Chapter VIII
Faculty

VIII.A Faculty Qualifications

CEPH Criterion

The School shall have a clearly defined faculty which, by virtue of its size, multidisciplinary nature, educational preparation, research, and teaching competence, and practice experience, is able to fully support the School’s mission, goals, and objectives.
Faculty Qualifications

CEPH Expected Documentation

1. Identification in a table or chart of faculty who support the degree programs offered by the School, indicating at least professorial rank, tenure status, percent time, earned degrees, universities at which degrees were earned, disciplinary area of degree, area of teaching responsibility, area of research interest, and selected demographic data (gender, ethnicity)

2. Description of the manner in which the faculty complement integrates perspectives from the field of practice

3. Identification of outcome measures by which the School may judge the qualifications of its faculty complement, along with data regarding the performance of the School against those measures over the last three years

4. Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met
Faculty Qualifications

Introduction

From the founding of the Bloomberg School of Public Health, its strength has emanated from the accomplishments of its outstanding faculty and students. Faculty excellence is critical to the continued success of the School’s formal academic programs, student mentoring, cutting-edge research, innovative practice programs, and broad-ranging service activities. The School continues to focus substantial efforts on maintaining an environment in which faculty can carry out their scholarly research, professional practice, educational, and service activities to their maximum capability. As noted elsewhere in the report, one of the four primary goals of Strategic Plan 2000 focused on recruiting, promoting, and retaining outstanding faculty (see Chapter I Mission, Goals and Chapter VII.B Faculty Policies).

Faculty

The School’s 485 full-time faculty members represent the broad array of public health disciplines and the sciences that underpin them. They are eminently qualified to lead the School’s tripartite mission of scholarship in research and/or professional practice, education, and service. The full-time faculty graduated from more than 175 universities and come from many educational backgrounds, including public health, the liberal arts, and medicine, as well as law, social work, education, and the social and physical sciences. Brief biographies of each full-time faculty member can be found at http://faculty.jhsph.edu/facultylist.cfm (see also Appendix VIII.A.1 Full-time Faculty). With rare exceptions, they hold 100 percent full-time-equivalent appointments, and all are on a 12-month calendar.

Professorial and Non-professorial Ranks: Approximately 60 percent of the School’s full-time faculty are considered professorial faculty in either the tenure or non-tenure track (Table VIII.A.1). Tenure and non-tenure track professorial faculty are expected to have the same qualifications and expertise in research, practice, and education. Scientists are expected to have equivalent qualifications and show the same level of scholarship in at least one of the three areas. Since 1999, the number of professorial faculty increased by 34 percent, from 222 to 298, while the number of non-professorial full-time faculty remained relatively stable.

Tenure and Non-tenure Professorial Faculty: Recruitment procedures and appointment and promotion criteria are the same for tenure and non-tenure track professorial faculty and are detailed in the Policy and Procedure Memorandum, Appointments, Promotions and Professional Activities of the Faculty (http://www.jhsph.edu/schoolpolicies/ppm_faculty_1.shtml and Appendix VIII.B.1 Policies and Procedures). In 2000, the Faculty Senate, department chairs, and School administration agreed to develop a non-tenure professorial track that included the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Tenure and non-tenure track professorial faculty have virtually the same responsibilities, consistent with their sources of support. Non-tenure track faculty, however, have no limit to the time they may remain in a

1 Curricula vitae of the faculty will be available at the CEPH site visit
rank. Tenure track positions require a national search; exceptions to this requirement are rare and handled on a case-by-case basis.

The size of the non-tenure track professorial faculty is deliberately linked to the size of the tenure track faculty. All tenure track positions in the School must be approved by the Dean and the Advisory Board. No more than 35 percent of a department’s professorial faculty can be on the non-tenure track and no more than 15 percent of the School’s full-professors can be untenured. As of December 2005, 96 percent (133/139) of full professors, 71 percent (55/78) of associate professors, and 75 percent (60/81) of assistant professors were tenured or tenure-eligible. The School offers tenure at the full professor level only.

Table VIII.A.1 Number of Full-time Faculty by Title and Rank, 1999–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Title</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professorial¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professorial</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-professorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Scientist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Scientist</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Scientist</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-professorial</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Includes tenure and non-tenure track professors

Non-professorial Full-time Faculty: Approximately one-third of non-professorial faculty are in the scientist rank; the remainder are primarily research associates (Table VIII.A.1). Scientist faculty may serve as primary or co-instructors in courses and as primary advisors for masters and postdoctoral students. They may also serve on examination committees, as well as on School, University, and departmental committees. Scientists may not, however, serve as primary academic advisors for doctoral students. Research associates principally support the research and/or practice activities of their department and the School, while instructors primarily participate in teaching (Chapter VIII.B Faculty Policies).

