



HARVARD
T.H. CHAN

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
Office of Faculty Affairs

Faculty Appointments Handbook:

Policies and Procedures for Faculty Searches, Appointments,
Reappointments, Promotions, and Leaves
at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health

10/18/2023

Harvard T.H. Chan School Faculty Appointments Handbook

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	1
<i>General Principles: Faculty Appointments</i>	2
<i>Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP)</i>	3
<i>Types of Appointments, Formal Titles, and Related Criteria</i>	4
Appointment Types and Titles _____	4
I. Primary Faculty _____	5
A. Primary faculty, tenured and tenure ladder	6
The tenure clock	6
Professor	7
Associate professor	8
Assistant professor	8
B. Primary faculty, non-tenure ladder.....	9
Research professor.....	9
Professor of the practice	9
Professor in residence	10
Senior lecturer and lecturer	10
Senior lecturer	11
Lecturer	11
Emeritus faculty.....	12
Member of the faculty	12
II. Secondary Faculty _____	12
III. Adjunct Faculty _____	13
ABCD appointments.....	13
IV. Visiting Faculty _____	14
V. Other Appointments _____	14
Faculty affiliations	14
Joint appointments	15
Associate of the department appointments	15
<i>Procedures for Faculty Searches</i>	16
I. Tenure-track Searches _____	16
A. Tenure-track search: proposal phase	16
B. Tenure-track search: review phase.....	17
Committee membership	17
Committee confidentiality	18
Search posting.....	18
First committee meeting.....	19
Search outreach	20
The short list.....	21
Candidate visit(s).....	22
Committee recommendation.....	22
C. Tenure-track search: approvals phase	23
Department review of the search report	23
Department review	23

Discussion of mentoring plans for approved candidates	24
Departmental vote	24
Provost's Appointments Review Committee (PARC).....	25
D. Tenure-track search: communication with the candidate(s).....	25
II. Tenured Searches _____	25
A. Tenured faculty search: proposal phase.....	25
B. Tenured faculty search: review phase	26
Committee membership	26
Committee confidentiality	27
Search posting	27
First committee meeting	27
Search outreach	28
The short list.....	29
Candidate visit(s).....	30
Comparison letter process	30
Committee recommendation.....	31
C. Tenured faculty search: approvals phase	31
Search report and SCARP review.....	31
Ad hoc committee review	32
Communication with the candidate(s).....	33
III. Targeted Search _____	33
A. Targeted search: proposal phase.....	33
B. Targeted search: search/review phase	34
Committee membership	34
Committee meetings	34
C. Targeted search: approvals phase	34
Ad hoc committee review	35
Communication with the candidate(s).....	35
IV. Other Searches _____	36
<i>Procedures for Faculty Reviews</i>	<i>36</i>
I. Appointment of Faculty Not on the Tenure Ladder _____	36
A. Lecturer/senior lecturer.....	36
Proposal phase	36
Written request/proposal contents	37
Review phase.....	38
Launch of review committee	38
Committee responsibilities.....	38
Candidate dossier	38
First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters	39
Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report	40
Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report	40
Report contents.....	40
Approvals phase	41
Communication with the candidate(s).....	42
B. Professor of the practice/professor in residence	42
Proposal phase	42
Written request/proposal contents	42
Review phase.....	43
Presentation by candidate and meeting of senior faculty.....	43
Launch of review committee	43

Committee responsibilities.....	43
Candidate dossier	44
First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters	45
Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report	46
Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report	46
Report contents.....	46
Approvals phase	47
Communication with the candidate(s).....	48
C. Secondary and adjunct faculty.....	48
Proposal phase	48
Review and approval phase	49
ABCD appointments	49
Final recommendation	49
D. Visiting faculty	49
Proposal phase	49
Written request and final determination.....	49
II. Reappointment of Faculty in Rank	50
A. Reappointment of primary faculty.....	50
Departmental consultation	50
Candidate dossier	50
Review	52
Report content and SCARP submission	52
Deans and Senior Vice Provost approval.....	53
B. Reappointment of secondary and adjunct faculty.....	53
C. Reappointment of visiting faculty	53
III. Reappointment with a Change of Status	54
A. Reappointment with a change of status from assistant/associate professor to lecturer/senior lecturer	54
Departmental initiation.....	54
Departmental review	54
Report content and SCARP submission.....	55
Submission to Senior Vice Provost	55
B. Reappointment with a change of status from primary to secondary or adjunct.....	55
C. Reappointment with a change of status from secondary or adjunct to primary.....	56
IV. Promotion of Faculty	56
A. Promotion from assistant to associate professor	56
Timing of the review.....	56
Proposal phase	56
Written request/proposal contents	56
Review phase.....	57
Launch of review committee	57
First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters	57
Approvals phase	58
Department evaluation and recommendation to department chair	58
Report contents.....	59
Submission to PARC.....	60
Communication with the candidate(s).....	60
B. Promotion from associate professor to professor with tenure	60
Proposal phase	60
Consultation with department chair about launching promotion reviews	60
Meeting with department chair and candidate to review procedures	61
Preparation and distribution of the candidate's dossier	61

Presentation by candidate and subsequent meeting of tenured faculty.....	62
Consultation with the department chair of the candidate’s affiliate department.....	63
Department chair reports decision about moving forward with promotion review.....	63
Review phase.....	63
Launch of promotion review committee.....	64
First meeting of promotion review committee and solicitation of letters.....	64
Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report.....	65
Third/final meeting of the committee and finalization of the report.....	66
Report contents.....	66
Approvals phase.....	67
Communication with the candidate(s).....	68
C. Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer.....	69
Proposal phase.....	69
Written request/proposal contents.....	69
Review phase.....	70
Launch of review committee.....	70
Committee responsibilities.....	70
Candidate dossier.....	70
First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters.....	71
Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report.....	72
Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report.....	72
Report contents.....	72
Approvals phase.....	73
Communication with the candidate(s).....	74
D. Promotion of secondary and adjunct faculty.....	74
V. Appointment as Emeritus Faculty Member.....	74
<i>Leaves of Absence and Tenure Ladder Extensions.....</i>	76
Clock extension.....	76
Parental leave.....	76
Paid Parental Leave (faculty on the Harvard payroll).....	76
Policy:.....	76
Procedure:.....	77
Tenure Clock Extension to Meet Child Care Needs (all faculty regardless of payroll).....	77
Policy:.....	77
Procedure:.....	78
Medical leave.....	78
Unpaid leave.....	79
Sabbatical leave.....	80
Purpose.....	80
Eligibility.....	80
Term and compensation.....	80
Procedure for requesting sabbatical leave.....	81
Procedure upon the faculty member’s return from sabbatical leave.....	81
<i>Appendices I-XVIII.....</i>	82
Appendix I: Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP): The Role of the Committee Members and Guidelines for Confidentiality.....	82
Appendix II: Academic Council Role.....	84

