FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION POLICIES
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

FACULTY PATHWAYS

1) Pathway 1: Research
2) Pathway 2: Clinical

The term “research faculty” is used to designate full-time SOE faculty whose primary responsibilities are scholarship, teaching, and service.

The term “clinical faculty” is used to designate full-time SOE faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching, program development and coordination, advising, other teaching-related duties, service obligations (e.g., partnering with school districts, establishing Professional Development Schools, and internship placements), other community-related duties (e.g., coordinating programs; establishing and maintaining partnership relationships), as well as scholarship.

Pathway #1 (Research)

Assistant Professor-Research: Educational background shall include an appropriate doctoral degree and a beginning scholarly agenda. An Assistant Professor-Research must demonstrate a portfolio documenting attainment of or a capacity for excelling in writing research publications and producing grant proposals, teaching, and service to school and community. Faculty appointments at this rank are made by the Dean in consultation with a search committee.

Associate Professor-Research: In addition to meeting the criteria of an Assistant Professor-Research, an Associate Professor-Research must have demonstrated distinction in his/her assigned role and primary assigned duties as delineated by the Dean. Distinction is typically demonstrated through significant scholarship; a high level of competence in teaching; service including leadership and contribution to the relevant academic field; and promise of continued productivity. This person must have developed a well-defined line of scholarly research in his or her field. Associate Professors-Research should have directed graduate research (e.g., dissertations) and have served and be serving the university, SOE, community, and their profession in useful ways. New faculty appointments may be made at this rank under circumstances deemed appropriate by the Dean and in consultation with a search committee and the SOE Promotions Committee.

Professor-Research: In addition to meeting the criteria of an Associate Professor-Research, the principal criteria for appointment to the rank of Professor-Research are a sustained level of excellent scholarship and scholarly achievement, evidence of intellectual leadership, creative accomplishment, and establishment of a national and, where appropriate, international reputation in one’s field. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Research indicates that the individual has achieved considerable stature in his or her profession beyond what is expected at the Associate level.

Promotion from Associate Professor to full Professor-Research requires that the candidate demonstrate continuing productivity in her or his professorial assignment, a high level of accomplishment in other areas relevant to research appointments (e.g., mentoring doctoral students and junior faculty, seminal publications and presentations, and governance in the school, university, and international arenas), evidence of distinction in an established line of inquiry, continuing evidence of relevant and effective professional service, and evidence of a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. In addition to the above,
evidence of distinction for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Research may include leadership roles in academic programs, appropriate professional associations, university-wide initiatives, and national or international professional organizations.

New faculty appointments may be made at this rank under circumstances deemed appropriate by the Dean and in consultation with a search committee and the SOE Promotions Committee.

Pathway #2 (Clinical)

Assistant Professor-Clinical: Assistant Professors-Clinical must have a doctoral degree (e.g., Ph.D., Ed.D.). Appointments to this rank are made by the Dean in consultation with a search committee.

Associate Professor-Clinical: In addition to meeting the criteria for Assistant Professor-Clinical, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor-Clinical requires that a faculty member has demonstrated distinction in his/her assigned role and primary assigned duties as delineated by the Dean. Distinction is typically demonstrated through a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching and demonstrated distinction and leadership in service and scholarship. New faculty appointments may be made at this rank under circumstances deemed appropriate by the Dean and in consultation with a search committee and SOE Promotions Committee.

Professor-Clinical: In addition to meeting the criteria for Associate Professor-Clinical, promotion to the rank of Professor-Clinical requires demonstration of continuing productivity in the candidate’s primary assignment, a high level of leadership in other areas relevant to clinical appointments, and a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Clinical indicates that the individual has achieved considerable national or international stature in his or her profession beyond what is expected at the Associate level. In addition to the above, evidence of distinction for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Clinical may include leadership roles in appropriate professional associations, university-wide initiatives, and national or international professional organizations. New faculty appointments may be made at this rank under circumstances deemed appropriate by the Dean and in consultation with a search committee and SOE Promotions Committee.

BIAS/CONFLICT OF INTEREST

To preserve the integrity of the process by which appointments and promotions are made, all individuals involved at any stage in the appointment, reappointment, or promotion process must disclose to the Chair of the Promotions Committee (and if the relationship is with the Chair, to the Dean) any relationship with the candidate that might be perceived by a reasonable observer to constitute a conflict of interest or source of bias with respect to the candidate. Any such relationship must be disclosed as early as possible in the process in sufficient detail as to allow an observer to judge whether an actual conflict of interest exists. In cases where a conflict of interest exists, the individual involved should be recused from the process. Recusal decisions based on actual or perceived conflicts shall be made by the Chair of the Promotions Committee (and if the actual or perceived conflict is with the Chair, by the Dean).

CONFIDENTIALITY

The integrity, privacy, civility, and rigor of the appointment, reappointment, and promotions process depends upon the observance of confidentiality requirements and the candidate’s and participants’ knowledge that those confidentiality requirements will be observed.