Part-time Faculty: The 558 part-time faculty enrich the School immeasurably through interactions with students and other faculty (Appendix VIII.A.2 Part-time Faculty). Part-time faculty
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hold the title of “associate” or “adjunct,” and are expected to have significant and ongoing involvement in the School’s mission, particularly in education. They may teach courses, present lectures or seminars, collaborate locally or internationally with full-time faculty, oversee student internships, or serve in other capacities. Most are not paid for their activities in the School, unless they serve as course instructors or teaching assistants, or participate in sponsored or subcontracted activities. As noted elsewhere, the School has allotted core funds to help support up to 10 part-time faculty drawn from the public health practice community (Chapter VII Service).

Joint Appointments: More than 280 faculty hold joint appointments in the School. Most have primary appointments in the School of Medicine or Nursing; the others come from all but two of the University’s other academic divisions. Faculty with joint appointments collaborate on research and practice activities, advise students, serve on student examination committees, and teach courses in the School. School of Public Health faculty members also hold joint appointments with similar roles in the other University divisions.

Integration of Practice Perspectives

In 1996, in response to Strategic Plan 1993, the School explicitly stated that scholarly application of professional practice was among the criteria for appointment and promotion of full-time faculty. Indeed, professional practice is included in each of the overarching criteria for promotion (http://www.jhsph.edu/schoolpolicies/appendix_1.shtml and Chapter VII Service). Faculty are encouraged to develop practice and teaching portfolios, in addition to a research portfolio, as evidence supporting appointment or promotion.

Full-time Faculty: As noted earlier, all full-time faculty contribute to at least one element of the School’s mission—education, scholarship in research and/or professional practice, and service. The balance of these elements is negotiated between the department chair and faculty member at the time of appointment and periodically thereafter, as applicable. Some of the School’s 650 sponsored projects are primarily practice-oriented, and many of the research-oriented projects include a practice or service component (Chapter VII Service). Faculty also provide service not related to sponsored projects (Appendix VII.1 Faculty Service) and bring the richness of their professional practice activities to the classroom and student advising. Those who are active in the professional degree programs assist students to identify appropriate professional practice internships and mentor them through their course work and culminating paper. In addition, faculty provide formal and informal guidance to student service activities, such as the Johnson and Johnson Scholars Program and student-organized international service trips. Finally, the School has renewed its commitment to provide more mentored professional practice activities to all students through core support for the Interdepartmental Applied Public Health Program and increased faculty involvement in and assumed administrative responsibility for the Urban Health Institute, and by leasing a new building for community-based activities.
**Part-time Faculty:** Part-time faculty serve as critical links between the School and the practice community. Many of their activities are organized through the Interdepartmental Applied Public Health Program, created to increase and coordinate the School’s professional practice activities that include mentored professional practice internships for students and training opportunities for the public health workforce (Chapter VII Service).

**Outcome Measures**

The School’s faculty represent the breadth and depth of public health disciplines and the underlying basic sciences. The full-time faculty are graduates of universities throughout the United States and abroad. Virtually all professorial faculty and most non-professorial faculty hold doctoral degrees. They are augmented by faculty with primary appointments in other divisions of the University and part-time faculty who engage in scholarly activities in partnership with the full-time faculty. Together they are responsible for 650 sponsored research and service projects in Baltimore and across the globe, sit on a wide-range of editorial and advisory boards (Chapter VI Research and Chapter VII Service), and author hundreds of peer-reviewed articles each year.²

The diversity, scope, and depth of the faculty’s educational backgrounds and research and professional practice activities are evident in the School’s approximately 500 academic courses and 100 degree programs, as well as certificate programs and continuing education opportunities (Chapter V Instructional Programs and Chapter VII Service). The ratio of students to faculty is low; on average there is one full-time professorial faculty for every 2.7 masters students and for every 2.3 doctoral students (Chapter IV Resources). The true ratio is actually much lower because many non-professorial, part-time, and jointly appointed faculty have direct student involvement.

---

² The School does not track the actual number of articles; curricula vitae of the faculty will be available at the CEPH site visit
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Assessment

Strengths

- The School's faculty represent the array of disciplines in public health and are eminently qualified to lead the School's tripartite mission of scholarship, education, and service.

- The School's faculty is drawn from many educational backgrounds, including schools of public health, traditional liberal arts schools, medical schools, and less frequently from other backgrounds such as schools of law, social work, or education.

- The faculty teach more than 500 academic courses, mentor more than 1,500 students in approximately 100 degree programs, participate in continuing education activities, oversee 650 sponsored research and service activities, author hundreds of peer-reviewed articles, and, as individuals, provide service to local, national, and international governmental and private agencies and to industry.