Appendix III: Checklist for Drafting Tenure-track Search Reports	85
Appendix III-A: Departmental Process for Tenure-track Faculty Search Report Approval	92
Appendix IV - Search Committee Guidelines and Pledge	94
Appendix IV-A: Charge to the Faculty Search Committee	100
Appendix V: The Conduct of Searches with Identified Internal or External Candidates	103
Appendix VI: Review for Promotion to a Tenured Professorship	105
Appendix VI-A: Tenure Criteria and Appendices	111
2010 TENURE CRITERIA APPENDIX A:	112
Educational Activities	112
2010 TENURE CRITERIA APPENDIX B:	114
Evaluating Individual Contributions to Collaborative Research	114
2010 TENURE CRITERIA APPENDIX C:.....	115
Translational Activities	115
Appendix VI-B: Tenure Candidate Dossier Components	117
Complete list of materials provided by the candidate in connection with a tenure review.....	118
Appendix VI-C: Tenure Review: Guidelines for Compiling Names of Experts	121
Appendix VII: Harvard Chan School CV Format	123
SAMPLE CITATIONS	127
Appendix VIII: Candidate Academic Report Guide for Tenure-track Reviews and Promotions	129
Appendix IX: Checklist for Recommendations of Reappointment	132
Appendix X: Checklist for Recommendations of Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (Promotion Review Packet)	135
Appendix X-A: Guide for Letters of Evaluation for Tenure-track Faculty Promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor	140
Appendix X-B: Sample Evaluation Letter Request for Promotion to Associate Professor Cases	142
Appendix XI - Checklist for Recommendations of Appointment as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer	144
Appendix XII - Checklist for Recommendations of Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer	155
Appendix XIII: Appointment and Reappointment Process Guide for Secondary Faculty	166
CRITERIA FOR SECONDARY APPOINTMENT	168
Appendix XIII-A: Nomination Form for Secondary Appointments and Reappointments	170
Appendix XIV: Appointment and Reappointment Process Guide for Adjunct Faculty	173
CRITERIA FOR ADJUNCT APPOINTMENT	174
Appendix XIV A: Nomination for Adjunct Appointments and Reappointments	176
Appendix XV: Paid Parental Leave Policy	179
Appendix XVI: Tenure Clock Extension to Meet Child Care Needs	180
Appendix XVII: COVID-19 Impact Statement Guidelines	181
Appendix XVIII: Candidate Evaluation Sheet	183
Appendix XIX: Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Statement	185

Preface

The Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health (Harvard Chan School or School) strives to provide timely, consistent, and comprehensive guidance to all members of the Harvard Chan community who have faculty or other academic appointments or who provide support to academic appointees.

Faculty affairs functions as a human resources team for faculty in several keyways. We document and maintain policies and procedures related to all academic appointments and appointment actions, including recruitment, hiring, onboarding, reviews, promotions, mentoring and development, leaves, retirements, as well as the miscellaneous activities in and around those milestones. Additionally, we track and analyze much of the data these processes generate, both on regular cycles and upon request. Utilizing data driven insights and responding to changing needs, climate, and market forces, we seek to provide strategically valuable professional development opportunities and resources to complement the School's and University's offerings, to ensure that our faculty and other academic appointees are well-positioned for success. If challenges arise, faculty affairs can take a case management approach and partner with departments, to convene the people, ideas, and resources needed to identify solutions.

OFA is first and foremost committed to the School's values of equity, diversity, inclusion, and belonging throughout the life cycle of all academic appointments. In close collaboration with the School's Office of Diversity & Inclusion, OFA provides guidance on fair and unbiased search processes; monitors salary equity, receives and addresses Title IX complaints and assists departments with other faculty related grievances, and helps to support individuals and teams as they work to collaborate, coauthor, and coexist effectively within the School's physical, intellectual, and financial footprint.

This appointments handbook is comprehensive, but not exhaustive. We work in tandem with other School business units—including academic departments, Human Resources, the Offices of Financial Services, Information Technology, Research Strategy and Development, Sponsored Programs Administration, Education, the Dean's Office, etc.—as well as all relevant University-wide offices. Our procedures reflect official School and University policy but will not always restate that policy verbatim. We do refer throughout this guidance to relevant external policies as needed, but our guidance is meant to operationalize and reinforce other School and University policy, not to supersede it. On occasion, when departure from regular procedure is necessary or unavoidable, OFA should be consulted to ensure no violation of policy undermines or invalidates the appointment or action in question.

General Principles: Faculty Appointments

The policies and procedures outlined in this document cover the appointment, reappointment, and promotion of faculty members at the Harvard Chan School. The categories and ranks of faculty used at the Harvard Chan School are specified in the section “Types of Appointment and Related Criteria.” While there is substantial overlap for policies and procedures related to different faculty ranks, there are notable differences, and this document attempts to specify such differences wherever possible.

The School’s overarching principles relating to appointments, reappointments, and promotions are as follows:

- **Fairness:** these policies and procedures are intended to achieve an appropriate degree of uniformity and equity within and across appointments. They should not be used to introduce inflexibility or unnecessarily cumbersome process steps, but they are intended to achieve some measure of fairness, and as such are not optional guidance but prevailing best practices. On occasion, procedures may be modified in special instances to better further the interests of the School and University, provided the modifications result in fair treatment and/or lawful accommodation of individual appointees.
- **Authority:** various individuals and committees hold responsibility for different aspects of appointment, reappointment, and promotion processes, including the deans, department chairs, members of search and review committees, and members of the Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP). The function of each role is to make recommendations on behalf of the department or School. Only the designated official or committee in the University’s central administration (e.g., the Provost’s office) has the authority to confer final approval on most of the School’s faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions.
- **Consistency:** those responsible for any step in the procedures relating to searches and reviews must ensure that there is no discrimination in the employment or advancement of qualified individuals based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability status, protected veteran status, gender identity, sexual orientation, pregnancy and pregnancy-related conditions or any other characteristic protected by law. More affirmatively, all searches and reviews should use the recommended procedures to ensure that maximum opportunity is provided for the recruitment and promotion of women and members of underrepresented minority groups.

Any individual (or department) who believes that appropriate procedures have not been followed in the context of a specific appointment, or that an injustice has been done to an individual, may appeal to the chair of the department, the chair of SCARP, or the Dean and/or Dean for Academic Affairs, and request

a review of the process and outcome. For general inquiries or concerns, please visit our anonymous reporting hot line at: <https://reportinghotline.harvard.edu>.

Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP)

The Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP) reviews recommendations for faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions; advises the Dean on the resolution of these recommendations; ensures that School policies and procedures leading to these recommendations have been followed and that any exceptions to them have been documented; and proposes new policies and procedures and/or revisions of existing policy as needed, which on certain occasions may be subject to the approval of the full faculty. After reviewing recommendations for promotion from assistant to associate professor, SCARP provides feedback to individual faculty members about aspects of their academic record that should be strengthened, modified, or expanded. Finally, SCARP may be asked to play a role in adjudicating grievances when an individual or department chair believes that appropriate procedures have not been followed in the context of a specific appointment or faculty member.