All participants involved in an appointment, reappointment, or promotion review are required to maintain the confidentiality of the information, documents, discussions, deliberations, and votes related to the
candidate. The promotions dossier (including review letters) shall be kept strictly confidential and may not be shared with the candidate or others (except for the materials submitted by the candidate him/herself). If the Promotions Committee seeks letters from reviewers not identified by the candidate, the identity of those reviewers shall be kept confidential. All reviewers’ responses will be treated with strict confidentiality, and the reviewers shall be informed that only those directly involved in the candidate’s evaluation process will see their responses, except as discussed below. Members of the Promotions Committee and the SOE Academic Council may not discuss or share any information, documents, discussions, deliberations, or votes related to a candidate for appointment, reappointment, or promotion with any individuals (including other members of the Promotions Committee or the Academic Council), except in formal meetings of the applicable Promotions Committee or SOE Academic Council. Notwithstanding the foregoing, exceptions to the confidentiality requirements may be necessary for University or legal review of the process.

The Dean shall convey any necessary information to the candidate. Likewise, any questions the candidate has about the process should be directed to the Dean. Candidates for appointment, reappointment, or promotion must observe the confidentiality of the process and may not request or seek to discover confidential information from participants in the process.

A breach of confidentiality by a participant or candidate in connection with an appointment, reappointment, or promotion review may subject the individual to discipline, among other consequences.

**PERFORMANCE REVIEWS**

Performance reviews are maintained by the Dean’s Office and become part of the faculty member’s record.

**Assistant Professor-Research (years 1, 2, and 4):** Performance review of the faculty member’s engagement and accomplishments during the previous year is conducted at the end of the first, second, and fourth years of service at the SOE. This review is conducted by the SOE’s Vice Dean (or designee) in consultation with SOE academic/program leadership and is based on information submitted by the faculty member through the SOE’s data management software system and other sources. The Vice Dean submits letters of review to the faculty members by July 1.

**Assistant Professor-Clinical (yearly):** Performance review of the faculty member’s engagement and accomplishments during the previous year is conducted yearly. This review is conducted by the SOE’s Vice Dean (or designee) in consultation with SOE academic/program leadership based on information submitted by the faculty member through the SOE’s data management software system and other sources. The Vice Dean submits letters of review to the faculty members by July 1.

**Associate Professor and Professor, Clinical and Research (every third year):** Following an appointment to the rank of Associate Professor-Clinical, Professor-Clinical, Associate Professor-Research, or Professor-Research, a performance review of the faculty member’s engagement and accomplishments will be conducted every third year. This review is conducted by the SOE’s Vice Dean (or designee) in consultation with SOE academic/program leadership based on information submitted by the faculty member through the SOE’s data management software system and other sources. The Vice Dean submits letters of review to the faculty member by July 1.

**PROMOTIONS TIMELINE AND PROCESSES**

The dates set forth in this section are intended as guidelines and can be changed or waived for good cause, at the discretion of the Dean.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor-Research to Associate Professor-Research**
An Assistant Professor-Research submits his or her dossier (See Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template) for third year review at the beginning of the third year to the SOE Promotions Committee. The faculty member (candidate for promotion) submits his or her dossier for promotion consideration at the end of the fifth year following the initial appointment.

**Promotion from Associate Professor-Research to Professor-Research**

The candidate for promotion may submit his or her dossier (See Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template) for promotion consideration at the end of any year following his or her initial promotion to Associate Professor-Research.

**Promotion from Assistant Professor-Clinical to Associate Professor-Clinical**

The candidate for promotion may submit his or her dossier (See Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template) at the end of any year following his or her initial appointment.

**Promotion from Associate Professor-Clinical to Professor-Clinical**

The faculty member (candidate for promotion) may submit his or her dossier (See Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template) at the end of any year following their Associate Professor-Clinical appointment.

**THIRD YEAR REVIEW (Assistant Professor-Research only)**

The Promotions Committee reviews the Assistant Professors-Research dossier (See Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template) during their third year of employment. Third year dossiers do not include external review letters. The Promotions Committee will assess whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward promotion. The Promotions Committee will document its discussion of the candidate’s accomplishments and progress toward promotion in a letter to the candidate with copy to the Dean. The letter identifies areas of strengths and weaknesses and makes clear recommendations for the candidate’s improvement. The goal is to provide thoughtful, constructive, and specific assessments and suggestions to the candidate.