- In 1996, the School explicitly stated that scholarly application of professional practice was among the criteria for appointment and promotion of full-time faculty, and developed a policy to this effect. Faculty are encouraged to develop a “practice portfolio” in addition to a “teaching portfolio” as part of the evidence in support of appointment or promotion.

- The 558 part-time faculty enrich the School immeasurably through multiple interactions with the full-time faculty, by teaching courses or lectures, collaborating locally or internationally, mentoring students in a practice or internship opportunity, and serving in other capacities.

- Part-time faculty serve as critical links between the School and the practice community.

Challenges

- Given the size of the full-time and part-time faculty, the School has not routinely collected certain information on full-time faculty, such as the institutions from which they received their degrees.

Plans

- The School plans to expand its database on the characteristics of the faculty to better meet the reporting requirements of CEPH.

The criterion is met
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VIII.B Faculty Policies

CEPH Criterion

The School shall have well defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint, and promote qualified faculty; to evaluate competence and performance of faculty; and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.
## Faculty Policies

### CEPH Expected Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inclusion of a faculty handbook or other written document that outlines faculty rules and regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Description of provisions for faculty development, including identification of support for faculty categories other than regular full-time appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Description of formal procedures for evaluating faculty competence and performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A description of student course evaluation process and/or evaluation of teaching effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Description of the emphasis given to community service activities in the promotion and tenure process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Policies

Introduction

The policies for recruitment, appointment, and promotion of faculty are well-documented and transparent; they are detailed in the Policy and Procedure Memorandum Faculty-1, Appointments, Promotions, and Professional Activities of the Faculty (Appendix VIII.B.1 Policies and Procedures and http://www.jhsph.edu/schoolpolicies/ppm_faculty_1.shtml). These policies are reviewed during new faculty orientation sessions and summarized in the Faculty Handbook,\(^1\) a resource guide that includes an overview of these policies and procedures, as well as descriptions of the School’s governance and administrative structure, resources, academic programs, other policies, etc., and their related Web links (Appendix VIII.B.2 Faculty Handbook).

Faculty Recruitment, Appointment, and Promotion Policies and Procedures

The policies for faculty recruitment, appointment, and promotion are reviewed and modified periodically following discussion and consensus in several venues, including the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, the Faculty Senate, and the Advisory Board. The most recent revision was undertaken in 2004 to clarify the roles of non-tenure faculty ranks. The policies were revisited as recently as 2005 in a survey designed to assess gaps in faculty understanding about the appointments and promotions process. The survey was requested by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions and undertaken by the Faculty Senate. Topics identified in the survey (see Appendix VIII.B.3 Promotions Process Survey) were then reviewed in open meetings with professorial and non-professorial faculty.

**Recruitment:** Requests for faculty positions originate with the departments, based on academic and other needs. All professorial positions must be justified by the chair, discussed by the School’s Advisory Board, and approved by the Dean; and with few exceptions require a national search. The documentation required for national searches is set by the Committee on Affirmative Action. Discussion within the Advisory Board encourages interdepartmental and interdisciplinary recruitment. Searches for non-professorial positions are frequently conducted, although not required.

**Appointments:** All full-time faculty appointments, including research associates and instructors, are evaluated by the department chair, the departmental appointments and promotions committee, the Dean, and the Advisory Board. Professorial and scientist appointments also are reviewed by the School’s Committee on Appointments and Promotions. Recommendations from the committee are sent to the Advisory Board for approval. Part-time faculty are identified for appointment through institutional and individual faculty contacts, vetted by the academic departments, reviewed by the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, as appropriate, and ultimately approved by the Advisory Board.

\(^1\) The Faculty Handbook is maintained on the School’s protected Web site
Annual Review: The School’s Committee on Appointments and Promotions annually reviews the curricula vitae of non-tenured faculty and provides the department chair feedback about faculty whose rate of progress may be of concern. The department chair, or division/program director, is expected to meet at least annually with all faculty to review their recent accomplishments and plans, and to provide an assessment of their teaching, advising, research, practice, and service activities. Feedback from the School’s Committee on Appointments and Promotions may also be discussed.

Promotion: The chair, with concurrence from the department’s appointments and promotions committee, recommends appointments and promotions for departmental faculty to the Dean. Professorial and scientist faculty appointments and adjunct faculty appointments are then referred by the Dean to the School-wide Committee on Appointments and Promotion for consideration and review. The committee does not initiate recommendations but evaluates each candidate according to the criteria set forth in School policy. Unlike some universities, assistant professors are recruited with the expectation that they will advance through the academic ranks. There are no artificial barriers to limit faculty progress or fixed ratios for the number of tenure-track assistant, associate, and full professors. Tenure of full professors is granted by the University’s Board of Trustees.