Details relating to committee membership are as follows:

- **SCARP members:** members are appointed by the Dean from among the School's tenured professors. The nine members of SCARP are selected for their academic distinction and integrity. They are also selected to bring disciplinary, departmental, and administrative breadth to the committee. It is expected that their allegiance as members of SCARP will be to the School as a whole and that they will not view themselves as representatives of their academic departments, though it is expected that a member will be familiar with a case in their department when it appears on SCARP's agenda. The Dean of the Faculty, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs are invited to serve *ex officio*.
- **Term of membership:** ordinarily, three members are appointed each year to serve for three-year terms. No more than two terms may be served consecutively.
- **Chair and vice-chair:** the members of SCARP elect a chair and vice-chair annually from the continuing members. The chair may not serve for more than two consecutive years.
- **Quorum and voting privileges:** a meeting will not be scheduled unless five voting members have indicated that they will be present; once scheduled, however, the meeting will be held if four voting members are present at the scheduled time. Ordinarily, only the nine appointed faculty members vote on recommendations; however, if fewer than five appointed members are present, the Dean for Academic Affairs may vote. A member leaves the room when a vote is taken on a recommendation pertaining to the member's own academic department, or if the

member served on the search or review committee from which a recommendation is being voted on.

- **Subcommittees:** SCARP normally acts as a committee of the whole but may choose to designate a subcommittee to examine more carefully a particular case of appointment, reappointment, or promotion in which there are questions about the procedures followed, or to draft or review proposed procedures.

Because it is essential that all information provided to and discussed by SCARP remain confidential, SCARP members are required to read and sign the document “Role of Committee Members and Guidelines for Confidentiality” (see [Appendix I](#)) at the first meeting of each academic year.

Types of Appointments, Formal Titles, and Related Criteria

Appointment Types and Titles

- Primary faculty: tenured and tenure ladder (or “tenure-track”)
 - **Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Associate Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Assistant Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]

- Primary faculty: non-tenure ladder (or “non-ladder” or “term”)
 - **Research Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Professor of the Practice** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Professor in Residence** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Senior Lecturer** on [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Lecturer** on [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Member of the Faculty** (administrative appointment)

- Emeritus faculty: retired primary senior faculty (of “long and faithful service”)
 - **Professor** of [DEPARTMENT], Emeritus
 - **Professor of the Practice** of [DEPARTMENT], Emeritus
 - **Professor in Residence** of [DEPARTMENT], Emeritus
 - **Senior Lecturer** on [DEPARTMENT], Emeritus

- Secondary faculty (primary appointment in another Harvard Faculty)*
 - **Professor in the Department** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Associate Professor in the Department** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Assistant Professor in the Department** of [DEPARTMENT]

- **Senior Lecturer in** the Department of [DEPARTMENT]
- **Lecturer in** the Department of [DEPARTMENT]
- Adjunct faculty (primary appointment outside of Harvard)*
 - **Adjunct Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Adjunct Associate Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Adjunct Assistant Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Adjunct Senior Lecturer** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Adjunct Lecturer** on [DEPARTMENT]
- Visiting faculty*
 - **Visiting Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Visiting Associate Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Visiting Assistant Professor** of [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Visiting Senior Lecturer** on [DEPARTMENT]
 - **Visiting Lecturer** on [DEPARTMENT]
- Faculty affiliates
 - **Faculty Affiliate** in the Department of [DEPARTMENT]

*Typically, the rank of the secondary, adjunct, or visiting faculty member’s primary appointment is mirrored in their Harvard Chan appointment, unless there is no equivalent appointment type or the criteria at the primary institution are disparate enough to warrant a different appointment type at the School. For example, the School does not have clinical or research faculty appointments but will typically recognize a clinical assistant professor as an “adjunct assistant professor” at the School. For appointments without an equivalent at the School (e.g., director, rector, reader, docent, tutor, etc.), the closest equivalent will be assigned based on the qualifications of the faculty member.

All appointments except for tenured primary faculty appointments are made for limited periods of time, or terms.

I. Primary Faculty

Primary faculty are those whose chief affiliation is with the Harvard Chan School, which holds institutional responsibility for their appointments and career development. Most primary faculty members are employees of Harvard University, in which case the Harvard Chan School is also responsible for salary, benefits, and any other financial and space arrangements agreed to at the time of appointment or subsequently. In some cases, a faculty member may be an employee of a Harvard teaching hospital, in which case the financial responsibility is held by the employing institution.

Very occasionally, a faculty member with a significant commitment both to the Harvard Chan School and to another Harvard school may hold simultaneous primary appointments (an arrangement known as a “joint appointment”) at both schools. [Other schools at Harvard may provide formal affiliations to Harvard Chan School faculty members, which are not joint appointments.] A joint appointment may be made following a search in which both schools have participated. While the two schools normally share responsibility for the financial aspects of the appointment, other arrangements may be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. While joint appointments are usually made only at the full professor rank, in the unusual case that the appointment is at the rank of assistant or associate professor, the two schools must agree on how responsibility for the individual’s career development and division of their service and teaching will be shared. More often, a secondary appointment at the Harvard Chan School will be given to a faculty member whose primary appointment is in another Harvard school and who makes a significant continuing contribution to the academic programs of the Harvard Chan School.

Ordinarily, the titles of primary faculty reflect the name of the individuals’ academic departments; however, occasionally a title will be amended to denote a specific disciplinary focus. Faculty titles are formally approved as part of the recruitment and promotion processes and are not conferred at the department level.

All primary faculty have the privilege of voting in faculty meetings.

A. Primary faculty, tenured and tenure ladder

Assistant and associate professors are described at the Harvard Chan School as “tenure ladder” or “tenure-track” appointments, to convey the fact that tenure is awarded only at the rank of full professor. While the combined total of term appointments as assistant and associate professor ordinarily does not exceed eleven years, ladder extensions are granted in certain circumstances. (See [Appendix XIV](#) for information about extension of the tenure clock.) Tenured and tenure-ladder appointments—collectively referred to at Harvard as “ladder faculty”—are expected to be full-time.

The tenure clock

A tenure clock refers to the limited period provided to tenure-track faculty during which they are eligible to be reviewed for promotion to tenure (a full professor appointment without limit of time). After the tenure clock expires, the faculty member is no longer eligible to be reviewed for promotion to tenure. At the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, the tenure clock is eleven years from the start date of the faculty member’s first assistant professor appointment. A full clock at the Harvard Chan School generally comprises: two three-year terms as assistant professor and one five-year term as associate professor,

plus any approved clock extension time. For faculty members who begin their faculty appointments as associate professors, it will be assumed they will be reviewed for tenure in their fourth or fifth year as associate professor, unless they have been granted clock extensions.

Extensions of the clock are made for the birth or adoption of a child, major medical events/leaves, major delays in lab construction, and the disruptive effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Typically, these are one-year extensions per event, but they may be shorter as appropriate:

- Birth or adoption clock extensions are automatic (opt-out) extensions (triggered by formal request for parental leave)
- Medical events/leave clock extensions are provided in consultation with the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
- Lab construction delay clock extensions are made in consultation with the department chair, the Executive Dean for Administration, and the Dean for Academic Affairs
- COVID-19 clock extensions:
 - A one-year (opt-in) clock extension was offered to all tenure-track faculty in 2020.
 - An additional extension of up to one year may be requested in consultation with the department chair, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.