The timeline for the Third Year Review process is as follows:

- **August 1**: The faculty member submits dossier to the Promotions Committee (See Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template).
- **December 1**: The Promotions Committee submits a letter of review to the candidate with a copy submitted to the SOE Dean’s office summarizing the faculty member’s progress according to promotion criteria. In the case of a faculty member within an SOE Center, a copy of the third year review letter is also forwarded to the Center Director.
- **On or before January 15**: The faculty member may, but is not required to, submit a letter to the Dean and the Promotions Committee responding to the third year review.
PROMOTION

The process and timeline for dossier submission and promotion review is as follows:

- **March 15:** The candidate for promotion to Professor-Research or any clinical faculty member who intends to submit his/her dossier for review notifies the Dean’s Office and the Promotions Committee of the intent to present a dossier for consideration of promotion. The Assistant Professor-Research submitting his/her dossier materials at the end of his/her fifth year of service is not required to inform the Dean or Promotions Committee of his/her intent to submit his/her dossier.
- **June 1 (Research Faculty):** The candidate submits his or her dossier for external review including: (a) research narrative component of dossier (see Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template, section IIIA), (b) 4-5 key publication examples, (c) a current curriculum vitae, and (d) a list of 4-5 names of external reviewers including the candidate’s relationship and/or prior work with the individual. These individuals should be knowledgeable of the candidate’s work, be a member of a faculty at an institution similar to or at a comparable academic level as Johns Hopkins University, and able to indicate no conflict of interest relative to providing the letter of review. The Promotions Committee solicits review letters from 8-10 total reviewers, including 3 from the candidate’s list. The Promotions Committee sends the candidate’s dossier, curriculum vita, 4-5 publications, and the promotions criteria document (Appendix B) to the external reviewers.
- **June 1 (Clinical Faculty):** The candidate submits his or her dossier for external review including: (a) research narrative component of dossier (see Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template, section IIIA), (b) 4-5 key publication examples, (c) a current curriculum vitae, and (d) a list of 3 names of external reviewers including the candidate’s relationship and/or prior work with the individual reviewer. These individuals should be knowledgeable of the candidate’s work, be a member of a faculty at an institution similar to or at a comparable academic level as Johns Hopkins University, and able to indicate no conflict of interest relative to providing the letter of review. The Promotions Committee solicits review letters from 4-5 total reviewers, including 2 from the candidate’s list. The Promotions Committee sends the candidate’s dossier, curriculum vita, 4-5 publications, and the promotions criteria document (Appendix C) to the external reviewers.
- **October 1:** The candidate submits all elements of the final dossier to the Promotions Committee (see Appendix D, Promotions Dossier Template).
- **February 1:** Following deliberations, the Promotions Committee members anonymously vote on candidate’s promotion and submits a confidential promotion recommendation to the Dean. There must be a quorum of half of the voting membership of the Promotions Committee plus one to conduct a vote. The vote is indicated in the letter, and the recommendation regarding promotion reflects a majority vote of the committee in attendance at the time of the vote. In the case of a candidate seeking promotion to Professor, committee members below the Professor rank will recuse themselves from voting.
- **April 15:** The Dean determines whether to recommend for or against promotion of the candidate. In the case that the Dean recommends promotion, he/she submits the recommendation to the SOE Academic Council. All members of the Academic Council except for the Dean and Provost may vote on the promotion recommendation. There must be a quorum of half of the voting membership of the SOE Academic Council plus one to conduct a vote. Approval of a promotion recommendation requires a majority vote of the SOE Academic Council members eligible to vote who are present. The Dean will in a timely manner notify the candidate and the Promotions Committee of promotion status by letter.
- **If the Assistant Professor-Research candidate is not successfully promoted, the candidate is allowed to maintain his or her position for one additional year based on his or her contract and may appeal the promotion decision, as outlined in the Appeal of Unsuccessful Promotion Decision...**
section below. If a candidate for promotion to Professor-Research or any clinical faculty member is not promoted, the candidate may resubmit his or her dossier after two years.

- The successful candidate is promoted on July 1 of the year in which the SOE Academic Council approves the promotion recommendation.

**Early Promotion**

Following completion of the third year review, an Assistant Professor-Research may elect to put forward a case for early promotion to Associate Professor-Research. Early promotion would be considered when a candidate feels that his/her dossier is sufficient to attain promotion. An early review for promotion may be conducted one or more year(s) prior to the required sixth year promotions review. Such review will adhere to the timeline set forth in this document. In these cases, the faculty member should inform the Promotions Committee at least 30 days in advance of the request for an early review for promotion.

**Extension Request Process**

The Office of the Dean may issue extensions to the maximum time at rank permitted for the Assistant Professor-Research for up to one year. Extensions may be granted for exceptional circumstances including special work-life and personal matters that interrupt the process of working toward promotion. Such circumstances include the birth or adoption of a child or a serious health issue affecting the faculty member or an immediate family member for whom the faculty member serves as a primary caregiver.

Assistant Professors-Research who wish to request an extension must submit a letter to the Vice Dean on or before March 15 of year five of the promotion timeline. The letter is to include the reason for the extension request, a current curriculum vitae, and a completed Faculty Activity Summary Chart (Appendix A).

The Vice Dean will review the request and consult, as appropriate, with the Associate Dean of Research and the Chair of the Promotions Committee. The Vice Dean will issue a letter indicating approval or denial of the extension request within 30 days of the receipt of the request.

