

University of North Texas Health Science Center at Fort Worth

School of Public Health (SPH)

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Adopted by the SPH Faculty

Approved: August 3, 2023

Updated: October 3, 2023

DocuSigned by:
Dharamsi
FAEE7DD414C747D...

Shafik Dharamsi, PhD
Dean

10/6/2023

Date

DocuSigned by:
Charles Taylor, PharmD
7B202D3F13864E1...

Charles Taylor, PharmD
Executive Vice President & Provost

10/10/2023

Date

The goals and objectives of the University of North Texas Health Science Center (HSC) can be achieved only through recruitment, development, and retention of outstanding faculty members. Promotion in rank and the granting of tenure are important benchmarks in the academic career of a faculty member, and in the continuing development of the School of Public Health (SPH) and the University.

The SPH Promotion and Tenure Process and Guidance (henceforth referred to as the Guidance) were developed to assist faculty members in applying for promotion, tenure, completing periodic peer reviews, completing three-year reviews, and to help guide the School's Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee in making its recommendations. This guidance is consistent with the Faculty Bylaws of the HSC and the Policies and Procedures of the HSC, including 6.104 Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Probationary Period (see also P6.002); 6.107 Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy (see also P6.003); 6.103 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Policy (see also P6.004), and are intended to elaborate and expand on the HSC criteria. The Guidance applies to all tenure track, promotion track (i.e., non-tenure track), and tenured faculty, as well as adjunct faculty. The Guidance does not alter or supersede prior contracts and/or agreements, or the HSC Faculty Bylaws or Policies and Procedures.

All updated HSC Policies and Procedures, as well as SPH Policies and Procedures, can be found in PolicyTech, the institutional policy repository. Because these policies and procedures are updated regularly, please access them online from the University intranet: <https://www.unthsc.edu/administrative/institutionalcompliance-office/unt-health-science-center-policies/>. In the application of University performance expectations, the P&T Committee should reference University-level rubrics for teaching, research, and service (see P6.003, Faculty Tenure and Promotion, Appendices A to D).

In addition, the University's Office of Faculty Affairs publishes annually updated timelines for Promotion and Tenure and for Periodic Peer Review, as well as content checklists. Check the Office of Faculty Affairs website for current information.

<https://www.unthsc.edu/office-of-faculty-affairs/annual-faculty-promotion-and-tenure/>

The Philosophy Supporting Scholarship in the SPH

Underlying the guidelines described herein is the notion of *scholarship*. In its most basic definition, scholarship is the possession of an elevated level of knowledge, expertise, and experience in a field and its application. Boyer (1990, 1996) defined five overlapping Pillars of Scholarship: engagement, discovery, application, integration, and teaching. The SPH relies on the Boyer model of scholarship as the philosophical foundation for the faculty guidelines described in this document.

What makes an activity “scholarship”?

The following list of characteristics of scholarship is adapted from *Recognizing Faculty Work*, by Robert Diamond and Bronwyn Adam (1993):

- The activity requires a high level of knowledge, expertise, and experience in a field and the application of knowledge toward improving the quality and conditions of life in society.
- The activity breaks new ground or is innovative.
- The activity can be replicated and elaborated.
- The work and its results can be documented.
- The work and its results can be peer reviewed and disseminated.
- The activity has significance or impact beyond the contribution to academia.

Synergistic Impact

While evaluation criteria are divided among teaching, research/scholarship, and service; it is recognized that synergies occur in the areas where these constructs overlap; with the ultimate synergistic effects occurring at the intersection of all three. SPH faculty are encouraged to identify areas of synergy and undertake intentional efforts to maximize the impact potential of their scholarly work.

It is recognized that the School of Public Health is a multi-disciplinary School, thus, the types of accomplishments required to meet SPH criteria for tenure and promotion may vary amongst disciplines and must be considered in tenure and promotion evaluations.

Promotion versus Tenure Considerations

Promotion focuses on past academic and public health practice achievements, and their alignment with the Guidance of the School and University. The awarding of tenure focuses on the likelihood for continued growth and sustainment of such activities into the future. Prospects of continued teamwork, collaboration, and recognition of the faculty member as a collegial and valuable member of the University and surrounding community are also considered for the awarding of tenure. For tenure-track faculty, the awarding of tenure indicates a high probability of continued success in externally funded research/scholarship, teaching excellence, and professional service. For tenure consideration, the tenure-track faculty member’s total scholarly efforts in research/scholarship, teaching, and service should reflect a trajectory consistent with promotion to Professor in due course.

Promotion and Tenure Committee

Overall Expectations

To function as an advisory committee to the Dean, including to review and evaluate all assigned

applications for promotion and tenure and make recommendations to the Dean.

- To foster the development and implementation of the Guidance for promotion and tenure as allowed within SPH and by HSC Faculty Bylaws.
- To maintain the confidentiality of all personnel records and matters under its jurisdiction.

Composition

The Committee that evaluates and provides recommendations on progress (i.e., three-year reviews for tenure-track faculty), promotion, tenure, and periodic peer review shall be composed of a minimum of seven members appointed by the Dean from Associate and Professor faculty within the SPH. The Dean and Department Chairs cannot serve on this committee. The members should be representative of all tracks and departmental affiliations. The committee may include persons in positions of leadership (associate/assistant deans/program directors), but the majority must be comprised of faculty in non-leadership positions. Each P&T Committee member will have one vote. The Dean will appoint a tenured Full Professor with tenure and promotion committee experience as the presiding P&T Committee Chair.

Only members of this Committee have full access to all promotion and/or tenure or periodic peer review portfolio materials and have voting privileges. However, all full-time faculty members of the School may request a copy of a candidate's Interfolio Faculty Profile. The Committee may also request input from other faculty members who are familiar with the candidate. After discussion, the Committee will meet in closed session for final deliberation and voting as required. All discussions at P&T meetings shall be confidential.