Professor

Appointments at the rank of professor are made with tenure, i.e., without limit of time. Criteria considered in evaluating a candidate's qualifications for a tenured professorship include the following:

- Originality, independence, and **excellence in science and scholarship**
- **National and international recognition** as a scholar whose research has had a significant impact on their field
- In collaborative research, **evidence of intellectual leadership** and identifiable individual contributions to science and scholarship
- National or international **leadership within the candidate's field**
- Promise of **future productivity** and innovation
- **Contributions to classroom teaching, research training and mentorship**, and/or leadership of educational programs
- Impact of **translational activities** that foster improvements in public health

Note: Intramural funding records can provide important evaluative information about a candidate for tenure at the Harvard Chan School, and often overlap with or enhance a candidate's accomplishments in the categories of research, teaching/mentoring, service, and translational activities. However, it is

important to note that the University does not officially use or recognize funding success as a formal criterion for tenure. In making a case for tenure—in the dossier or a committee report—funding achievements should be highlighted to reinforce the independent intellectual case for the candidate rather than being presented as a primary argument for tenure.

Associate professor

An appointment as associate professor ordinarily carries a term of five years. However, in certain circumstances, for example if a five-year term would extend the individual's time on the tenure ladder beyond eleven years, the appointment may be granted for a shorter term. Criteria considered in evaluating a candidate's qualifications for appointment as an associate professor include the following:

- **Nationally recognized** as an independent investigator whose research has contributed to their field
- **Continuing publication in refereed journals of original research** in the forefront of the field; should be first (or senior) author or contributor of major ideas and innovations
- Identifiable **independence from senior scientific** mentors
- Participation in mutually reinforcing **collaborations with colleagues**
- **Excellent performance in classroom and individual instruction**, and/or leadership in educational program development
- Membership and **active involvement in professional societies**
- **Contributions to School service**, leadership, and community engagement activities

Assistant professor

An initial appointment as assistant professor carries a term of three years. Appointments at this rank are ordinarily renewed only once, for a second three-year term. The total number of years at this rank ordinarily may not exceed eight. Criteria considered in evaluating a candidate's qualifications for appointment as an assistant professor include the following:

- Evidence of a **high level of scientific competence** in a specialty area and promise for important contributions
- **Major contributor to refereed publications** or other evidence of potential for scholarship
- Evidence of a **high level of competence in oral communication** and a demonstrated interest in teaching

B. Primary faculty, non-tenure ladder

The Harvard Chan School also appoints primary faculty whose positions are not on the tenure ladder (e.g., lecturer, professor of the practice) and who are not subject to the eleven-year rule (i.e., the tenure clock limit for tenure-track faculty). Appointments of non-ladder primary faculty are renewable if a demonstrated need for the appointment exists and the expectations for performance are met, but they carry no inherent entitlement to reappointment.

A select few current faculty members hold term professorships made under previous criteria that are at variance with criteria presented in this document. The continuation of their current rank and title has been approved by the Provost if these individuals are approved for reappointment. Because the criteria by which they were originally appointed are no longer in use, reappointment decisions for such term professorships are made on a case-by-case basis.

Research professor

The rank of “research professor” provides transitional appointments to individuals who are eligible for emeritus status and who relinquish tenure but wish to remain involved in faculty activities. Such titles can be held for up to five years after formal retirement. Appointment terms are made in one-year increments. Individuals who request this title in lieu of the regular title of professor, *emerita* or *emeritus* are asked to write to their department chair annually to confirm their planned research activities and funding plans for the coming year.

The terms of the research professorships require that an active program of research in retirement be underway. If an individual accepts another full-time academic appointment after retirement from Harvard, the appropriate title will be professor, *emeritus* or *emerita*.

Professor of the practice

An appointment as professor of the practice may be proposed for an individual recognized for their prominence and effectiveness as a leader in public health practice, defined for this purpose as the design, implementation, and evaluation of policies and programs to deliver services aimed at improving the health of defined populations, generally at the state, national, or international level. Practice appointments are most likely to arise when the School identifies an individual with the ability and experience needed to play a significant role in the academic and practice community at the Harvard Chan School; for example, when a senior official leaves a government post during a transition of administration.

The faculty title normally takes the form of “professor of the practice of public health.” Appointments are ordinarily five years in duration and can be renewed indefinitely, although they carry no inherent entitlement to reappointment. A professor of the practice is expected to have a full-time commitment to the School. Professors of the practice have voting rights as senior faculty in the department, except on decisions relating to appointments to the tenured rank.

Note: While the School wishes to increase the number of faculty members whose practice-related efforts evolve as an integral part of their research interests and teaching responsibilities, applied public health research or community-based activities conducted as a member of the faculty at this or another academic institution would rarely, if ever, be sufficient to qualify such an individual for a practice faculty position. Prior ladder faculty appointments do not pre-qualify an individual for practice appointments.

Professor in residence

Appointments as professor in residence are reserved for senior scholars who ordinarily have held tenured appointments at other academic institutions and (1) fulfill a well-defined but time-limited programmatic or administrative need; (2) have the capacity to make significant contributions to the School throughout the term of their appointments; and (3) have had a considerable impact on their fields, including demonstrated excellence in teaching and research. Candidates should ordinarily have a doctorate (with the exception, as appropriate, of appointments in the arts).

Appointments to this rank are made for a term of up to five years with approval from the Dean and the Provost. These appointments are renewable for one additional five-year term contingent upon review and approval of the Dean and the Provost. Professors in residence have voting rights as senior faculty in the department, except on decisions relating to appointments to the tenured rank.

Senior lecturer and lecturer¹

Appointments as lecturer and senior lecturer are intended, in the service of identified core School education and research needs, to provide greater flexibility with respect to individuals’ backgrounds and activities than do appointments on the tenure ladder. In terms of background, candidates may fall anywhere along a spectrum of professional to academic. Collectively, their contributions to the School also lie on a spectrum, from predominantly teaching to predominantly conducting research. The department, in proposing individuals for these ranks, should begin its recommendation with a statement of the need that this candidate will fill, and SCARP, in reviewing these recommendations, should consider the qualifications of the candidate in relation to that need. Please refer to the Lecturer/Senior Lecturer appointment procedures, or the Senior Lecturer promotion procedures for guidance on criteria

and procedure guidelines. For additional guidance on policies and procedures please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Senior lecturer

An appointment as senior lecturer carries a five-year term and may be renewed indefinitely. An appointment as senior lecturer may be appropriate in the following circumstances:

- Senior lecturer may be the first faculty appointment at the Harvard Chan School for an individual who, during a search or review for appointment, is found to be qualified for faculty appointment and is expected to bring special experience or skill to the faculty, but whose circumstances, while meeting a particular need of the department, are inappropriate for a position on the tenure ladder.
 - It is also possible that the individual may be qualified for a position on the tenure ladder but that such a position is not available at the time of appointment.
- A lecturer who has demonstrated significant leadership in either education or research may be recommended for promotion to senior lecturer. Promotion in such a case would also indicate an increased level of responsibility, disciplinary expertise, and/or participation in curriculum or program development or other by making formative contributions to the department.
- In certain rare circumstances, an appointment as senior lecturer may be recommended for an associate professor at the Harvard Chan School who leaves the tenure ladder (i.e., they will not be promoted to tenure) but for whom the School may have compelling reasons to retain on the faculty. For purposes of equity and consistency, senior lecturer is the only faculty rank that should be used for individuals who leave the tenure ladder as associate professors.
- Open searches are encouraged but not required for term positions, such as senior lecturer. A department may seek, identify, or otherwise recruit a senior lecturer directly to fulfill an appropriate set of duties.