Faculty Development

The Dean’s Office organizes the faculty orientation program that introduces new faculty to the School’s mission, organizational structure, deans, key faculty, and administrative staff responsible for virtually every aspect of the School, from academic programs to research administration and sponsored projects. The department chair is responsible for assuring that each junior or new faculty member receives appropriate mentoring. Associate and full professors are expected to mentor junior professorial and non-professorial faculty. In keeping with the goals of Strategic Plan 2000, a number of faculty development initiatives have been implemented since the last accreditation.

Faculty Exit Interviews: “Recruitment, promotion, and retention of outstanding faculty” was one of the four primary goals of Strategic Plan 2000. In 2001, the Committee on Affirmative Action and the Dean’s office initiated an exit interview for professorial faculty who leave the institution. The interview is designed to better understand their reasons for leaving, in order to increase faculty retention (see Appendix VIII.B.4 Faculty Exit Survey). In 2005, a review of the initial 25 exit interviews found that the majority were pleased with their experiences in the School. During the first two years of exit interviews, however, a few junior faculty felt they had not received adequate or consistent mentoring from their chair or other senior faculty.

Faculty Mentoring Program: In response to the early exit survey results, the Dean’s Office developed the Junior Professorial Faculty Mentoring Program to augment formal mentoring by the department chair and informal mentoring by other faculty. The program, endorsed by the chairs and Faculty Senate in 2003, is designed to foster a supportive environment by
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providing advice on the appointments and promotions process, publishing, grant preparation, and serving on committees. Each department is responsible for developing and implementing minimum expectations to ensure that the program addresses the department’s unique culture (http://www.biostat.jhsph.edu/~kbroman/Senate/business/mentoring.html and Appendix VIII.B.5 Faculty Mentoring).

The program encourages newly appointed assistant and associate professors and their chairs to identify one or two non-supervisory senior faculty to serve as mentors. Between 2003 and 2005, 45 of the 51 new assistant or associate professors partnered with senior faculty. The six new professorial faculty who did not participate had prior appointments in the School. An evaluation of the first cohort of 15 indicated that, for the most part, junior faculty and mentors believed that the program was beneficial and have continued their relationships.

Teaching Workshops: Teaching workshops, available to all faculty, have been held twice a year since January 2004. These half-day events are organized by a faculty committee, the Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Research, and the Center for Teaching and Learning with Technology. Typically 30 to 60 faculty participate in each workshop. Topics have included active learning, developing learning objectives and assessment methods, using student evaluations to improve a course, designing lectures for maximum impact, and, most recently, using the new CoursePlus tool for on-campus, as well as online courses (http://courseplus.jhsph.edu and Chapter V.H. Nontraditional Formats). Other workshops and courses have discussed grant and scientific writing, giving scientific talks, managing projects, and using new information technology tools.

Sabbatical Program: The School’s active sabbatical program has grown substantially since its initiation in 1995 (http://www.jhsph.edu/schoolpolicies/ppm_faculty_2_sabbatical_leave.shtml and Exhibit VIII.B.1 Sabbatical Leave). Because faculty support comes primarily from sponsored activities, most sabbaticals are necessarily limited to between two and five months. More than one-third of the tenure track faculty and several non-tenure track professorial faculty have taken at least one sabbatical.

Support for Part-time Faculty: The role of part-time faculty in the School’s educational, research, and practice activities varies considerably across the School. All are invited to the School’s seminars and special lectures that occur almost daily, as well as to departmental retreats and faculty meetings. Those participating in the academic programs are encouraged to attend the School’s teaching workshops. Resources for the support of many part-time faculty derive principally from sponsored activities. The Interdepartmental Applied Public Health Program also serves as a support network for the part-time faculty involved in professional practice activities (Chapter VII Service).

Evaluation of Faculty

As described earlier, the department chair, a departmental faculty committee, and the School-wide Committee on Appointments and Promotions annually review the progress of non-
tenured faculty. Tenured faculty are generally reviewed by the department chair, and their progress is discussed with the Dean at the time of departmental budget reviews. Non-professorial faculty are also evaluated by their supervisory faculty or principal investigator, and there are opportunities for informal discussions with senior faculty that provide additional guidance and insight to junior faculty. The specific criteria and processes for promotion are made available during faculty orientation and online, and are summarized in the Faculty Handbook. The criteria include the faculty member’s contribution to research, professional practice, and the academic programs.

**Evaluation of Research and Professional Practice:** Traditionally excellence in research has been the primary criterion for faculty appointments and promotions. The School’s criteria have been broadened to excellence in scholarship that is defined as discovery and dissemination of new knowledge—a balance of original research and professional practice as evidenced in scholarship.