If the faculty member disagrees with the decision, he or she may appeal to the Dean with a letter outlining the reasons why he or she believes the Vice Dean’s decision should be reviewed. The Dean’s decision is final and will be given in writing within 30 days of receipt of the appeal.

**Appeal of Unsuccessful Promotion Decision**

If the candidate is not successfully promoted from Assistant Professor (Research) to Associate Professor (Research), he or she may elect to appeal the decision based on clear evidence of impropriety substantially affecting the outcome of the promotion process.

The process is as follows:

- On or before June 15: The candidate submits a letter to the Provost detailing reasons why an appeal is justified.
- On or before September 1: The Provost notifies the candidate of the Provost’s determination of whether there was clear evidence of impropriety substantially affecting the outcome of the promotion process. The Provost may deny the appeal or, if he or she finds that there was clear evidence of impropriety substantially affecting the outcome of the promotion process, send the case back to the level at which the impropriety occurred. If the Provost determines that the impropriety is irreparable, the promotions case shall begin again de novo. There is no further appeal of a negative decision.
# APPENDIX A

## FACULTY ACTIVITY SUMMARY CHART

I. **Courses taught per semester:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term, Course #, and Title</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>No. of Class Meetings</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. **Sponsored research and other grant awards**

Provide name of PI; Years of the grant award; Title of the grant; Grant sponsor; Amount funded per year, Total amount of grant; Award # if applicable; Role on the grant; percentage of time on the grant per year.

III. **Governance/administrative (service) activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term &amp; Year</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. **Publications (in print, in press, in progress) in APA format**
APPENDIX B

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION FOR RESEARCH FACULTY

This document is an Appendix to the Johns Hopkins University School of Education (SOE) Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies document.

General Definition of Research Faculty

The term “research faculty” is used to designate full-time SOE faculty whose primary responsibilities are scholarship, teaching, and service. The promotion of research faculty in the SOE is based on the demonstration of distinction in his or her professorial role as delineated by the Dean of the SOE.

Promotion Criteria

In addition to meeting the criteria of an Assistant Professor-Research, an Associate Professor-Research must demonstrate significant scholarship; a high level of competence in teaching; service including leadership and contribution to the relevant academic field; and promise of continued productivity. This person must also have developed a well-defined line of scholarly research in his or her field. Associate Professors-Research should have directed graduate research (e.g., dissertations) and have served and be serving the university, SOE, community, and their profession in useful ways.

In addition to meeting the criteria of an Associate Professor-Research, the principal criteria for appointment to the rank of Professor-Research are a sustained level of excellent scholarship and scholarly achievement, evidence of intellectual leadership, creative accomplishment, and establishment of a national and, where appropriate, international reputation in one’s field. Promotion from Associate to Professor-Research indicates that the individual has achieved considerable stature in his or her profession beyond what is expected at the Associate level.

Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Research requires that the candidate demonstrate continuing productivity in her or his professorial assignment, a high level of accomplishment in other areas relevant to scholarship that makes a significant impact in the field (e.g., research and publications, seminal publications, and presentations in his or her field of study), teaching (including mentoring doctoral students and junior faculty), and governance in the school, university, and international arenas, evidence of distinction in an established line of inquiry, continuing evidence of relevant and effective professional service, and evidence of a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. In addition to the above, evidence of distinction for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Research should include leadership roles in academic programs, appropriate professional associations, university-wide initiatives, and national or international professional organizations.

Scholarship

Scholarship is defined broadly to reflect a thematic research agenda that includes but is not limited to quantitative and qualitative research, basic research, the integration and synthesis of knowledge, the transformation of knowledge through the intellectual work involved in teaching and facilitating learning, and/or the application of knowledge to solve a compelling problem. Although publications may take a variety of forms as described below, the majority of the candidate’s dossier should include peer-reviewed publications in high impact venues.

The following represents a list of example activities within the area of scholarship that may provide evidence of distinction:
Published Works

- Publication in peer-reviewed, high-impact journals
- Books
- Book chapters
- Monographs, technical reports, and program evaluations
- Abstracts for research publications and proceedings

Research Presentations

- Peer-reviewed papers and presentations at national and international conferences
- Invited presentations at national and international conferences
- Peer-reviewed papers and presentations at state and regional conferences

Grant Activity

- Grant proposals funded as PI or Co-PI
- Grant proposals submitted as PI or Co-PI
- Grant participation as an expert (non-PI status such as advisory boards)

Awards and Honors

- Recognition as a promising scholar by a professional association (for Assistant Professor seeking promotion to Associate Professor)
- Institutional, state, national, and international awards for scholarly work
- Research fellowships in support of a faculty member’s work

Other Related Scholarship Activities

- Creative works or activities, surveys or instrumentations, patents and copyrights
- Intervention programs that prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes or optimize positive outcomes for individuals or groups
- Documented contributions to public policy at the local, state, national, or international levels (for example, written testimony and policy briefs)

Evidence of distinction in an established line of inquiry for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Research may include the following in addition to the above:

- Established national/international reputation based on research
- Recognition as a leading scholar by a professional association
- Documented leadership roles (e.g., PI or Co-PI) on grants and grant proposals
- Documented leadership roles in professional organizations (e.g., AERA program chair, president of organization)

Teaching

Faculty members in the SOE are expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. Performance in teaching should be defined in its broadest sense to include instruction, course revision and development, analysis of the impact of one’s teaching, program development and leadership, advising and
mentoring, and/or serving on and chairing doctoral committees. Teaching also includes responsiveness to students’ needs beyond the classroom. To the extent possible, it is expected that the candidate’s teaching will have demonstrable ties to current research in the candidate’s field.