Votes for promotion require a quorum of Committee members at the rank or higher of the Candidate under review. Votes for tenure require a quorum of tenured Committee members at the rank or higher of the candidate under review. A quorum will consist of at least five eligible voting Committee members. If there is not a quorum of qualified voters on the School's regular faculty, HSC faculty outside the School may be called on to participate. Reviews will be guided by the SPH Faculty Workload Guidelines, the SPH P&T Process and Guidance, Department Chair's annual faculty expectations memoranda, End of Year Performance Reports, and HSC Faculty Bylaws or Policies and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Periodic Peer Review deliberations (6.104 Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Probationary Period (see also P6.002); 6.107 Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy (see also P6.003); and 6.103 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Policy.

Each Committee member is required to disclose a conflict of interest prior to a discussion or vote and refraining from voting.¹ The P&T Committee Chair will arrange to temporarily replace

¹ Conflicts of interest can arise if a Committee member has a personal relationship (e.g., spouse) with a candidate, or is aware of any prejudice that seems likely to impair judgment, or if the P&T member believes recusal is necessary to preserve the real or perceived integrity of the Committee's process.

the Committee member by a vote from all remaining P&T Committee members if needed to assure a quorum.

Responsibilities of the Committee

The P&T Committee is responsible for reviews and recommendations of all tenure and promotion track (i.e., non-tenure track faculty) faculty, and tenured faculty, as well as adjunct faculty, including:

- Three-year reviews for tenure-track faculty.
- Recommendations for promotion (6.107 Faculty Tenure and Promotion and P6.003).
- Recommendations for tenure (6.107 Faculty Tenure and Promotion and P6.003).
- Periodic Peer Review (see 6.103 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Policy (see also P6.004).
- Periodic Peer Review or Professional Improvement Review as requested by the Dean per 6.103 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty Policy (see also P6.004).
- Recommendations for tenure-track faculty and promotion-track (i.e., non-tenure track faculty) faculty initial appointments, rank, tenure status, and/or years toward tenure, as written in HSC Faculty Bylaws or Policies and Procedures.
- Initial appointment and rank for adjunct faculty members are determined by the Department Chair and the Dean in alignment with appropriate SPH guidelines for teaching at rank. The SPH P&T Committee will make recommendations for promotion for these adjunct faculty when requested by the Department Chair or the Dean.

When conducting reviews or making recommendations, the P&T Committee will consider P&T criteria based on allocation of faculty effort and whether the metrics are in concordance with the faculty member's assigned responsibilities. It is the Candidate's responsibility to provide evidence in support of their application, which can be objectively substantiated, to demonstrate their career progression and impact on the field of academic public health and/or public health practice. The P&T committee is authorized to make requests of candidates to obtain evidence or documentation to assist them in their deliberations.

The P&T Process and Guidance will be periodically reviewed as needed, or every three years at minimum. Recommended changes will be brought to the SPH faculty for review and approval via formal and anonymous voting. To be considered approved, a minimum of 80% of the faculty members must express their approval for the recommended revisions. This threshold has been set to foster consensus among the faculty and to ensure that any significant changes garner substantial backing.

Promotion to Associate Professor, Promotion to Professor, Conferral of Tenure, and Periodic Peer Review

Promotion focuses on past academic and public health practice achievements. Tenure focuses on the likelihood for continued growth and sustainment of such activities into the future, as well as prospects of continued teamwork, collaboration, and recognition of the faculty member

as a collegial and valuable member of the University and surrounding community. Promotion and tenure are distinct decisions. Tenure track and promotion track (i.e., non-tenure track faculty) are encouraged to apply for promotion “when ready,” as determined by specific metrics for teaching, research/scholarship, and service identified in this document. Promotion decisions are based on past performance in the assigned areas of responsibility identified in the faculty member’s annual Faculty Expectations Memos. All faculty members will be evaluated in teaching, research/scholarship, and service. All faculty must be judged to be Outstanding in at least two areas and Quality (proficient) in the third category to receive promotion and/or tenure.

In considering applications for tenure from eligible faculty members, the P&T Committee will consider the future professional trajectory of the Candidate. In evaluating applications for tenure, consideration must be given to the Candidate’s potential for sustained scholarship in all of its forms. Candidates deserving of tenure will be recognized by their peers as possessing an unwavering commitment to student development and success. Successful candidates shall also be judged to be capable of making important contributions to science throughout their career. Tenure will be granted only to those faculty stewards who embrace service to the University, community, and their profession as a fundamental obligation of the professoriate. In most but not all cases, faculty are expected to engage relevant communities and prepare students for practice in community and academic settings. In addition, the granting of tenure will be limited to those who demonstrate their character through excellent actions (see P6.003, Faculty Tenure and Promotion Review, Appendix D, Type – Values and Professionalism).

Periodic Peer Review focuses on productivity in the recent past. The purpose of this review is to provide performance feedback, and when necessary, assist that tenured faculty member with restoring their performance to the required level. A rating of “deficient” in one or more categories of performance will require the development of a Performance Improvement Plan. Periodic Peer Review also allows for corrective actions to be taken in cases where a tenured faculty member is considered to be performing below the standard expected for their rank (see 6.107, 6.103, and P6.004 for details).

Three-Year Review for Tenure-Track Faculty

The three-year review for tenure-track faculty is an SPH requirement rather than a UNTHSC policy. Tenure-track faculty will have a three-year review at the start of their fourth and seventh years of service, following the first full year joining the School’s faculty on September 1. Reviews will continue to be performed following each third full year of service until tenure is conferred or the end of the probation period (see 6.107 Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy, 6.104 Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Probationary Period; and P6.002).

Three-year reviews are requested by the Department Chair. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide their Department Chair with all needed documents as required by the SPH Promotion and Tenure Process and Guidance and following technical guidance provided by

the Dean's Office. The Department Chair will forward the faculty member's complete packet of supporting documents to the Chair of the P&T Committee. By August 15 of the third year of service, the Candidate's supporting documents will be available for the P&T Committee to review. The Chair of the P&T Committee will deliver the Committee's report to the Department Chair and the Dean no later than the subsequent date of March 15. The Department Chair will deliver the review to the Candidate no later than March 30.