**Student Course Evaluation:** Contribution to the School’s academic programs includes advising and developing curricula, as well as teaching. Currently, the quality of teaching is primarily assessed through student course evaluations (see Chapter IX.D Student Roles) and teaching portfolios that often include letters of support from former students. The Committee on Course Evaluations is currently evaluating peer review methods and will forward its recommendations to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions and the Faculty Senate, and eventually to the Advisory Board for consideration.

**Community Service:** Service activities are encouraged as a part of the responsibility of all faculty. While service itself is not a criterion for promotion, the scholarship associated with professional practice and/or educational activities qualifies candidates for promotion. Such scholarship includes publications in peer-reviewed literature; program development and evaluation; formulation of local, national, or international laws and policy recommendations; development of new curricula, academic or training programs, or teaching tools; or other scholarly or commercial products that translate research or policy into practice.
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Assessment

Strengths

- The policies for recruitment, appointment, and promotion of faculty are well-documented, transparent, and subject to periodic review and revision by the faculty.
- The policies are contained in the Appointments, Promotions, and Professional Activities of the Faculty Memorandum, are introduced to new faculty during the faculty orientation program, and are contained in the Faculty Handbook and on the School’s Web site.
- All segments of the faculty are involved in developing and modifying faculty policies.
- Professorial appointments must be justified based on planned roles in the academic programs.
- The School continues to focus substantial efforts on maintaining an environment in which faculty can carry out their scholarly, educational, and service activities to their maximum capability; the core theme of the 2000 Strategic Plan focused on faculty development.
- Formal mentoring support is available for junior professorial faculty.
- Faculty exit surveys are used to better understand the reasons for leaving the School and to assess ways to increase retention rates.
- Faculty have access to teaching workshops to improve their instructional methods.
- The School-wide Committee on Appointments and Promotions annually reviews the curricula vitae of non-tenured faculty and provides feedback to department chairs.
- Faculty performance and competence are formally evaluated at least annually by the department chairs or designee, such as a division director, and by the Dean as part of discussions about salary.
- The Committee on Course Evaluations is evaluating methods for peer evaluation of academic contributions by the faculty as an adjunct to the teaching portfolio that is part of the promotion process.

Plans

- The School will continue to assess and revise, as appropriate, policies and procedures for faculty recruitment, appointments, and promotions, and continue to communicate the procedures to the faculty.
- The School will continue to develop more detailed guidelines for evaluating scholarship in professional practice.
- The Committee on Course Evaluation will continue to review methods for evaluating educational contributions of faculty and make recommendations to the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, the Faculty Senate, and eventually the Advisory Board.

The criterion is met.
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The primary purpose of a sabbatical leave is to provide an uninterrupted opportunity for intellectual refreshment and concentrated periods of scholarship. A sabbatical is intended to be of benefit to the faculty member and to the University. The faculty member may write, read, attend courses or conferences, or engage in academic activities at another institution.

The average sabbatical leave is for 3 months, with some flexibility in duration. Financial support for a sabbatical is provided by general funds from the department of the faculty member requesting the sabbatical, or from other non-federal sources that may be obtained for this purpose.

Faculty who have been in a professorial position in the School for a minimum of 3 full-time years are eligible for sabbatical leaves. Full-time professorial faculty are eligible subject to availability of financial support by their department.

Time taken for a sabbatical leave is included in the time-in-rank for promotion purposes. After a sabbatical leave, it is expected that the faculty member will spend at least one year at the School.

PROCEDURE

Sabbaticals must be approved by the department chair.

After approval by the department, the department chair will send a letter to the dean requesting the sabbatical. The letter must specify the beginning and ending dates of the sabbatical.

A work plan (one page in length) developed by the faculty member must accompany the request. Arrangements for teaching, advising, committee service, and other responsibilities during the faculty member’s absence must be indicated.

If approved by the dean, the request will be forwarded to the Advisory Board for review and approval.

Sabbatical leaves must be approved by the Advisory Board before the beginning date of the leave. Retroactive requests will not be reviewed.
Chapter VIII
Faculty

VIII.C Faculty Diversity

CEPH Criterion

The School shall recruit, retain, and promote a diverse faculty, and shall offer equitable opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of age, sex, race, disability, religion, or national origin.
Faculty Diversity

CEPH Expected Documentation

1. Demographic data on the School's faculty

2. Description of policies and procedures regarding the School's commitment to providing equitable opportunities without regard to age, sex, race, disability, religion, or national origin

3. Identification of outcome measures by which the School may evaluate its success in achieving a demographically diverse faculty complement, along with data regarding the performance of the School against those measures over the last three years

4. Assessment of the extent to which this criterion is met
Overview

The School is strongly committed to expanding and supporting faculty diversity, particularly with respect to ethnicity and gender. It uses a variety of approaches to recruit faculty and support their career development, and routinely tracks the success of these activities. They include the Faculty Mentoring Program; the sabbatical leave policy (Chapter VIII.B Faculty Policies); centers that bring together faculty with similar interests (Chapter II.B Internal Organization); core support for innovative research by junior faculty and interdisciplinary research (Chapter VI Research); and expanding the criteria for promotion to include scholarship in professional practice, as well as excellence in teaching. Efforts specifically targeting women and minorities are described below.