Teaching activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Evidence of the quality of teaching as evaluated by peer reviews and through student evaluations
- Development of new courses and revisions of existing courses (including online and other presentation mediums as assigned)
- Course conversions from face-to-face to online formats
- Development or creative utilization of new materials and new technology
- Program development or leadership, including leadership in the accreditation process
- Teaching awards by undergraduate or graduate students and/or graduates
- Local, regional, national, or international teaching, advising, or mentoring awards
- Mentoring graduate students, graduates, and/or faculty in research, publication, and/or teaching

Evidence to demonstrate distinction in teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Peer review of teaching
- Teaching evaluations by students, such as course evaluations, and other student reflections
- Recognition of teaching such as nomination or receipt of awards for teaching and/or advising at the local, regional, or state levels
- Curriculum and course design and implementation
- Technological innovations for instruction
- Methodological innovations for instruction
- Demonstration of quality of student advising through letters or emails from advisees

**Service**

Service refers to work performed on behalf of others in any of the following three areas: leadership in and advancement of a scholarly discipline (e.g., service to the profession), fulfillment of the obligations of institutional governance (e.g., service to a program area, school, or university), or meaningful engagement with local, state, national, or international communities (e.g., service to schools, parents/families, community agencies, or other organizations).

Service activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Service to State, National, or International Professional Organizations**

- Editorial service for peer-reviewed journals (e.g., editor, editorial board, reviewer, or editing special issues)
- Leadership role in the governance of professional organizations in the candidate’s field or discipline (e.g., holding office in a national organization or taking a leadership role and making substantive contributions to areas such as accreditation standards)
- Organization of conferences and symposia
- Honors, awards, and other recognition for service to the profession

**Service to the Program Area, School, or University**
• Chair or member of governance committees and other representative bodies
• Mentoring of faculty and students
• Developing and/or sponsoring professional student groups
• Participation in recruitment activities
• Honors, awards, and other recognition for service

Service to the Local, State, National, or International Community

• Sustained work in schools or other relevant community settings. The expectation is that this work, when feasible, will result in publications, awards, and/or leadership, and will translate beyond the particular setting in which the work is done
• Honors, awards, and other recognition for service to the local, state, national, or international community
• Presentations at non-peer-reviewed conferences
• Sustained work with local, state, or federal agencies (e.g., test development; standards development; accreditation reviews). The expectation is that this work, when feasible, will result in conference presentations, publications, awards, and/or leadership, and will translate beyond the particular setting in which the work is done

Possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in service include, but are not limited to, the following:

• Program evaluation reports, technical reports, monographs, accreditation reports
• Presentations/publications about service activities or programs
• Evaluations by supervisors or peers; other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in service
• Awards for service
• Evidence of exemplary service or consultation to public schools; school or university committees; community-based organizations; related agencies; and one’s profession in general
• Leadership roles in shaping policy at the local, state, and/or national level
• Leadership roles in professional organizations as evidenced by election or appointment to offices or committees
• Editorial advisory board and review for education conferences, journals, textbooks, and so forth

Evaluating Center Research Faculty for Promotion

Existing general criteria for evaluating SOE research faculty also apply to research faculty employed in SOE Centers who likewise are expected to demonstrate effective performance in the domains of scholarship, teaching, and service. However, each Center will have unique needs regarding faculty roles and the types of faculty it employs, which require that evaluation reviews be adapted accordingly. As a generic framework, the following rationale and guidelines are offered:

• Research faculty in SOE Centers may be mostly funded by soft money (contracts and grants). In these cases, institutional funding shall be provided to the extent faculty perform required institutional activities (e.g., teaching and advising) that are not externally funded. In all cases, the faculty member’s Institutional Base Salary, as defined under University policy
should encompass the full annual salary to address all anticipated duties.

- Some research faculty in SOE Centers will include a higher volume of technical research reports, greater participation in seeking grant and contract funding, and fewer journal publications.
- Some research faculty in SOE Centers will typically devote less time to advising, teaching, and/or service, based on their assigned Center responsibilities.
- Because the performance of research faculty in SOE Centers is strongly determined by assigned individual roles and the quality of associated work products, the promotions process should include a statement from the Center Director describing performance expectations for the candidate.
APPENDIX C
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION FOR CLINICAL FACULTY

This document is an Appendix to the Johns Hopkins University School of Education (SOE) Faculty Appointment and Promotion Policies document.