Faculty Considerations in Applying for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion and tenure decisions are distinct considerations in the School. In many cases, faculty at the Assistant Professor rank may decide to apply for promotion with, or without, tenure after five years of successful service at HSC. Faculty at the Associate Professor rank without tenure may decide to apply for tenure after three years of successful service at HSC. Regardless, the most basic question for the Candidate to consider is: "Am I ready to be reviewed?" In all cases, faculty should consult with their Department Chair before deciding to apply for promotion and/or tenure. Faculty should expect that favorable promotion and tenure decisions will depend heavily on earning "Outstanding" ratings in their End of Year Performance Reports.

There is no penalty for applying early for tenure and receiving an adverse decision.

Furthermore, if denied tenure, these outcomes will not prejudice subsequent P&T Committee decisions. For tenure track faculty without tenure, the probationary period for an initial appointment at the Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor rank is nine, six, and six years, respectively, from the date of a tenure track appointment (see 6.104 Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Probationary Period; see also P6.002). All tenure track Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors entering their last year of the probationary period must be evaluated for tenure, unless an extension of the probationary period is granted (see 6.104 Faculty Appointment, Reappointment and Probationary Period; see also P6.002).

Interfolio Faculty Information System

The HSC faculty tenure and promotion review process is managed by the Interfolio Faculty Information System. When faculty decide to seek promotion and/or tenure, it is their responsibility to update their Faculty Profile and to upload all of their supporting materials in the Interfolio system. The Dean's Office is responsible for providing faculty members with guidance for uploading materials into Interfolio that are needed for evaluating specific criteria found in the SPH Promotion and Tenure Process and Guidance. Faculty members who fail to upload appropriate materials into Interfolio by the appropriate deadline may be evaluated by the P&T Committee as Deficient in one or more performance areas.

Timeline for Faculty Promotion and Tenure Review

Promotion and tenure guidelines and dates follow HSC Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy (6.107), Procedure (P6.003), and Promotion and/or Tenure Packet Checklist/Contents. If a

faculty member wishes to be reviewed for promotion or tenure, the individual must meet HSC deadlines. The Office of Faculty Affairs posts annually updated timelines for Promotion and Tenure and for Periodic Peer Review as well as Promotion and/or Tenure Packet Checklists/Content. Check the Office of Faculty Affairs website for current information.

External and Internal Reviewers

Promotion, tenure, and period peer review applications will include external reviews. A minimum of five names will be provided by the Candidate to the Department Chair. To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, external reviewers will hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor at peer or aspirational universities. If being promoted to the rank of Professor, external reviewers will hold the rank of Professor at peer or aspirational universities. External reviewers will have no direct involvement in the Candidate's work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor, co-author, or co-investigator). Promotion, tenure, and period peer review applications will include internal reviews. The Candidate will submit to the Department Chair two names of faculty members outside the SPH, but within the HSC who can comment on the Candidate's qualifications and institutional contributions.

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Tenure/Tenure Track Research Guidance: Assistant to Associate Professor

Research Performance

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (Tenure-Track), a record of success that demonstrates excellence and a growing local, regional, and national reputation in research/scholarly work is required. It is recognized that the quantity and quality of scholarly work, publications, dissemination outlets, and levels and sources of external funding may vary based on numerous factors such as research and practice domain, workload responsibilities, discipline, and other factors.

- Faculty members must demonstrate growth and impact of their research/scholarly work, its dissemination, and implementation as appropriate. The quantity and quality of a candidate's scholarly contributions, as well as a continuing record of external funding commensurate with the type and area of research, are important factors considered in decisions for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.
- The HSC SPH is committed to systematically closing the gap between what we *know* and what we *do*. Engaged, applied, participatory, translational and implementation work and community-partnered scholarship to facilitate the uptake and initiation of evidence-based practice and research into regular use by practitioners, policymakers, educators, community organizations and/or academics are highly valued as appropriate. Additionally, academic-community partnerships that foster the co-development or adaptation of interventions or policies that advance health and/or address health equity and address existing gaps in evidence-based practices are also highly valued as appropriate. Faculty members are highly encouraged to demonstrate their past, current, and future efforts toward these effects as appropriate.
- A substantive role in the planning, implementation, analyses, and/or writing of the scholarly output is essential. Scholarly output includes peer-reviewed journal articles and refereed books and book chapters written in academic and/or trade presses. Peer-reviewed publications should be able to be retrieved through sources such as, but not limited to, Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, and similarly reputable databases. In addition to peer-reviewed publications, scholarly activities that contribute to the advancement of quality and conditions of life in society will also be considered as part of the candidate's research portfolio (e.g., development of new programs or applications; contributions to policy, systems, or program development; research training curricula; implementation guidelines; and authorship of books or policy papers that become standard in the field or lead to a paradigm shift). Scholarly work should demonstrate high impact, significant advancement of knowledge, programs, practice, *or* policy, and be strongly supportive for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Presentations at academic and professional conferences at the local and national levels are expected.
- Recognition of scholarly stature can also be documented, for example, by membership on grant review panels, study sections, data safety and monitoring boards, research advisory groups, community boards, editorial boards, and paper reviews for journals.

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Additionally, community request and demand for consultancies and contractual projects demonstrates the capacity of the faculty to provide relevant professional research contributions for local development. *Note that these research and scholarly activities are synergistic with service and thus can also be considered service activities.*

- SPH's commitment to community engagement and publicly engaged scholarship aligns with the values of public scholarship and embraces the unique relationships and contributions between faculty and community. Public scholarship is an intellectually and methodologically rigorous endeavor that is responsive to public audiences and non-academic peer review. It is scholarly work that advances one or more academic disciplines by emphasizing production, integration and implementation of knowledge with community stakeholders. SPH recognizes public scholars and embraces their unique relationships and contributions to the community. Public scholarship is conducted in partnership with identified communities to address their needs and concerns. As such, public scholarship tends to be highly collaborative, is outcomes focused, and results in a range of scholarly products that benefit and are valued by the community. In addition to standard peer-reviewed papers, scholarly outcomes may include exhibits, curricular products, community projects, policy briefs, practice related products, educational websites, and the like. The nature of public scholarship is diverse, and the evidence used to support it may differ from traditional forms of research. Non-traditional dissemination outlets and alternative metrics will be acknowledged as acceptable forms of documentation. Peer review of public scholarship must consider the faculty members' investment in such activities as building community relationships, engaging in reciprocal learning and identification of problems that need to be studied, developing and implementing collaborative methods, and writing grants to support collaboration. Peer review must also evaluate the types and the appropriateness of the outcomes produced based on the faculty member's goals, methods, and public/community partners. Given the importance of collaboration in this work, external evaluators must have knowledge of the processes involved in public scholarship activities and should have knowledge of the project content, rather than only experience based on the evaluating faculty member's own discipline, body of work, and perspectives of scholarship. Other research/scholarship activities not captured in the above examples will also be considered based on specific information provided by the faculty member and must demonstrate high impact, significant advancement of knowledge, programs, practice, and policy.