Demographic Data on School Faculty

Gender: We, along with many other schools of public health and medicine, have seen a growing predominance of women in our student body. These women are the future leaders in public health and need to have successful role models and mentors in the academic community. Almost one-half of the full-time faculty are women; however, women are less likely to be associate or full professors and more likely to be non-professorial faculty than men (Table VIII.C.1). Among professorial faculty, women are also less likely to be on the tenure track, particularly at the associate professor rank (Table VIII.C.2). Since 1998, however, the number and percentage of full professors who are women increased from 18 percent to 26 percent. In addition, women are chairs of two of the 10 academic departments, and approximately one-half of the deans and chairs of the School’s standing committees are women. Data from the 1999 self-study are provided in this section for purposes of longitudinal comparisons.

Table VIII.C.1 Full-time Faculty by Rank and Gender 1998 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientists (all ranks)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associates and</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VIII.C.2  **Professorial Faculty by Tenure-track and Gender, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number in Rank</td>
<td>Percent on Tenure-Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of possible reasons for the differences between the proportion of male and female faculty holding tenure-track positions. The creation of the non-tenure professorial track now provides career ladders for faculty who would have otherwise held other titles. External forces may exist as well. These data suggest the need to follow up on the gender differences, particularly among the associate professors.

**Ethnicity:** The number of underrepresented minority full-time faculty (African American/Black, Hispanic, and American Indian) increased from 30 in 1998 to 44 in 2005. The increase occurred primarily for African Americans/Blacks, from 16 to 28 (Tables VIII.C.3-4). Currently, all but two of the 24 African American/Black and Hispanic professorial faculty are tenured or tenure-eligible. Despite these increases, the proportion of underrepresented minorities within the School’s faculty changed little since the last self-study, from eight percent to nine percent in 2005. The proportion of underrepresented minorities among the part-time faculty is similar to the percentage among the full-time faculty (Table VIII.5).

Table VIII.C.3  **Ethnicity of Full-time Faculty, 1998**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Scientist/ Research Associate/ Instructor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American, Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Other¹</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Includes White, European, Middle Eastern, and North African
Table VIII.C.4 Ethnicity of Full-time Faculty, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Scientist</th>
<th>Research Associate/Instructor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American, Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Other (^1)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (^2)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes White, European, Middle Eastern, and North African
2 Does not include 15 faculty (two scientist and 13 research associates/instructors) with undisclosed ethnicity

Table VIII.C.5 Ethnicity of Part-time Faculty, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American, Black</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Asian American, Pacific Islander</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Other (^1)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (^2)</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes White, European, Middle Eastern, and North African
2 Does not include 65 faculty with undisclosed ethnicity

Nationality: The percentages of faculty and students who are international are similar. International students comprise approximately one-fourth of the student body. Among the full-time faculty, 88 percent reported their citizenship, and of these, 20 percent (86/427) were international. Similarly, of the 82 percent of part-time faculty who reported their citizenship, 28 percent (127/458) were international.

Policies to Support Equitable Opportunities

As part of Strategic Plan 2000, the School’s mission statement was modified specifically to include diversity among its trainees, by stating that “The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health is dedicated to the education of a diverse group of research scientists and
public health professionals” (Chapter 1, Mission, Goals). Specific policies to support diversity among faculty are described below.

**University Policies:** The University reaffirms its commitment to equal opportunity for its faculty, staff, and students through an annual letter from President Brody that is published and shared with the University community (Exhibit VIII.C.1 University Statement). The University strictly adheres to the guidelines of an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer. The Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, including the hospital, the Health System, and the Schools of Medicine, Nursing, and Public Health, also publish a diversity and inclusion statement ([http://www.jhu.edu/news_info/policy/diversity.html](http://www.jhu.edu/news_info/policy/diversity.html)). The March 2006 statement is:

*Johns Hopkins is a community committed to sharing values of diversity and inclusion in order to achieve and sustain excellence. We firmly believe that we can best promote excellence by recruiting and retaining a diverse group of students, faculty, and staff and by creating a climate of respect that is supportive of their success. This climate for diversity, inclusion, and excellence is critical to attaining the best research, scholarship, teaching, health care, and other strategic goals of the Health System and the University. Taken together, these values are recognized and supported fully by the Johns Hopkins Institutions leadership at all levels. Further, we recognize that the responsibility for excellence, diversity, and inclusion lies with all of us at the Institutions: leadership, administration, faculty, staff, and students.*

**Recruitment of Minority Faculty:** The School routinely engages in a variety of activities and strategies to improve the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority faculty at both junior and senior faculty ranks (Table VIII.C.6). The School also tracks the recruitment of all minorities, underrepresented minorities, and women (Table VIII.C.7).