General Definition of Clinical Faculty

The term “clinical faculty” is used broadly to designate full-time SOE faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching, program development and coordination, advising, other teaching-related duties, service obligations (e.g., partnering with school districts, establishing Professional Development Schools, and internship placements), other community-related duties (e.g., coordinating programs; establishing and maintaining partnership relationships), as well as scholarship.

In addition to meeting the criteria for Assistant Professor-Clinical, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor-Clinical requires that the faculty member has demonstrated distinction in his/her assigned role and primary duties as delineated by the Dean, a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching, and demonstrated distinction and leadership in service and scholarship.

In addition to meeting the criteria for Associate Professor-Clinical, promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Clinical requires demonstration of continuing productivity in the candidate’s primary assignment, a high level of leadership in other areas relevant to clinical appointments (e.g., teaching, practitioner-related research and scholarship, and professional service), a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching, service and scholarship. Promotion from Associate Professor-Clinical to Professor-Clinical indicates that the individual has achieved considerable national or international stature in his or her profession beyond what is expected at the Associate Professor level.

In addition to the above, evidence of distinction for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor-Clinical may include leadership roles in appropriate professional associations, university-wide initiatives, and national or international professional organizations.

Teaching

Clinical faculty members in the SOE are expected to demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. Performance in teaching should be defined in its broadest sense to include instruction, course revision and development, analysis of the impact of one’s teaching, program development and leadership, advising and mentoring, and/or serving on doctoral committees. Teaching also includes responsiveness to students’ needs beyond the classroom. To the extent possible, it is expected that the candidate’s teaching will have demonstrable ties to current research in the candidate’s field.

Teaching activities may include but are not limited to the following:

- Development and implementation of courses
- Course conversions from face-to-face to online formats
- Implementation of online courses
- Advisement and supervision of students and interns
- Evaluation of course impact
- Facilitation of teaching efforts of faculty, including K-12 teachers, SOE faculty, counselors, public safety academies, and so forth
- Assistance to SOE faculty in the study of his or her teaching efforts
• Development of methods for disseminating feedback of teaching efforts
• Instruction of non-credit courses, professional development workshops, and so forth

Evidence to demonstrate distinction in teaching may include, but are not limited to, the following:

• Peer review of teaching
• Teaching evaluations by students, such as course evaluations, and other student reflections
• Evaluations of teaching efforts in settings such as professional development workshops
• Recognition of teaching such as nomination or receipt of awards for teaching and/or advising at the local, regional, or state levels
• Curriculum and course design and implementation
• Technological innovations for instruction
• Methodological innovations for instruction
• Demonstration of quality of student advising through letters or emails from advisees

Service

Service refers to work performed on behalf of others in any of the following three areas: advancement of a scholarly discipline (e.g., service to the profession), fulfillment of the obligations of institutional governance (e.g., service to a program area, school, or university), or meaningful engagement with local, state, national, or international communities (e.g., service to schools, parents/families, community agencies, or other organizations).

Service activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Service to the Program Area, School, or University

• Academic program leadership
• Chair or member of governance committees and other representative bodies
• Mentoring of faculty and students
• Developing and/or sponsoring professional student groups
• Participation in recruitment activities
• Honors, awards, and other recognition for service

Service to the Local, State, National, or International Community

• Sustained work in schools or other relevant community settings. The expectation is that this work, when feasible, will result in publications, awards, and/or leadership, and will translate beyond the particular setting in which the work is done
• Honors, awards, and other recognition for service to the local, state, national, or international community
• Presentations at non-peer reviewed conferences
• Sustained work with local, state, or federal agencies (e.g., test development; standards development; accreditation reviews). The expectation is that this work, when feasible, will result in conference presentations, publications, awards, and/or leadership, and will translate beyond the particular setting in which the work is done

Service to State, National, or International Professional Organizations
Governance of professional organizations in the candidate’s field or discipline (e.g., holding office in a national organization or taking a leadership role and making substantive contributions to areas such as accreditation standards)

Involvement in the organization of conferences and symposia

Honors, awards, and other recognition for service to the profession

Possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in service include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Documentation of program development
- Documentation of program leadership
- Program evaluation reports, technical reports, monographs, and accreditation reports
- Presentations/publications about service activities or programs
- Evaluations by supervisors or peers; other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in service
- Awards for service
- Evidence of exemplary service or consultation to public schools; school or university committees; community-based organizations; related agencies; and one’s profession in general
- Leadership roles in shaping policy at the local, state, and/or national level
- Leadership roles in professional organizations as evidenced by election or appointment to offices or committees
- Editorial advisory board and review for education conferences, journals, and textbooks