In addition to public health research and public scholarship, the **scholarship of teaching** is highly valued for all faculty and demonstrates investment in advancing the education and training of future health professionals as evidenced by (but not limited to):

- Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), such as peer-reviewed publications,

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

presentations, internal and external grants related to teaching (may be applicable to research domain)

- Citations of SoTL
- Received teaching and mentoring awards and honors from department, school, university, professional associations related to mentee research activities
- Web articles, blogs, webinars, databases, or other dissemination activities on teaching
- Editor reviewed teaching presentations and publications
- Invitations to participate in teaching presentations, publications, workshops, and seminars
- Use and/or reviews of your textbooks or teaching materials
- Dissemination of teaching materials or methods with outside users (e.g., community)
- Evidence of course and curriculum development
- Contributions to professional organizations related to teaching or curriculum development

Criteria for Outstanding Research Performance:

For faculty members to achieve Outstanding Performance in research/scholarly work for consideration of promotion from Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor (Tenure-Track) it is essential that they provide evidence of independent scholarship and/or team-based research, the uptake of their research/scholarly work into use by scholars, practitioners, policymakers, educators, community organizations and/or academics, and a national reputation. A steady record of having received external funding support for research/scholarly activities is expected. Candidates should also provide evidence of dissemination of scholarly research standards and expertise to mentees, including masters and doctoral students.

Criteria for Quality Research Performance:

For faculty members to achieve Quality Performance in research for consideration of promotion from Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor (Tenure-Track) it is essential that they provide at least *emerging* evidence of independent scholarship and/or team-based research, *well-documented plans for the uptake of* their research/scholarly work into regular use by scholars, practitioners, policymakers, educators, community organizations and/or academics, and provide evidence of an *emerging* national reputation. An *emerging* record of seeking and having received external funding support for research/scholarly activities is expected. Candidates should also provide *emerging* evidence of dissemination of scholarly research standards and expertise to mentees, including masters and doctoral students.

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Tenure/Tenure Track Research Guidance: Associate Professor to Professor

Research Performance

For promotion to the rank of Professor (Tenure-Track) a substantial and sustained record of success in externally funded research/scholarly activity is required. For faculty members who primarily undertake more traditional forms of scholarly activity as independent or team-based scholars, the quantity and quality of peer-reviewed publications and external funding to support their research enterprise are key factors considered in decisions for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

- For faculty who undertake publicly engaged scholarship, in addition to standard peer-reviewed papers, a body of diverse scholarly “products” will be considered, including but not limited to exhibits, curricular products, community projects, policy briefs, practice related products, educational websites, and the like. It is recognized that the typical number of scholarly products or research publications may vary by academic discipline and the nature of scholarly focus. A substantive role in the planning, implementation, analyses, or writing of the scholarly output is essential. Peer-reviewed publications should be able to be retrieved through sources such as, but not limited to, Web of Science, Scopus, PubMed, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, and similarly reputable databases. Other scholarly activities will also be considered as part of the candidate’s research portfolio (e.g., publicly engaged scholarship, development of important new computer programs or applications; contributions to policy, system, or program development; research training curricula; implementation guidelines; and authorship of books or policy papers that become standard in the field or lead to a paradigm shift; cf reference to *Public Scholarship* above). In instances where a candidate’s portfolio contains fewer outputs, they should be of high impact and demonstrated importance to the candidate’s academic field and the public/community served. A substantial number of presentations at professional conferences at the local and national levels is expected.
- Recognition of scholarly stature can also be documented, for example, by membership on grant review panels, study sections, data safety and monitoring boards, research advisory groups, community boards, editorial boards, and manuscript reviews for journals. Note that these research activities are synergistic with service and thus can also be considered service activities. Other research/scholarship activities not included in the above will also be considered based on specific information provided by the faculty member.

Criteria for Outstanding Research Performance:

For faculty members to achieve Outstanding Performance in research for consideration of promotion to the rank of Professor (Tenure-Track) it is essential that they provide substantial

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

and sustained evidence of independent and/or team investigative work, and a national reputation. A sustained record of having received external funding support for research activities is expected. Candidates should provide significant evidence of dissemination of scholarly work and expertise to mentees, including masters and doctoral students. Candidates should also provide evidence of transmission of scholarly research standards and expertise to early career faculty.

Publicly engaged scholarship, implementation science and community-partnered scholarship, and other impactful work that facilitates the uptake of evidence-based practice and research into regular use by practitioners, policymakers, educators, community organizations or academics should become an increasingly prominent part of the faculty member's portfolio as an independent scholar and/or as part of a research team(s). Also highly valued is participatory work with community partners that works to fill gaps in evidence-based policy and practice through co-created intervention/policy design and development.

Criteria for Quality Research Performance:

For faculty members to achieve Quality Performance in research for consideration of promotion to the rank of Professor (Tenure-Track) it is essential that they provide sustained evidence of independent and/or team investigative work and a national reputation. A record of having received external funding support for research activities is expected. Candidates should provide evidence of transmission of scholarly research standards and expertise to mentees, including masters and doctoral students.

The gradual realization of well-established and documented plans for the uptake of research/scholarly work into regular use by practitioners, policymakers, educators, community organizations or academics should *emerge* as part of the faculty members portfolio as an independent scholar and/or as part of a research team.