Lecturer

An appointment as lecturer carries a three-year term and may be renewed indefinitely. An appointment as lecturer may be appropriate in the following circumstances:

- Lecturer may be the **first faculty appointment** at the Harvard Chan School for an individual who, during a search or review for appointment, is found to be qualified for a faculty appointment and is expected to bring special experience or skill to the faculty, but whose circumstances, while meeting a particular need of the department, are inappropriate for a position on the tenure ladder.
 - It is also possible that the individual may be qualified for a position on the tenure ladder but that such a **position is not available** at the time of appointment.

- In certain rare circumstances, an appointment as lecturer may be recommended for an **assistant professor at the Harvard Chan School who leaves the tenure ladder** (i.e., they will not be promoted to associate professor, but there are compelling reasons to retain them on the faculty). This option will be exercised only very rarely.
- Open searches are encouraged but not required for term positions, such as lecturer. A department may seek, identify, or otherwise **recruit a lecturer directly** to fulfill an appropriate set of duties.

Emeritus faculty

Primary senior faculty members (ladder and non-ladder) who have rendered “long and faithful service” under the terms of a 2022 Harvard Corporation vote, are eligible to become emeritus faculty of the Harvard Chan School. Emeritus faculty retain an emeritus title and several ongoing benefits and perquisites, including continued email and other account access, and enjoy opportunities to continue to engage with the School and University communities.

Member of the faculty

This title is reserved for individuals who do not hold another faculty rank but who serve in senior administrative positions at the Harvard Chan School. The purpose of such appointments is to enable participation in faculty meetings as a mechanism for informing and enhancing the functions of the administrative position. The appointment is coterminous with the individual’s administrative position. No review is conducted. This rank does not confer voting rights.

II. Secondary Faculty

- A secondary faculty appointment may be proposed for a faculty member of another Harvard school who is expected to make a **significant contribution to Harvard Chan academic activities**. Contributions are expected to constitute a minimum of 5% fulltime equivalent (FTE); examples of activities that meet this requirement include serving as the primary instructor of a course, as a student’s primary dissertation advisor, or as mentor to a postdoctoral fellow. (See [Appendix XI-A](#) for additional appointment criteria, appointment procedure, and the form used to nominate secondary faculty.)
- While **research collaborations are not sufficient grounds** to grant a secondary appointment, it is a School requirement that an individual who serves as principal investigator on a grant that is funded through the School hold a Harvard Chan appointment. For this reason, occasionally, a secondary appointment may be granted administratively (i.e., without SCARP review) to the principal investigator on an active grant running through the School.

- The **titles of secondary faculty take the form of “Professor in the Department of _____.”** The Harvard Chan School ordinarily honors the individual’s primary appointment rank (assistant, associate, or full professor).
- Appointments and reappointments of such individuals are ordinarily **coterminous with their primary Harvard appointments**, but no single term may be longer than five years.
- Secondary faculty have the **privilege of voting in school wide faculty meetings**, and their appointments are renewable if a need for the appointment exists and the expectations for performance are met, though they carry no inherent entitlement to reappointment.

III. Adjunct Faculty

- An adjunct appointment may be proposed for an individual whose primary affiliation is not at Harvard University and who is expected to make a **significant contribution to Harvard Chan academic activities**. Contributions are ordinarily expected to constitute a minimum of 5% FTE; examples of activities that meet this requirement include serving as the primary instructor of a course, as a student’s primary dissertation advisor, or as mentor to a postdoctoral fellow. See [Appendix XII](#) for additional adjunct faculty appointment criteria, appointment procedure, and the form used to nominate adjunct faculty.
- Ordinarily, an adjunct faculty member **must hold a primary academic appointment at another college, university, academic institute, or teaching hospital**. In rare circumstances, an adjunct appointment may be conferred to or renewed for an individual who has transitioned out of academia or has retired from their primary appointment.
- While the **Harvard Chan School ordinarily honors the individual’s rank** (assistant, associate, or full professor) held in their home institution, consideration may also be given to whether the nominee would be a finalist (“short-listed”) in a Harvard Chan search at the proposed rank. Persons who have not held an academic rank will ordinarily be appointed at the rank of lecturer. In each case, the Harvard Chan **title is preceded by the modifier “adjunct.”**
- Terms are ordinarily five years (for adjunct professor, associate professor, and senior lecturer) or three years (for adjunct assistant professor and lecturer) and may be renewed if a need for the appointment exists and the expectations for performance are met, though they **carry no inherent entitlement to reappointment**.
- Adjunct faculty **do not have the privilege of voting** in school-wide faculty meetings.

ABCD appointments

Each department has a limited number of slots (typically 5) for making “appointments by the chair’s discretion” (ABCD). These secondary and/or adjunct appointments are reserved for the department chair to grant to those who would benefit the department in a clear and measurable way, but who may not technically qualify for an appointment. The department chair will submit to OFA the candidate’s CV, along with a letter explaining the planned contributions of the candidate to the department and School. These appointments are not reviewed by SCARP.

IV. Visiting Faculty

- A visiting faculty appointment may be proposed for an individual with academic rank in another university or relevant professional position who will be present at the Harvard Chan School for a designated period, for example while on leave from a home institution. Visiting faculty are **expected to participate in academic activities** to an extent commensurate with their qualifications and length of appointment.
- While the Harvard Chan School ordinarily honors the individual’s rank (assistant, associate, or full professor) held in their current or former home institution, consideration may also be given to whether the nominee would be a finalist (“short-listed”) in a Harvard Chan search at the proposed rank. Persons who have not held an academic rank will ordinarily be appointed at the rank of lecturer. In each case, the Harvard Chan **title is preceded by the modifier “visiting.”**
- Ordinarily, the appointment is for **a period of up to one year with renewal for an additional year**. Visiting faculty appointments will **not exceed two years**, regardless of whether the appointments were consecutive or non-consecutive. This two-year limit also applies even if the faculty member’s rank should change at any point during the duration of appointment.
- Visiting faculty **do not have the privilege of voting** in school-wide faculty meetings.

Note: Visiting appointments are not to be made as courtesies to collaborators or prominent scholars who are not actively participating in the School’s fundamental activities. Justification for these appointments should be driven by departmental and/or School need.

V. Other Appointments

Faculty affiliations

All faculty members are appointed and have an administrative home in one of the School’s academic departments, though some have affiliations with other departments to facilitate interdepartmental exchange and collaboration. **Faculty affiliates do not hold faculty “appointments”** in their non-primary

departments, and as such are neither required to be evaluated formally by the affiliate departments nor expected to contribute to the service or teaching needs of those affiliate departments.

Departments may have expectations regarding the level of engagement in department activities for faculty affiliates, and the department chair will communicate those expectations upon granting an affiliation request.

Joint appointments

In some rare cases, a faculty member who will be making significant contributions to two departments may be appointed in both departments (this is known as a “joint appointment”). In this case, both departments would participate in the search and all other evaluative aspects of the appointment, such as reviews and promotions.