**Table VIII.C.6 School Strategies to Increase Underrepresented Minority Recruitment and Retention**

- Departments have access to core funds that support recruitment of underrepresented minorities to professorial positions by providing unbudgeted salary support and resources, such as laboratory equipment.
- The School continues its educational and scholarly focus on health disparities, an area of particular interest to many underrepresented minority students and faculty.
- Faculty positions are created to recruit underrepresented minority faculty who are recent graduates or postdoctoral fellows in the School, are identified during searches for other positions, or are recommended by colleagues.
- If one or both of the top two candidates for a faculty position are underrepresented minorities, both candidates are recruited.
- During searches, senior underrepresented minority leaders are routinely asked to suggest faculty candidates.
- Ongoing collaboration with historically black colleges and universities and underrepresented minority faculty at other institutions helps identify short-term or visiting positions for underrepresented minorities who act as role models for the School’s junior faculty and students.
- Administrative responsibilities of junior, underrepresented minority professorial faculty are minimized because these faculty often spend considerable time informally mentoring minority students, in addition to formal advising.
- A priority of the School continues to be raising funds for scholarships that attract highly qualified students and using School resources to support minority and disadvantaged students who may go on to join the faculty of this or another university.
Faculty Diversity

Faculty Recruitment: The Committee on Affirmative Action annually tracks the number of times women and minorities are included on the short list of candidates for professorial faculty positions, as well as the number of women and minorities hired for these positions. The proportion of searches that have included women and minorities on the short list of candidates has varied considerably since 1999, from 100 percent in 2000 to approximately 50 percent in other years (Table VIII.C.7). Underrepresented minorities have consistently been included on the short list of approximately one-third of searches undertaken each year. In general, when women are short-listed, they are hired about 50 percent of the time, but the percentages are lower for minorities. The identification and communication about emerging trends in these data help us in our efforts to recruit a diverse and excellent faculty, and to identify obstacles when we are unsuccessful.

Stop the Clock for Family Needs: In 1999, the School’s Committee on Affirmative Action recommended, and the Advisory Board adopted, a two-pronged policy to assist tenure-track faculty with family needs. Faculty may extend the time in rank for one year by working part time for up to three years. For example, faculty may work half-time for two years or one-third time for three years. Tenure-track faculty can also “stop the clock” while continuing to work full time (http://www.jhsph.edu/schoolpolicies/ppm_faculty_1.shtml and Appendix VIII.B.1 Policies and Procedures). To date, six tenure-track faculty, all women, have used the “stop the clock” provision. One faculty member took a leave, four continued to work without leave, and another worked part time for several years. Several of these faculty subsequently took advantage of a second option to extend the amount of time their promotion clock was stopped. Prior to 1999, tenure-track faculty either continued working while attending to family needs or took an unpaid leave of absence that counted toward their time to promotion.

Table VIII.C.7 Percent of Professorial Searches That Included Women, Minorities, 1999–2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Positions</th>
<th>Percent of Short Lists Including</th>
<th>Percent Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003¹</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Excludes eight faculty members who transferred from the scientist track to the professorial track
Underrepresented minority recruitment was not assessed separately before 2001

Salary Equity: The School routinely analyzes faculty salaries as part of its ongoing efforts to assure gender and minority equity. Since the last self-study, the methodology has been
expanded from an annual cross-sectional evaluation of tenure-track faculty to trends analysis for professorial faculty, including gender, minority status, faculty rank, and other demographic variables. During the past three years, there was no statistically significant difference between the salaries of male and female professorial faculty. In addition, a gap that existed prior to 2002 between the salaries of minority and non-minority professorial faculty is no longer statistically significant. In 2005, the analysis was further expanded to include faculty on the scientist track. An annual report of the analysis is shared with faculty and is formally presented to the School’s Advisory Board (Appendix VIII.C.1 Salary Analysis). The Dean meets with each department chair to discuss faculty members with salaries significantly below the expected range.