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Tenure-Track Teaching Guidance: Assistant to Associate Professor *and* Associate Professor to Professor

Teaching in higher education involves multiple facets, including pedagogy, mentorship, and scholarship of teaching. Pedagogy reflects the method and practice for how one teaches, that is, the use of a variety of appropriate and evidence-informed teaching methods to foster learning. Pedagogy includes learning outcomes, i.e., the results/impact of teaching and learning activities toward the development of foundational competencies. Mentorship reflects a learning relationship to assist trainees in developing competencies needed for success as a public health practitioner, health administrator, policymaker, and/or scholar. The scholarship of teaching includes systematic investigation into teaching practices and student/trainee learning (<https://cei.umn.edu/teaching-resources/guide-scholarship-teaching-and-learning>)

Practice-based teaching is “a transdisciplinary, collaborative process that engages the student in experiential learning. It includes strategies that enable students to critically reflect and synthesize learning to enhance professional competence.” (see *Demonstrating Excellence In Practice-Based Teaching For Public Health*, 2004, ASPPH). Practice-based teaching includes a shared enterprise between academia and practice, community involvement in teaching, and the performance of scholarly service as part of learning. Practice-based teaching in public health and health administration develops students who can meet the broad, diverse, and multidisciplinary needs of the public health and health administration workforce in various agencies and organizations that serve the community. Practice-based teaching activities and approaches encourage students to apply academic concepts and theories to current public health and health management related issues in real-world settings (inside and outside the classroom) to support meaningful and relevant learning. Skills and competencies promote student excellence in the “art of problem framing, the art of implementation, and the art of interdisciplinary adaptation and improvisation.” (see *Demonstrating Excellence in Practice-Based Teaching for Public Health*, 2004, ASPPH). Faculty members ought to employ practice-based teaching when appropriate, such as assigning applied projects for student assessments, designing experiential learning and/or field visits, and inviting public health practitioners within and outside of HSC to provide guest lectures.

Criteria for Outstanding Teaching Performance:

Outstanding Performance in teaching will be assessed by a variety of factors including the faculty member’s continued commitment to quality teaching as detailed below. This includes use of innovative, evidence-informed teaching methodologies and, pedagogical approaches (e.g., service-learning, active learning techniques, and/or practice-based learning). Further, outstanding teaching can be assessed by curricular rigor as identified through methods such as peer-review of teaching, and through curricular innovation, as well as developing new courses, revising existing courses, designing novel or signature assignments or completing training certificates in particular teaching practices and subsequently integrating that training in the classroom. Outstanding performance in teaching also indicates a dedication to teaching as part of scholarly practice through a willingness to reflect on past teaching successes and failures and

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

identify and implement strategies for improvement to enhance learning outcomes. Student evaluations of instruction should be considered corroborating or indirect sources of evidence and not be the primary basis for asserting outstanding teaching performance.

Faculty performance can be assessed in a variety of ways. The items cited below are examples only. It is not expected that faculty members will accomplish all items cited. Evidence of outstanding teaching may include:

Pedagogy:

- Stimulating and building skills in critical thinking, interaction, innovation in teaching methods, and effectiveness of teaching in their courses. This is documented through demonstrating use of high impact educational practices and related learning outcomes. *See examples at the end of this section.*
- Responsiveness to student feedback including, but not limited to, feedback provided in student evaluations.
- High quality peer reviews of teaching, including certifying online courses through Quality Matters (if applicable), review of teaching materials, and formative observations of teaching.
- Working to improve teaching through workshops & certifications and other continuing pedagogical trainings with demonstrated evidence of integration of that training into the classroom.
- Continued evidence of course and curriculum development and revisions.
- Organizing seminars and/or professional development sessions.
- Invited lectures in other courses.
- Using varied and multiple assessment methods.
- Providing performance feedback to students early and throughout the semester.
- Applying measures equitably to assess the performance of all students (e.g., rubrics).
- Evidence of exhibiting responsiveness to student learning needs.
- Evidence of student learning, which can include course-related student artifacts – papers, exams, lab manuals, reflection journals, performance on tests before and after instruction (including feedback).
- Student end of course ratings in tabular form (used to show responsiveness to students not as a sole evaluation of teaching).
- Mid-course student evaluations, including representative themes from classroom assessments. This step will often include a description of an instructional improvement cycle: you see a problem, reflect on it (through the literature, talk with colleagues, etc.), try something, and assess how it worked.
- Unsolicited feedback from current and former students (letters, notes, emails) and/or letters from employers of former students.
- Evidence of student achievement, such as awards, graduate school admission, career progression including job placement of former students.
- Teaching awards, honors, and recognitions.
- Developing and/or delivering workforce development training sessions/programs.

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

- Providing pedagogical support/training/observation/feedback to peers.
- Implementing practice-based educational practices, as discussed above.

Examples of High Impact Education Practices in the classroom include:

- In-class presentations
- Problem, situation-based learning or case studies
- Project Based Learning (PBL)
- Team activities (TBL)
- Simulation exercises
- External field activities or service learning (a systematic approach to applied learning involving repeated cycles of student service and reflection)
- Strategic/consulting projects
- Reflective learning

Mentorship:

- Evidence of advising and mentoring doctoral, graduate, and undergraduate students, such as, professional development activities, dissemination of products, community partnerships, and student achievements.
- Substantial contribution to doctoral student training which can be demonstrated in several ways:
 - This includes serving as the Chair or member of doctoral committees, teaching courses in the doctoral program, contributing to doctoral seminars and workshops, mentoring doctoral students to publish papers, as well as other professional activities for doctoral students.
- Demonstrated mentoring of post-doctoral fellows and early career faculty, as appropriate (expected at Associate to Full Professor ranks).
- Directing undergraduate and graduate student projects and internships.
- Service on teaching-related committees or serving as a faculty advisor to a student club or organization.
- Evidence of scholarship of teaching (refer to scholarship section for more detail).

