external reviewers. Yet, innovative publications that challenge current assumptions or propose paradigm shifts are often difficult to publish in high quality, established journals, even though these papers may have great long-term impact. Also, practice journals are read more often by practitioners, who as a group, publish less often than faculty members in academics. As a result, practice publications may be of higher quality than their impact score would indicate.

**Pattern of productivity**  
While the entire scholarship record will be considered in promotion reviews and is particularly important in assessing impact, particular attention is given to the period since the last faculty review to evaluate for a continued pattern of high quality productivity.

Pattern of productivity is evaluated on publication numbers and quality. Contributions to new knowledge are given the highest value. While we anticipate that faculty will generally publish 2-3 peer reviewed data-based articles per year, that number might be lower given factors noted previously. Significant reviews or syntheses, as well as methods and theoretical papers may be considered as scholarship if they contribute new knowledge.

Pattern of productivity is also evaluated on the roles played by the faculty member being reviewed in the preparation and submission of manuscripts for publication. Thus, faculty members are strongly encouraged to identify both their role and contributions to each article, as well as the meaning of author order, including student mentoring. Faculty members being reviewed will generally be lead author in a substantial proportion of the higher quality publications. The designation of “lead author” is variously indicated, with terms such as first, corresponding, senior, or last.
The designation of lead author is complex and warrants special considerations. One consideration is faculty member discipline. Academic disciplines and their associated journals have different norms for designating lead authors. The Social sciences generally indicate lead author in the first position, while bench sciences more often use the final position to indicate lead author. Another consideration is involvement of students and junior faculty members in the research of the faculty member being reviewed. That is, faculty members using their own research program experiences to mentor students often allow the student to have first author position, while the faculty as lead author assumes the second position. In collaborative research all authors are expected to play individuated roles. These roles are acknowledged by authorship often established alphabetically. Last, consideration of role of faculty members in student dissertations is also related to discipline. Depending on the academic discipline, publications from student dissertations may or may not include the dissertation advisor as an author. In the Nursing discipline this practice is contingent in part, on the relative independence of the student for the article’s conceptualization, data source, and analyses.

Research Funding
External research funding is an essential element of the fiscal health of the College of Nursing and the University of Iowa. Increasing the Collegiate level of external funding is a key element in the College of Nursing strategic plan. For these reasons, a positive Promotion and Tenure Peer Group review is a strong indication of the significance, rigor and potential impact of the faculty research program.

In an academic institution, the fundamental role of external research funding is and should be to provide the means to expand scientific knowledge. An Assistant Professor is expected to have begun to establish an independent funding record and is expected to receive at least one major extramural research grant as principal investigator by the time of the promotion and tenure evaluation. Career Development Awards, including NIH K-awards, RWJ, VA, and HSR&D funding, are considered major extramural research grants as long as the funding proposals are written and the research conducted with relative independence by the Principal
Investigator. The term “relative independence” means the Principal Investigator is not under the direction of someone else.

The College of Nursing has no expectations for the amount of funding or the nature of the grants. While the college recognizes that in some peer academic institutions there is an expectation that an R01 award from NIH is a condition of promotion and tenure, it is our position that such an expectation is unreasonably inflexible, particularly given the current economic circumstances. For this reason, priority scoring of R-series grant applications will also be considered. Faculty members being reviewed are encouraged to include summary reviews as evidence of quality.

Faculty candidates for full professorship are expected to have functioned in leadership roles on multiple funded research projects. These roles can be demonstrated by acting as a Principal Investigator or research funded for several investigators conducting the same study, Co-Principal Investigator or single Investigator playing a designated leadership role.

The relative importance of funding history and publication record are evaluated on an individual basis. All factors are weighed in deliberations, including funding history. A weak funding record given an adequate publication record is not by itself a justifiable reason to deny promotion and tenure. Because the fiscal survival of the College of Nursing depends on collective productivity among the faculty in raising external funds, however, such a record cannot be ignored. Conversely, a strong funding record will not overcome a weak publication record.

Other miscellaneous and unrelated considerations will have importance in peer group evaluation of faculty members. The first such consideration relates to the amount of funds from funding agencies. Funding as measured in dollars is not by itself a direct measure of the potential impact of the study toward advancing the science. Some grants require expensive equipment or laboratory costs. The most relevant quantitative measure of funding for the College of Nursing relates to the total faculty effort and graduate research assistantship supported by the grant award. The second consideration relates to the independent
contribution to science on the part of faculty members being reviewed. In general, funding from a source using peer review to guide funding decisions provides a clearer indicator of a contribution to knowledge than non-peer reviewed grants or contracts. Similarly, extramural awards are generally a clearer indicator of contribution to science than are intramural grants.