**Scholarship**

Clinical faculty members’ scholarship is defined broadly to reflect a *thematic research agenda* that includes, but is not limited to, quantitative and qualitative research, basic research, the integration and synthesis of knowledge, the transformation of knowledge through the intellectual work involved in teaching and facilitating learning, and/or the application of knowledge to solve a compelling problem. The productive scholar is continuously involved in teaching, writing, and creative efforts that advance knowledge in a field. *Although publications may take a variety of forms as described below, the majority of the candidate’s dossier should include peer-reviewed publications in high impact venues.*

Scholarship activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Research and evaluation of program effectiveness
- Publication of articles, books, technical reports, and so forth
- Development of briefings to leaders or policy makers
- Presentations at professional conferences or symposia
- Procurement of external research funding
- Creative works or activities, surveys or instrumentations, patents and copyrights
- Intervention programs that prevent, ameliorate, or remediate persistent negative outcomes or optimize positive outcomes for individuals or groups.
- Documented contributions to public policy at the local, state, national, or international levels (e.g., written testimony and policy briefs)

Possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in scholarship include, but are not limited to, the following:
• Established reputation based on practitioner or clinical research
• Awards for scholarly activity
• Publications that are appropriate to the candidate's field, including practitioner articles in peer-reviewed journals, books, monographs, chapters, bibliographies, catalogs, abstracts, reviews, media releases, creative works, activities, patents, or copyrights, and other miscellaneous publications (e.g., non-refereed publications)
• Lectures, workshops, or papers presented to professional meetings
• Documented roles (e.g., Coordinator, Author, Project Manager) on grants and grant proposals

Evidence of distinction for promotion from Associate Professor-Clinical to Professor-Clinical may include the following in addition to the above:

• Documented leadership roles (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-Investigator) on grants and grant proposals
• Established national/international reputation based on practitioner-based research
• Publications in peer-reviewed journals such as articles related to program evaluation, impacts, outcomes, and innovations
• Lectures, speeches, workshops, or papers presented at major national or international education conferences

Evaluating Center Clinical Faculty for Promotion

Existing general criteria for evaluating SOE clinical faculty also apply to clinical faculty employed in SOE Centers who likewise are expected to demonstrate effective performance in the domains of scholarship, teaching, and service. Each Center will have unique needs regarding faculty roles and the types of faculty it employs, which require that evaluation reviews be adapted accordingly. As a generic framework, the following rationale and guidelines are offered:

• Clinical faculty in SOE Centers may be mostly funded by soft money (contracts and grants). In these cases, institutional funding shall be provided to the extent faculty perform required institutional activities (e.g., teaching and advising) that are not externally funded. In all cases, the faculty member’s Institutional Base Salary, as defined under University policy (http://finance.jhu.edu/depts/frc/eff_pp.html), should encompass the full annual salary to address all anticipated duties.
• Some clinical faculty in SOE Centers will include a higher volume of technical research reports, greater participation in seeking grant and contract funding, and fewer journal publications.
• Some clinical faculty in SOE Centers will typically devote less time to advising, teaching, and/or service, based on their assigned Center responsibilities.
• Because the performance of clinical faculty in SOE Centers is strongly determined by assigned individual roles and the quality of associated work products, the promotions process should include a statement from the Center Director describing performance expectations for the candidate.
APPENDIX D
PROMOTIONS DOSSIER TEMPLATE

Below is a template—or outline—of the promotion dossier sections. Complete all sections of the template, even areas in which you may not have contributions. Where appropriate, indicate none. Please review the complete promotion guidelines for instructions regarding each item below.

Submission of Dossier

Candidates should prepare the dossier using APA format including Times New Roman and 12-point font size. Save the dossier as five PDF files:

1. **PDF #1**: Promotions Dossier Sections I-III – introduction through research.
2. **PDF #2**: All materials related to Section III, C, #1-13.
3. **PDF #3**: Promotions Dossier Section IV – Teaching and Advising Effectiveness including course evaluations for all courses.
4. **PDF #4**: Promotions Dossier Section V – Professional Service and additional Outreach Activities
5. **PDF #5**: Curriculum Vita

The major sections and subsections of the dossier (i.e., Roman numeral sections and letter-identified subsections) should be bookmarked creating a clickable table of contents. For PDF #3 & PDF #4, include all supporting data within the PDF following the narrative sections and paginate consecutively across PDF 1, 3, and 4.

The five PDF files should be submitted as electronic documents by sharing a BOX folder with the chair of the Promotions Committee. Please identify the folder with “your name_dossier”. Candidates are also required to submit one hard copy of the dossier to the chair of the Promotions Committee.

Questions

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the promotion process, you may contact the promotions committee chair.
I. Executive Summary
Provide a 2-3 page summary of your experiences that contextualizes your career to date for the reviewers.

II. Recommendation Statements
A. Annual Review Letters by the Vice Dean and/or Center Director (or designee)
B. Third Year Review Letter
C. Faculty members with assignments in more than one Program Area or appointments within other units within the university should provide a list of contact person(s)
D. For faculty whose appointment is within an SOE Center, a letter from the Center Director describing performance expectations for the applicant

III. Research and Creative Activities
A. Candidate’s statement
Provide a 2-3 page narrative that describes your research agenda. Situate your research agenda within the existing theoretical and empirical literature. The discussion of prior literature should be brief (e.g., maximum one or two paragraphs).