Criteria for Quality Teaching Performance:

Quality (proficient) Performance in teaching will be determined by several factors, including evidence from sources such as course syllabi or other material, peer-review results, participation in the quality of instruction program, and other sources. Student evaluations of instruction will be considered corroborating or indirect sources of evidence and as such should not be the primary evidence. Overall, quality teaching includes items listed above for Outstanding, and includes a well-established and documented plan for high-impact education practices, but is noted that the evidence is *emerging* and will not be as substantial with documented outcomes related to pedagogy, mentorship, or scholarship. Evidence of teaching may come from multiple sources, including faculty's descriptions of informal efforts to gather student feedback and engage in continuous improvement, student evaluations, peer review, sample activities/rubrics/assignment descriptions, and alumni feedback.

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Tenure-Track Service Guidance: Assistant to Associate Professor *and* Associate Professor to Professor

Faculty members are expected to provide service to the university, their profession or discipline, and the public/community. Service to the university is critical to the carrying out of the university's mission. Examples of such service include, but are not limited to, membership or leadership of unit committees or task forces; advising student organizations; involvement in faculty governance; coordination of programs, committees, and technical support; and recruitment.

Service to the profession is also expected, especially as faculty members develop their careers. Professional service includes activities such as serving on committees for a professional organization; planning a conference or event; contributing to the production of a professional journal; and reviewing manuscripts, grants, programs, or textbooks.

Particularly important to a school of public health is extramural service to the community. CEPH defines extramural service below:

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. Faculty maintain ongoing practice links with public health agencies, especially at state and local levels." (CEPH, 2021, p42)

Service to the community is a form of citizenship; it should not be confused with the Scholarship of Application, which develops new solutions to problems (as opposed to the application of existing discipline-related knowledge), benefits a single or small group of organizations (as opposed to having broad application), is not disseminated to disciplines (as opposed to publication in journals or on websites), and is not externally evaluated (as opposed to the peer review of artifacts).

For **outstanding service**, faculty accomplishments should include some combination of university, SPH, professional, and community service. The items cited below are examples only. It is not expected that faculty members will accomplish all items cited. Evidence of outstanding service may include:

TENURE/TENURE TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Committee/special project leadership (academic unit, school, university, system)

- Public health-related community involvement
- Working in or with professional organizations
- Relating public health expertise to the community
- Development of cooperative ventures between the university and community
- Participating in NIH or NSF study section or equivalent grant review process
- Editorship of an indexed international or national peer-reviewed journal of respected scientific quality
- Elected to a leadership position in a respected international or national research society
- Other service to national or international research organizations
- Service on local advisory boards or review groups, or other community service provided as an SPH representative

For **quality service**, faculty accomplishments should include *emerging* efforts to contribute to university, SPH, professional, and community service. The items cited below are examples only. It is not expected that faculty members will accomplish all items cited. Evidence of quality service may include:

- Advising or supporting student organizations
- Committee/special project participation (academic unit, college, university, system)
- Public health-related community involvement
- Working in or with professional organizations
- Relating public health expertise to the community;
- Participating in cooperative ventures between the university and community.
- Participation in professional society meetings and committees
- Reviewer for refereed journals

PROMOTION TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

PROMOTION TRACK FACULTY (i.e., NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY)

Professors of Practice are promotion-track faculty who engage in practice-based teaching, scholarship, and service. Professors of Practice may hold non-tenure track appointments at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor levels. Professors of Practice bring substantive practice and/or pedagogical experience in public health and/or closely related disciplines that align with the knowledge base, skills, and/or competencies associated with CEPH accredited public health degree programs. Exemplary Professors of Practice seek and implement teaching, research, and service initiatives that hold maximal benefit to multiple stakeholder groups, including but not limited to service learning projects benefiting students and communities; equitable participatory research studies driven by the needs and questions of community partners; community-based assessment, evaluation, and implementation science studies; workforce development, capacity building, task force, and strategic planning initiatives that include student co-learning components.

The quality, quantity, and continuity of a faculty member's work will be evaluated under three main promotion evaluation criteria (teaching, scholarship, and service; see below). These criteria may be weighted differently according to the faculty's career trajectory and work responsibilities, but consistent with promotion at HSC; faculty must be evaluated as outstanding in at least two of three areas.

Boyer (1990, 1996) defined five separate, but overlapping, Pillars of Scholarship. These five forms of scholarship include: engagement, discovery, application, integration, and teaching. The SPH relies on the Boyer model of scholarship as the philosophical foundation for the faculty guidelines described in this document.

For promotion track faculty, scholarly contributions may revolve heavily around the scholarship of application and/or the scholarship of teaching. The **scholarship of application** represents a dynamic process where knowledge is gained or reinforced through application of professional expertise in the process of partnering on the creation and implementation of solutions for a healthier community and/or through contracts and consultancy work. It is distinct from citizenship or traditional academic service, such as participating on committees or reviewing manuscripts, which is also worthy but is not scholarship.

In the **scholarship of teaching**, faculty seek to build pedagogical knowledge on teaching strategies, techniques, curriculum development, and transformational learning. It involves systematic inquiry, dissemination, and peer or related stakeholder review.

PROMOTION TRACK
FACULTY GUIDANCE

**Promotion Track Teaching Guidance:
Assistant to Associate Professor *and* Associate Professor to Professor**

Teaching in higher education involves multiple facets, including pedagogy, mentorship, and scholarship of teaching. Pedagogy reflects the method and practice for how one teaches, that is, the use of a variety of appropriate and up-to-date teaching methods to foster learning. Pedagogy includes learning outcomes, or the results/impact of the teaching on students. Mentorship reflects a learning relationship to assist trainees in developing competencies needed for success in public health. The scholarship of teaching includes systematic investigation into teaching practices and student/trainee learning (<https://cei.umn.edu/teaching-resources/guide-scholarship-teaching-and-learning>)

Practice-based teaching is “a transdisciplinary, collaborative process that engages the student in experiential learning. It includes strategies that enable students to critically reflect and synthesize learning to enhance professional competence.” (Demonstrating Excellence in Practice-Based Teaching For Public Health, 2004, ASPPH). Practice-based teaching is distinguished from traditional, public health teaching in the following ways: shared enterprise between academia and practice, community involvement in teaching, and the performance of scholarly service as part of learning. Practice-based teaching in public health develops students who can meet the broad, diverse, and multidisciplinary needs of the public health workforce in agencies and organizations that serve the community. Practice-based teaching activities and approaches encourage students to apply academic concepts and theories to current public health issues in real-world settings (inside and outside the classroom) to support meaningful and relevant learning. Skills and competencies promote student excellence in the “art of problem framing, the art of implementation, and the art of interdisciplinary adaptation and improvisation.” (Demonstrating Excellence in Practice-Based Teaching for Public Health, 2004, ASPPH).