- In a true joint appointment, one department is normally designated as the “primary administrative home” for the faculty member and is responsible, as appropriate and relevant, for the logistical management of the appointment’s administration and any financial and/or space arrangements agreed to at the time of appointment or subsequently.
- The financial obligations of each department are normally specified prior to the extension of an offer of joint appointment.
- Joint appointees should be evaluated for reappointment and promotion by both departments and are expected to contribute formally and proportionally to the service needs of both departments.

Associate of the department appointments

The department associate appointment, while **not technically a faculty appointment**, may be used on occasion to engage faculty collaborators who do not meet the criteria for other appointment types. is an **annual, unpaid** non-faculty appointment at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, which can be used for several specific and limited purposes. **Department associates are not eligible for PI rights.**

This appointment is intended to foster collaboration with self-funded individuals engaged in activities that directly support the School’s teaching and/or research missions, who may not be eligible for any other appointment. The appointment can be made for a minimum of three months and is not to exceed 12 months. Individuals may hold the department associate title for up to one year and are eligible for extension during the annual reappointment process if the need for their contribution continues. Titles take the form of “Associate of the Department of _____.”

As stated above, the department associate appointment should be used to foster or engage useful and relevant professional capacities related to specific identified education or research needs that are otherwise unmet at the School. It may also be used to strengthen a department's mentoring or inclusion and belonging activities or expertise. Department associates are not required to be on campus and are unpaid, so this appointment type may be used in the context of off-campus field research.

Procedures for Faculty Searches

The decision to launch a search normally begins with the identification of a particular need within a department, ideally within the context of the department and the School's strategic plans. In exceptional circumstances, the decision can also begin with the identification by the department chair or Dean of an individual whose potential appointment represents a unique opportunity for the department or School.

All initial appointments to the tenure-track ranks of assistant or associate professor and most to the rank of professor are made after a rigorous open search, even when there is an identified internal or external candidate. For tenure-track searches for assistant or associate professor ranks, even if an individual has been identified as an extraordinary opportunity for recruitment, the department and search committee are encouraged to follow all open search guidelines. Before commencing the search it is vital for the department chair and committee members to provide the names of any known candidates who are likely to apply. This list should be included, with CV's for candidates if available, in the initiation of a search request. If a potential member of the search committee has a real or perceived conflict with a likely applicant in an upcoming search, it is best to proactively avoid including that faculty member on the search committee. For further details on disclosing conflicts of interest on search committees please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs.

I. Tenure-track Searches²

A. Tenure-track search: proposal phase

A proposal to launch a search ordinarily originates with the department chair, though in some circumstances the proposal may be initiated by the Dean. In either case, a search should be driven by the identification of a particular need within the department, ideally within the context of existing department and School strategic plans. The first step is for the Dean, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the department chair to discuss the possibility of launching a search.

² In collaboration with the Office for Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging (ODIB), OFA is currently reviewing and updating search policies and procedures to ensure searches are conducted fairly and that the potential for implicit bias is minimized. Additional guidance as to the purposes and procedures for conducting fair searches and minimizing implicit bias will be forthcoming (May 2022).

The department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for an associate professor appointment: associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors; for an assistant professor appointment: assistant and associate professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the search should proceed. If on consultation with the Dean or Dean for Academic Affairs, additional School input is warranted, the department chair may be invited to make a presentation to Academic Council (see [Appendix II](#)).

After consulting with the relevant department faculty, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean for Academic Affairs, including:

- Information about the research and programmatic **focus of the position**
- Rationale for a hire** in this area vis-à-vis the department's faculty development and/or strategic plan
- Draft position** description
- Proposed **committee membership**
- OTF form** completed in coordination with the Office of Financial Services
- List of at least five **women and/or under-represented minority candidates** that fit the search criteria**
- Disclosure of any **identified internal or external candidate**.

A copy of this request along with accompanying materials must be shared with the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA).

**At or before the first committee meeting, committee members should be consulted to add to this list in case committee input would provide a more relevant or promising list of candidates for outreach activities.

B. Tenure-track search: review phase

Committee membership

Before OFA invites committee members to serve, written approval of the search and committee membership from the Dean for Academic Affairs (as requested in the chair's letter) should be obtained. Ordinarily, tenured professors comprise search committees, though occasionally associate professors, term professors, or senior non-ladder faculty may be requested to serve by exception (e.g., relevant

tenured faculty are on sabbatical, or the committee would otherwise lack disciplinary or demographic diversity).

All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals*. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot serve as search committee chair. If a potential member of the search committee has a real or perceived conflict with a likely applicant in an upcoming search, it is best to proactively avoid including that faculty member on the search committee.

Committee confidentiality

Members of the committee are apprised of the School's policy on the confidential nature of searches and are asked to sign a confidentiality agreement (see [Appendix IV](#)). This document will normally be sent by OFA along with the invitation to serve or will be distributed for signature at the first committee meeting. It is the responsibility of each committee member to disclose any potential conflict of interest with candidate(s) as soon as that potential is known.

Search posting

Once the members of the committee have been seated, the search committee may examine the job advertisement to be posted, either via email or at the first committee meeting. Consultation with the Chief Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Officer and/or the Associate or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs is required to ensure that the ad and advertising plan are optimized to solicit the most diverse pool of applicants possible.

Once the job posting has been finalized by the committee, including ex officio members, Chief Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Officer and Associate or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs, it can be posted in the Academic Recruiting Information eSystem (ARIES) by the search administrator. Please note that the ARIES posting must be reviewed and approved by the Office of Faculty Affairs before it is posted externally. All applicants to the search must apply through ARIES to receive full consideration and review. All applicants must meet the posting's published basic qualifications to be considered for the position as it is a legally binding section. See search outreach section below for important guidelines about documenting recruitment efforts.

It is important that the job description highlights and encourages a diverse and inclusive pool of candidates to help build our campus community. Some examples of potential wording to include in the posting are:

- “Harvard is especially interested in candidates who, through their research, teaching, and service, will contribute to the diversity and excellence of the academic community. The department strongly encourages applications from individuals who identify as members of groups that are underrepresented in [FIELD].”
- At the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, we believe diversity is integral to the Harvard experience and our mission of improving public health education, research, and policy. Diversity of cultural backgrounds, identities, lived experiences, perspectives, and ways of understanding the world enriches our community and enables us to best meet the public health needs of the United States and the world. Ongoing learning and development related to diversity allows for both individual and institutional growth and is necessary to foster and sustain a culture of inclusion. To achieve this, we are committed to ensuring equitable access to opportunities for learning, living, and working at Harvard T.H. Chan. We maintain an unwavering dedication to diversity, inclusion, and belonging as core to our institutional values and to actively address racism, sexism, xenophobia, homophobia, gender bias, and all forms of discrimination.”
- “We seek faculty members who will foster the principles of diversity, inclusion, and belonging throughout their research and teaching activities that will enhance the work of the department and attract and retain a diverse student body.”

“The department values diversity among its faculty, is committed to building a culturally diverse intellectual community, and strongly encourages applications from women and members of underrepresented groups.”

First committee meeting

At the first scheduled search committee meeting, the Associate or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs will give the committee its charge, provide an overview of expectations of the search committee, and answer any questions the committee may have. The School’s Chief Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Officer will also join the first meeting to provide any additional guidance on unconscious bias and fair search practices. This consultation will supplement formal implicit bias training that all faculty eligible to serve on search committees will receive as part of regular School and departmental programming. If it has not been discussed yet the search committee will work to finalize the job posting and provide input on potential sources of outreach. The search administrator should note all important discussions that occur at each meeting.