The research role played by faculty members also reflects their independent contributions to science. In some instances, a faculty member may be a member on several funded projects as a collaborator with clearly designated leadership roles, but not be a Principal investigator. In these instances, it is important to consider how the faculty functions independently of supervision and direction and the extent to which the faculty member being reviewed is making a substantive contribution to scientific knowledge.

**Expected Unmistakable National or International Recognition for Full Professor Candidates**

Candidates for the rank of Full Professor must demonstrate unmistakable national or international recognition primarily through their research and scholarship. Indicators of such recognition include a) national scientific committee or task force membership; b) selection for and service on national peer review panels and councils; c) elected office or membership or fellow status in national or international organizations; d) awards from national or International organizations; e) invited consultation for a comparable university or national task force; f) an editorship or membership on editorial Boards of high impact journals; and g) invited keynote presentations at national and international meetings.

**Service Criteria**

The Service Criteria from the University of Iowa Operations manual are provided below.

**General Service criteria** as stated in the operations manual: (Operations Manual III 10.2(c):

"From time to time, a faculty member is called upon to render major professional services to the University or to society in general. Such contributions should be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University and its effect on the development of the individual."
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Considerations for Peer Group Guidance

In addition to teaching and research contributions, faculty members are expected to provide service at various levels within and outside the College. The College of Nursing values and encourages service to our college and university, profession, the State of Iowa, and national and international organizations. However, an individual’s professional service record is of secondary importance for promotion either to Associate or Full Professor. No amount of service outweighs a weak record of publication, scholarship, teaching and mentoring students.

Factors that are paramount in the evaluation of overall service contributions are successful discharge of collegiate and university responsibilities, growth in the scope of service with advancement in academic ranks, and contribution to the enhancement of the reputation of the College and the University. For the College and University, faculty members are expected to carry out committee responsibilities in a thorough and timely manner. Other activities include advising students and student organizations, providing peer support through review of proposals and articles written by colleagues, and, for more experienced faculty members, taking a leadership role in curriculum review and development.

Other required activities including participation in Professional, Governmental and Community organizations. For Professional and Scholarly organizations, these activities can include committee leadership or other types of leadership, organization of conferences or sessions at conferences, membership on accreditation boards or agencies, reviewing of journal articles and research grant proposals, editorship of journals, presentation of seminars at universities, research laboratories, and professional organizations as well as providing service in organizational leadership and advisory panels. Service for governmental units and community units might include service on community, state and national boards, and professional advising of government organizations in the solution of health related issues and in the formulation of health policy.
Service Expectations for Associate Professor Candidates

Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure are expected to have provided evidence of a trend toward increasing service effort. Assistant professors are expected to have begun performing professional service that is typical for any faculty member, particularly service that can enhance the individual’s professional reputation, such as serving as a reviewer for journals and funding agencies as well as participation in professional organizations. Higher levels of service, such as serving on a journal editorial board or on a national committee, would be considered as indicators of the national recognition and quality of the individual’s research.

Service Expectations for Full Professor Candidates

Candidates for promotion to full professor should have demonstrated a significant and effective record of achievement in service. Indicators of effective service include service in positions with increasing responsibility after serving on those with fewer responsibilities, service awards; and letters of commendation.

Candidates for full professor are expected to have played leadership roles on College of Nursing faculty governance committees or other college-wide major committees and initiatives with evident records of achievement. Examples of these expectations include leadership for implementation of policies or procedures, participation in or leadership for University governance, such as Faculty Senate or Faculty Council, or other strategic University committees. Other examples include service in leadership roles for national and international professional organizations.

A long-standing collegiate norm is to minimize the amount of Collegiate and particularly University service by assistant professors. As our college demographics shift to a higher proportion of junior faculty and lower proportion of senior faculty, however, it may be necessary to engage our assistant professors in more internal service. Junior faculty members are expected to participate in faculty meetings and other collegiate-wide activities,
and to contribute ideas to improve the fulfillment of the college's mission. Academic citizenship and demonstration of generative contributions are valued highly.
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