Criteria for Outstanding Teaching Performance:

Outstanding Performance in teaching will be assessed by a variety of factors including the faculty member’s continued commitment to quality teaching as detailed below. Outstanding teaching performance is defined as consistent evidence while quality teaching performance is defined as emerging evidence. This includes use of innovative teaching, pedagogical methodologies and approaches (e.g., service-learning, active learning techniques). Further, outstanding teaching can be assessed by curricular rigor as identified through methods such as peer-review of teaching, and through curricular innovation, such as designing novel or signature assignments or completing training certificates in particular teaching practices and subsequently integrating that training in the classroom. Outstanding performance in teaching also indicates a dedication to teaching as part of scholarly practice through a willingness to reflect on past teaching successes and failures and identify and implement strategies for improvement to enhance learning outcomes. Student evaluations of instruction should be considered corroborating or indirect sources of evidence and not be the primary basis for asserting outstanding teaching performance.

PROMOTION TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Faculty performance can be assessed in a variety of ways. The items cited below are examples only. It is not expected that faculty members will accomplish all items cited. Evidence of outstanding teaching may include:

Pedagogy:

- Stimulating critical thinking, interaction, innovation in teaching methods, and effectiveness of teaching in their courses. This is documented through demonstrating use of high impact educational practices and related learning outcomes. See examples at the end of this section.
- Responsiveness to student feedback including but not limited to feedback provided in student evaluations.
- High quality peer reviews of teaching, including certifying online courses through Quality Matters (if applicable), review of teaching materials, and formative observations of teaching.
- Working to improve teaching through workshops & certifications and other continuing pedagogical trainings with demonstrated evidence of integration of that training into the classroom.
- Continued evidence of course and curriculum development and revisions.
- Organizing seminars and/or professional development sessions.
- Invited lectures in other courses.
- Using varied and multiple assessment methods.
- Providing performance feedback to students early and throughout the semester.
- Applying measures equitably to assess the performance of all students (e.g., rubrics).
- Evidence of exhibiting responsiveness to student learning needs.
- Evidence of student learning, which can include course-related student artifacts – papers, exams, lab manuals, reflection journals, performance on tests before and after instruction (including feedback).
- Student end of course ratings in tabular form (used to show responsiveness to students not as a sole evaluation of teaching).
- Mid-course student evaluations, including representative themes from classroom assessments. This step will often include a description of an instructional improvement cycle: you see a problem, reflect on it (through the literature, talk with colleagues, etc.), try something, and assess how it worked.
- Unsolicited feedback from current and former students (letters, notes, emails) and/or letters from employers of former students.
- Evidence of student achievement, such as awards, graduate school admission, career progression including job placement of former students.
- Teaching awards, honors, and recognitions.
- Developing and/or delivering workforce development training sessions/programs.
- Providing pedagogical support/training/observation/feedback to peers.

PROMOTION TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

Examples of High Impact Education Practices in the classroom include:

- In-class presentations
- Problem, situation-based learning or case studies
- Project-based learning
- Team-based learning activities
- Simulation exercises
- External field activities or service learning (a systematic approach to applied learning involving repeated cycles of student service and reflection)
- Strategic/consulting projects
- Reflective learning.

Mentorship:

- Evidence of advising and mentoring doctoral, graduate, and undergraduate students, such as, professional development activities, dissemination of products, community partnerships, and student achievements.
- Substantial contribution to doctoral student training which can be demonstrated in several ways:
 - This includes serving as a member of doctoral committees, teaching courses in the doctoral program, contributing to doctoral seminars and workshops, mentoring doctoral students to publish papers, as well as other professionalization activities for doctoral students.
- Demonstrated mentoring of post-doctoral fellows and early career faculty, as appropriate (expected at Associate to Full Professor ranks).
- Directing undergraduate and graduate student projects and internships.
- Service on teaching-related committees or serving as a faculty advisor to a student club or organization.
- Evidence of scholarship of teaching (refer to scholarship section for more detail).

Criteria for Quality Teaching Performance:

Faculty performance can be assessed in a variety of ways. The items cited below are examples only. It is not expected that faculty members will accomplish all items cited. Quality (proficient) Performance in teaching as an Associate Professor or Full Professor will be determined by several factors, including evidence from sources such as course syllabi or other material, peer-review results, participation in the quality of instruction program, and other sources. Student evaluations of instruction will be considered corroborating or indirect sources of evidence and as such should not be the primary evidence. Overall, quality teaching includes items listed above for Outstanding, but is noted that the evidence is *emerging* and will not be as substantial with documented outcomes related to pedagogy, mentorship, or scholarship.

Evidence of teaching may come from multiple sources, including faculty's descriptions of informal efforts to gather student feedback and engage in continuous improvement, student evaluations, peer review, sample activities/rubrics/assignment descriptions, and alumni feedback.

PROMOTION TRACK
FACULTY GUIDANCE

**Promotion Track Scholarly Guidance:
Assistant to Associate Professor**

Practice-based research and scholarly activity is “systematic inquiry into the systems, methods, policies, and programmatic applications of public health practice” (Demonstrating Excellence in Practice-Based Research for Public Health, 2006, ASPPH). The body of scholarly work for a Professor of Practice will likely include a wide array of dissemination methods, including peer reviewed journal articles, technical reports and manuscripts (e.g., program evaluation, community assessment, strategic plans, etc.), academic and practice-based conferences, and other targeted media (e.g., podcasts, blog posts, editorials, etc.).