**Faculty Retention:** Once faculty are successfully recruited, their retention is the responsibility of the entire School, including the department chairs, deans, and the Committee on Affirmative Action. The School’s size and complexity may present challenges to assuring that faculty perceive that they are important and contributing members of the School. In addition to departmental efforts and activities within centers, the School tries to create supportive communities or cohorts by inviting faculty to serve on School-wide committees, contribute to the annual new faculty orientation sessions, and participate in the faculty mentoring program. The Faculty Senate serves to inform faculty of School-wide issues and policy decisions and brings faculty concerns and suggestions to the School’s leadership. Routine professorial faculty exit interviews were initiated in 2001 to better understand the reasons faculty leave the School. Development of a support structure for minority faculty has been more problematic. The School’s goal is to increase the number of underrepresented minority faculty in order to form a critical mass for mentoring and support through existing and informal mechanisms as the faculty advance and assume increasingly visible academic and administrative leadership roles.

**Outcome Measures**

Tracking and assessing efforts to recruit and retain minority and women faculty is a cornerstone of the School’s continuing commitment to increase faculty diversity. The School has not set specific targets, preferring instead to develop, refine, and evaluate recruitment and retention strategies. The School will continue its existing efforts, develop and evaluate new strategies, and continue to allocate resources to support these critical activities.

The School’s mission statement clearly articulates its commitment to diversity, and the School is further committed to increase recruitment of underrepresented minorities and women. Since 1999, several new policies aimed at increasing faculty retention have been implemented. Data are routinely collected and analyzed to assess these efforts.

Currently almost one-half of the full-time faculty members are women. While full professors are more likely to be men, the number of women in this rank has almost doubled, since the last self-study and 97 percent of them are tenured. Two of the department chairs are women and approximately one-half of the deans and School-wide committee chairs are women.
Faculty Diversity

Overall, there has been little change in the proportion of faculty who are minorities; however the number of underrepresented minority faculty increased from 30 in 1998 to 44 in 2005. Currently, all but two of the 24 African American/Black and Hispanic professorial faculty are on the tenure track. Within the professorial ranks, salaries are equitable for women and minorities, compared with males and non-minorities.

Assessment

Strengths

- The commitment to diversity is articulated in School and University policies and is reaffirmed in the School’s mission statement
- Programs to increase retention of professorial faculty include the sabbatical leave policy and improved junior faculty mentoring, as well as the stop the clock policy for tenure-track faculty
- School resources are allocated and policies established for targeted recruitment of underrepresented minority faculty
- Salaries are equitable for women and minority professorial faculty
- Exit interviews are conducted to better understand why professorial faculty leave the School

Challenges

- The number of underrepresented minority faculty needs to be increased, particularly at the professorial level
- Potential obstacles for the successful recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented professorial faculty need to continue to be identified and remedied
- Efforts are needed to assure that the tenure and non-tenure professorial tracks do not evolve into a hierarchy, valuing one over the other, particularly as they relate to women faculty

Plans

- Continue to evaluate existing and new strategies to enhance recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty
- Continue to scrutinize professorial appointments and identify and attempt to remedy the reasons for overrepresentation of women in the non-tenure professorial track
- Work with underrepresented minority faculty to explore mechanisms to provide support and create informal or formal communities
- Identify appropriate leadership opportunities for women and minority faculty
- Routinely collect more complete information on faculty nationalities
- Conduct a more quantitative assessment of faculty retention

The criterion is met
University Statement on Equal Opportunity, 2006

In May 2006, President William R. Brody issued the following statement to all members of the University community as a reminder of the university's long-standing dedication to equal opportunity.

Each year the university formally reaffirms its commitment to equal opportunity for its faculty, staff, and students. As a matter of policy to which it is staunchly committed, the university does not discriminate on the basis of gender, marital status, pregnancy, race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, disability, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, veteran status, or other legally protected characteristic. The university is committed to providing qualified individuals access to all academic and employment programs, benefits, and activities on the basis of demonstrated ability, performance, and merit, without regard to personal factors that are irrelevant to the program involved.

The university's equal opportunity policy is essential to its mission of excellence in education and research and applies to all academic programs administered by the university, its educational policies, admission policies, scholarship and loan programs, and athletic programs. It applies to all employment decisions, including those affecting hiring, promotion, demotion, or transfer; recruitment; advertisement of vacancies; layoff and termination; compensation and benefits; and selection for training. Consistent with its obligations under law, it also extends to the maintenance of affirmative action programs for minorities, women, persons with disabilities, and veterans.

The university assigns a high priority to the implementation of its equal opportunity policy, and significant university resources are devoted to assuring compliance with all laws prohibiting discrimination in employment and educational programs. Ray Gillian, the university's associate provost and director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Programs, is responsible for assisting me and other university officers in the implementation of equal opportunity and affirmative action programs. Members of the university community are encouraged to contact the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Programs at Garland Hall 130, Homewood campus, 410-516-8075 (TTY 410-516-6225), or the divisional offices of Human Resources regarding any questions or concerns about these matters.