Based on the contents of the job description, the committee should document the criteria they will use to evaluate candidates prior to the longlist and shortlist stages. Not documenting and agreeing upon objective criteria but instead relying on superlative qualifiers or abstract descriptions (e.g., “leadership potential” or “outstanding publication record”) can understandably lead to unconscious bias. Criteria related to the field and subfield(s), potential teaching and mentoring areas, commitment to educational objectives (such as inclusive curricula and mentoring of diverse student populations), as well as desired technical skills, should be incorporated into the evaluative process for all stages to reinforce the

committee's commitment to a fair and unbiased search. Preferably, the committee will develop a concrete rubric by which each candidate can be assessed, which may include different metrics for different ranks and/or subfields, depending on the breadth of the search.

For details and additional recommendations for developing criteria, see the [Best Practices for Search Committees](#) guide from the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity and the Harvard Chan School Toolkit for Conducting Fair Searches.

Search outreach

To develop a strong applicant pool, the committee and search administrator conduct broad outreach, as follows; these steps may begin before or after the committee's initial meeting:

- The committee and search administrator contact the identified women and/or under-represented minority **candidates from the list drafted for the search approval request**, encouraging them to apply. Committee members will follow-up with individuals personally, several times if needed, to recruit as diverse a pool as possible. The committee is also encouraged to identify additional women and/or under-represented minority candidates via their professional networks throughout the application phase of the search to ensure a strong pool of diverse candidates.
- The position is **widely advertised in print and electronic media**, with all advertisements including a statement that the School is particularly interested in applications from women and underrepresented minority candidates. Departments are encouraged to include in the posting a description of the department's culture and approach to mentoring, as well as references to resources and related centers/communities that could benefit new ladder faculty. If exclusively using online advertisement the primary site on which the ad is posted must be a national professional journal and have original content, such as articles, in addition to job postings. The mandatory online recruitment period is a minimum of 30 days. The confirmation email and/or billing invoice confirming the placement of the ad and its exact period of posting should be saved. Departments that rely on online recruiting will need two printouts or screenshots of the full ad from the website: one from the first day of posting and another on the thirtieth day of posting. These pages must be dated by the actual website printout, not by hand or other addition of the date. If you plan to solely utilize online recruitment, please be sure to document the posting dates as explained in this paragraph.

The committee identifies an extensive **list of individuals, institutions, and organizations** to which it then communicates a request for the nomination of candidates for the position; members are expected to follow up individually with selected recipients and, normally, with all named nominees. Email and phone

communication is the preferred method – emails should be saved, and phone calls should be documented with the date and summary of the conversation that took place.

- The committee and search administrator **contacts individuals who should be invited to apply**, including any identified internal or external candidates. Committee members are expected to follow up with individuals who have been invited to apply. (See [Appendix V](#) for procedures related to identified internal or external candidates.)
- To **build a strong and diverse pool of applicants** it is advisable to post on websites targeted to women and under-represented minority scholars. [A helpful list of websites](#) is provided by the Office of the Senior Vice Provost. Another useful resource for committees is Harvard's membership in the [New England Higher Education Recruitment Consortium \(HERC\)](#), which provides many relevant discounts and best practice guides.
- All **outreach efforts by the search committee and search administrator should be documented** – if candidates are contacted over the phone dates and summaries of conversations should be provided to the search administrator.

The short list

Depending on the size of the overall pool, longlist and shortlist stages may be established simultaneously or sequentially. Whether or not a longlist is required, the committee meets to discuss applicants and to prepare a list of candidates who are considered top candidates (the short list), according to their pre-established criteria. In searches for non-tenured positions, letters of recommendation are solicited either before or after preparing the shortlist. At any point during the candidate review process if a committee member becomes aware of any conflict of interest (real or perceived) they are obligated to disclose the substance of it to the search committee immediately and next steps will be determined in accordance with the type of conflict disclosed. Shortlisted candidates are typically invited for a campus visit, which will include interviews and a recorded seminar. Longlist candidates may be held for further assessment if the original shortlist candidates do not yield offers. Please note that prior to inviting candidates for a campus visit the shortlist, and longlist if utilizing, must be reviewed by the Dean of Academic Affairs. Invitations for a campus visit may only be extended after the Dean of Academic Affairs has given approval.

For best practices and more detail on how to conduct a search and how to create a long list and short list please review the Provost office's [Best Practices for Conducting Faculty Searches](#).

The search administrator should disposition all candidates in ARleS after the committee has made their determination; please refer to the [ARleS Guide to Closing a Search](#). They may disposition those candidates who do not make the short list prior to closing the search if they do not plan to use the long list for backups.

Candidate visit(s)

Candidate visits with shortlisted candidates are scheduled. Visits include a recorded seminar, interviews with members of the committee, department chairs, other members of the faculty, and with the Dean for Academic Affairs and a faculty affairs representative. Each candidate visit must be conducted in as standardized a way as possible – e.g., in terms of overall length and structure of the visits, primary meeting list, and any social events. This is to ensure all candidates are treated consistently and receive equitable consideration.

- The **seminars should be widely advertised but not as job talks**; only department faculty should be informed that these seminars are job talks. The same basic materials, question sets, introductory remarks, email communications, and agenda documents should be used across all visits.
- The search committee should draft a **core set of questions** or themes to be asked of every candidate (e.g., potential research program, possible teaching initiatives, mentoring of a diverse student body).
- **Candidate CVs** can be shared with department faculty; if the department prefers, research statements can be shared as well. Application materials including LORs, cover letters, or any other materials should not be shared outside the committee during the candidate visit phase of the search. These materials can be shared with department’s primary faculty as part of the committee’s report later in the process (during the departmental review).
- **Supplemental meetings** with potential collaborators, women and underrepresented minority faculty members, and/or related relevant research and/or technical staff should be customized according to the specific needs and/or expressed interests of a candidate. All supplemental activities should be documented.
- After the visit has completed the search administrator should obtain standardized **faculty evaluations** (see [Appendix XVI](#)) from those who attended the seminar and those who met with the candidate as part of the primary meeting list for the visit. The recorded seminar should be circulated to all primary faculty within a department to try and gain as much faculty input as possible. These evaluations will be important for the search committee to review and will need to be included in the final search report.

Committee recommendation

After meeting to formulate its recommendation, the committee reports its conclusions to the Dean for Academic Affairs and the department chair in the form of a [Tenure-track Search Report](#); the Dean for Academic Affairs may wish to meet with the search Committee Chair to discuss the recommendation. The committee is expected to recommend all candidates determined to be qualified for the position, and to rank them in order of their preference for appointment. Please be sure as the committee begins

to formulate its recommendation that all candidates within ARIES have been dispositioned according to their applicable status (eg. Not interviewed, not selected; interviewed, not selected; recommended for hire, etc).

C. Tenure-track search: approvals phase

Department review of the search report

In Fall 2019, following requests from departments to find ways to expedite offers to tenure-track faculty candidates in a competitive and often time-sensitive market, the Academic Council deliberated on and endorsed a proposal to permit tenure-track search committees to substitute department approval for SCARP approval. Now departments review and approve search committee search reports before the deans consider and submit them to the Provost's Appointments Review Committee (PARC) for final approval. SCARP was consulted on this change and endorsed the plan.