To demonstrate impact and relevance, the construct of peer review will be extended to include a description of stakeholder review and impact. This may be described by the faculty member, with possible supporting documentation by stakeholders. Faculty members may wish to describe the process of obtaining stakeholder review for technical reports and manuscripts, the method of dissemination, and examples of data-driven decisions that were influenced by the scholarly products.

Scholarly products for a Professor of Practice may include, but not limited to:

- Scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL), such as peer-reviewed publications, presentations, internal and external grants related to teaching (may be applicable to research domain)
- Citations of SoTL
- Received teaching awards and honors from department, college, university, professional associations
- Web articles, blogs, webinars, databases, or other dissemination activities on teaching
- Editor reviewed teaching presentations and publications
- Invitations to participate in teaching presentations, publications, workshops, and seminars
- Use and/or reviews of your textbooks or teaching materials
- Dissemination of teaching materials or methods with outside users (e.g., community)
- Evidence of course and curriculum development
- Contributions to professional organizations related to teaching or curriculum development
- Peer reviewed journal articles on public health practice
- Technical reports (program evaluation, community assessment, strategic plan, and others)
- Books and book chapters
- Media coverage as a subject matter expert
- Academic and practice-based conference presentations
- Training materials (micro-credentials, on-line modules, webinars, materials approved for continuing education credits, and instructional manuals
- Awarded grants/contracts that fund public health practice scholarly activities or that

PROMOTION TRACK
FACULTY GUIDANCE

support the work of public health practice partners

- Development and/or co-creation of community programs and initiatives

Criteria for Outstanding Scholarly Performance:

- Scholarly products for a professor of practice would show include evidence of impact on organizational, community, professional, or larger systems of care.
- Evidence of demand for knowledge and expertise by the practice or related community (e.g., consultation, contractual work, repetitive or national scope media requests).

Criteria for Quality Scholarly Performance:

- *Emerging* evidence of impact on organizational, community, professional, or larger systems of care.
- *Emerging* evidence of demand for knowledge and expertise by the practice or related community (e.g., consultation, contractual work, repetitive or national scope media requests).

PROMOTION TRACK
FACULTY GUIDANCE

**Promotion Track Scholarly Guidance:
Associate Professor to Professor**

The promotion to Professor in the School of Public Health is based on achievement. The candidate should have distinguished performance as an Associate Professor and established a national or international reputation or exemplary public health practice impact. The candidate must be a highly productive member of the Department, school, and university who is contributing to the growth of the next generation of scholars and practitioners via teaching, advising, mentoring, and collaborating with students and early career scholars. Evaluation for promotion shall be based on the assigned proportional effort in teaching, scholarly activities, and service and should be specific to the expertise and field.

Possible activities to be considered for Scholarship are listed below. This list is not exhaustive. It is not expected that candidates will have accomplished all of the listed activities. For candidates providing additional activity not listed, adequate documentation must be provided to explain the activity.

Criteria for Outstanding Scholarly Performance:

- Receive regional, state, national, or international recognition for practice-based scholarship or impact.
- Present scholarly works at national/international professional meetings.
- Generate a sustained record of scholarly productivity, including a diversity of practice-based scholarly products.
- Sustained receipt of external funding to support public health projects and activities.

Criteria for Quality Scholarly Performance:

- Evidence of *emerging* regional, state, national, or international recognition for practice-based scholarship or impact.
- *Emerging* evidence of presenting scholarly works at national/international professional meetings.
- Generate an *emerging* record of scholarly productivity, including a diversity of practice-based scholarly products.
- *Emerging* receipt of external funding to support public health projects and activities.

PROMOTION TRACK
FACULTY GUIDANCE

**Promotion Track Service Guidance:
Assistant to Associate Professor and Associate Professor to Professor**

Practice-based service is defined as “the application of scientific or professional knowledge, derived from one’s field of scholarship and applied as consultant, expert, or technical advisor for the benefit of policy makers, public officials, agencies, organizations, professionals and the society at large to improve the health of populations” (Demonstrating Excellence In The Scholarship Of Practice-Based Service For Public Health, 2009, ASPPH). Service generally falls into three categories: service to the university, service to the profession, and service to the community. Internal service to the institution is valued, particularly service that supports the achievement of the institution’s and SPH’s vision, mission, and values. Service to the profession is also valued and may include serving as a grant reviewer, manuscript reviewer, and being active in organizations that serve the profession such as the Texas Public Health Association, American Public Health Association, among others. The Council on Education for Public Health emphasizes that community service must benefit “the greater society, over and beyond what is accomplished through teaching and research.” Therefore, service is encouraged to be practice-based, addressing community health issues.

Possible activities to be considered for Service are listed below. This list is not exhaustive. It is not expected that candidates will have accomplished all of the listed activities. For candidates providing additional activity not listed, adequate documentation must be provided to explain the activity.

Criteria for Outstanding Service Performance:

- Participating on or leading advisory boards, task forces, advisory committees, or community coalitions with evidence of strong contribution to the mandate of the organization.
- Participating on or leading the review, scoring, and/or recommendation of funding proposals/grant applications with evidence of strong contribution to the mandate of the organization.
- Consultation (contractual and/or pro bono) on organizational practices/decisions.
- Evidence of contribution to advancing health equity and reducing health disparities in the region.
- Leadership roles in a public health or related professional organization (e.g., Texas Public Health Association) with evidence of impact on advancing the mandate of the organization.
- Organizing service events that raise awareness of public health.
- Leadership in HSC and SPH activities that exemplify the values and work towards achieving the goals of the institution and school.

Criteria for Quality Service Performance:

- Participation in advisory boards, task forces, advisory committees, or community coalitions.

PROMOTION TRACK FACULTY GUIDANCE

- Providing professional public health services to organizations such as evaluation, assessment, strategic planning; as well as at events or programs (e.g., screening or vaccine promotion at events).
- Contributing to advancing equity, diversity, and inclusive excellence at HSC and in the surrounding region
- Participation and volunteering with a public health or related professional organization (e.g., Texas Public Health Association).
- Participating in service events that raise awareness of public health.
- Participation in HSC and SPH activities that exemplify the values and work towards achieving the goals of the institution and school.