B. Awards, prizes, and recognitions

C. List of contributions (submit materials for each item listed in 1-13; supply references for items 14-18)
   1. Manuscripts in refereed journals (both print and electronic; include impact factor where available)
   2. Manuscripts in non-refereed journals
   3. Books
   4. Book chapters
   5. Edited books
   6. Manuscripts in refereed conference proceedings
   7. Monographs
   8. Technical reports
   9. Performances, exhibitions, compositions
   10. Online manuscripts or webinars
   11. Other outlets/blogs (international/national/local)
   12. Reviews of publications (e.g., book reviews)
   13. Prefaces, introductions, catalogue statements, etc.
14. Peer reviewed papers and posters presented at professional meetings or conferences
15. Translations
16. Abstracts
17. Other papers and reports
18. Work under review or in progress
   a. Work submitted and under review
   b. Work in progress

D. Sponsored research and other grant awards
   (Provide the following: Name of PI; Years of the grant award; Title of the grant; Grant sponsor; Amount funded per year, Total amount of grant; Award # if applicable; Role on the grant; Percentage of time on the grant per year.)

E. Unfunded submitted grant proposals

F. Invited keynote presentations or lectures

G. Editorships, curatorships, etc.
   1. Journals and other peer-reviewed publications
   2. Exhibitions, performances, displays, etc.

H. Economic contributions and entrepreneurship
   1. Start-up businesses
   2. Commercialization of discoveries
   3. Other

I. Intellectual property
   1. Software
   2. Patents
   3. Disclosures (pre-patent)

IV. Teaching and Advising Effectiveness

A. Candidate’s teaching statement
   Provide a 2-3 page narrative that describes your teaching philosophy and how it relates to
the courses you have taught.

B. Courses taught
State your teaching load expectations for each year since appointment to Johns Hopkins University (Table 1). Provide a chronological list of courses taught since the date of appointment to Johns Hopkins University (Table 2). Include a description of the course, number of class meetings, number of students, delivery method (i.e., face-to-face, web-enhanced, or online, use of a teaching assistant, if any). Include an explanation about whether teaching load was reduced due to participation on a grant or other administrative assignment.

Table 1. Expected teaching load by academic year in chronological order from date of hire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Expected teaching load per contract with explanation for any discrepancies from the contract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Courses Taught by Semester in chronological order from date of hire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course # and Title</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
<th>No. Class Meetings</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Delivery Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Recognition and awards for teaching or advising effectiveness

D. A chronological list of non-credit courses, workshops, and other related outreach and/or extension teaching since the date of appointment to Johns Hopkins University

E. Completed theses, dissertations, other graduate degree projects, major undergraduate research projects, and honors theses directed

F. Supervision of visiting scholars or postdoctoral fellows

G. Current academic advising responsibilities—graduate and undergraduate

H. Course, curriculum, and program development

I. Student evaluations of instruction of all courses taught since the date of appointment to Johns Hopkins University (Include PDF file of course evaluations and complete table 3)
Table 3: Course Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Total Course Enrollment</th>
<th># of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Progress on Relevant Objectives</th>
<th>Excellent Teacher</th>
<th>Overall Rating Average</th>
<th>Summary Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J. Peer evaluations of instruction (Provide list of individuals who have conducted a peer-review of your instruction. Include written evaluation as an appendix.)

K. Demonstrated efforts to improve one’s teaching effectiveness (Provide a statement regarding ways in which you have used evaluation data to improve teaching effectiveness)

V. Professional Service and Additional Outreach Activities

A. Candidate’s service statement
   Provide a 2-3 page narrative that describes your service commitments.

B. Professional service accomplishments
   1. Service as an officer of an academic or professional association
   2. Other service to one’s profession or field (e.g., service on committees)
   3. Professional meetings, panels, workshops, etc., led or organized
   4. Service on editorial boards
   5. Service as occasional reviewer for professional journal

C. Additional professional outreach and extension activities
   1. Professional achievements in program development, implementation, and evidence of impact
   2. Outreach and extension publications, including trade journals, newsletters, websites, blogs, multimedia items, etc.
   3. Presentations in area of expertise to community and civic organizations, including schools and alumni groups, etc.
   4. Peer evaluations of extension program(s)
5. Service on external boards, commissions, and advisory committees

6. Reviewer for grant submissions (paid/unpaid)

7. Expert witness/testimony

8. Consulting that is consistent with SOE/university priorities

D. International professional accomplishments

1. International recognition and awards

2. Other international activities

E. Awards for service

F. University and SOE service

1. University committees, panels, workshops, etc. led or organized

2. University service, including administrative responsibilities

3. Program area service

4. SOE service such as committee membership

5. Service to students—involvelement in co-curricular activities, advising student organizations, etc.