Department review

The search committee drafts, reviews, and signs off on its search report and then sends the report to OFA for feedback, cc'ing the department chair. Please see [Appendix III](#) for a checklist on drafting the search report. Pending any OFA revision suggestions, tenure-track search committees now present their completed reports and recommendations to department faculty for review.

- The department pre-circulates the search report and the dossiers of recommended candidates to primary faculty and **schedules a meeting to discuss the report's recommendations**. The materials for discussion should be marked very clearly CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE.
 - **External letters may be excluded** from the search report or redacted for the departmental discussion if the search committee believes there could be sensitivities that would distract from the discussion. For example, if letters make references to other faculty in the department or criticize candidates about personal details unrelated to the search. Please consult with the Associate or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs as needed.
- A member of the search committee, the departmental SCARP representative, or the department chair "presents" the report to the department. **Primary faculty will discuss the report and its recommendations** and have an opportunity to ask questions of the committee.
- After a corresponding discussion of the full primary faculty (attended by the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs), **senior faculty in the department will vote** to move the case forward to the deans. We consider senior faculty to be the following: tenured professors,

research professors, term professors, professors of the practice, professors in residence, and senior lecturers.

- The departmental discussion should generally **focus on the report as written** and as a whole. Clarification and/or revisions to the report may be offered for the committee's consideration.
- Any **dissenting opinions on the recommendations of the report shared during the departmental discussion should be documented** and explained in an appendix to the report.
- The **discussion will include all primary departmental faculty**, but voting will be restricted to senior (tenured and term) professors. By inviting the tenure-track faculty to participate in the discussion only, we invite them to take an active role in shaping department without creating a conflict of interest or pressure to align with senior colleagues.

Discussion of mentoring plans for approved candidates

In addition to accelerating the timeline to offers, enlisting the department faculty to discuss and vote on the committee's report should facilitate better tenure-track onboarding, more comprehensive mentoring, and regular reflection on departmental culture. The discussion should also therefore focus on mentoring plans for the top-ranked candidates, as well as identifying any additional department, School, or University resources that would enhance the support of those candidates and/or serve as useful supplementary offer terms.

Departmental vote

- While the discussion will include all primary faculty in the department, **voting is restricted to senior (tenured and term) professors**.
 - The recommended phrasing for the vote is: "Are you in favor of the recommendations presented in this report, Yes or No?"
- **Primary senior faculty should attend the departmental meeting** (at least by video- or teleconferencing) to be eligible to vote. Votes can be solicited at a subsequent executive session after the discussion with tenure-track colleagues, or by email immediately following the departmental meeting and with a very short deadline.
- Tallies should be sent to OFA with the final report (which will now include a summary of the discussion and subsequent vote). Any **changes to the report recommended by department faculty can be incorporated into the final report** at the committee's discretion.
- **OFA will submit the report for decanal and provostial reviews and approval**. Only after those steps, should offers be delivered and communicated to the candidate(s).

Note: SCARP continues to approve reappointments for tenure-track faculty, promotion cases, senior non-ladder, or secondary and adjunct appointments.

Provost's Appointments Review Committee (PARC)

Following department review and the deans' approval, OFA submits the recommendation for University-level approval. (I.e., recommendations for appointment to tenure-track positions are forwarded to PARC for final approval).

D. Tenure-track search: communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for recruitment. The search committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended, and no offers are made to candidates by the department chair before PARC approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

II. Tenured Searches

Initial appointment to the rank of full professor is generally made after a rigorous open search (i.e., one that is advertised and in which a candidate pool is actively sought), even when there is an identified internal or external candidate. Where an individual has been identified as an extraordinary opportunity for recruitment, the department and search committee are encouraged to indicate that an accelerated timeline is desired, even though all open search requirements will be fulfilled. In certain special circumstances, there is also an option to conduct a targeted search (see next section).

A. Tenured faculty search: proposal phase

A proposal to launch a search ordinarily originates with the department chair, though in some circumstances the proposal may be initiated by the Dean. In either case, a search should be driven by the identification of a particular need within the department, ideally within the context of existing department and School strategic plans. The first step is for the Dean, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the department chair to discuss the possibility of launching a search.

The department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for an associate professor appointment: associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors; for an assistant professor appointment: assistant and associate professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the search should proceed. If on consultation with the Dean or Dean for Academic Affairs, additional School input is warranted, the department chair may be invited to make a presentation to Academic Council (see [Appendix II](#)).

After consulting with the relevant department faculty, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean for Academic Affairs, including:

- Information about the research and programmatic **focus of the position**
- Rationale for a hire** in this area vis-à-vis the department's faculty development plan
- Draft position** description
- Proposed **committee membership**
- OTF form** completed in coordination with the Office of Financial Services (OFS)
- List of at least five **women and/or under-represented minority candidates** that fit the search criteria**
- Disclosure of any **identified internal or external candidate**.

A copy of this request along with accompanying materials should be shared with the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA).

**At the first committee meeting, committee members should be consulted to add to this list in case committee input would provide a more relevant or promising list of candidates for outreach activities.

B. Tenured faculty search: review phase

Committee membership

Before OFA invites committee members to serve, written approval of the search and committee membership from the Dean for Academic Affairs (as requested in the chair's letter) should be obtained. Only tenured professors may serve on tenured faculty search committees.

All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity*

goals. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot serve as search committee chair.

Committee confidentiality

Members of the committee are apprised of the School's policy with respect to the confidential nature of searches and are asked to sign a confidentiality agreement (see [Appendix IV](#)). This document will normally be sent by OFA along with the invitation to serve or will be distributed for signature at the first committee meeting.

Search posting

Once the members of the committee have been seated, the search committee will discuss the position/job advertisement to be posted. These discussions can take place via email before the first scheduled search committee meeting or at the first committee meeting. Consultation with the chief diversity, inclusion, and belonging officer is encouraged to ensure that the ad and advertising plan is designed to solicit a diverse pool of applicants.

Once the job posting has been finalized by the committee (including the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and the Chief Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Officer) it can be posted in ARleS by the search administrator. All applicants to the search must apply through ARleS to receive full consideration and review. All applicants must meet the posting's published basic qualifications to be considered for the position.

First committee meeting

At the first scheduled search committee meeting, the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs will give the committee its charge, provide an overview of expectations of the search committee,

and answer any questions the committee may have. The School's Chief Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Officer will also join the first meeting to provide any additional guidance on unconscious bias and fair search practices. This consultation will supplement formal implicit bias training that all faculty eligible to serve on search committees will receive as part of regular School and departmental programming. If it has not been discussed yet the search committee will work to finalize the job posting and provide input on potential sources of outreach. The search administrator should note all important discussions that occur at each meeting.

Based on the contents of the job description, the committee should document the criteria they will use to evaluate candidates prior to the longlist and shortlist stages. Not documenting and agreeing upon objective criteria but instead relying on superlative qualifiers or abstract descriptions (e.g., “leadership potential” or “outstanding publication record”) can understandably lead to unconscious bias. Criteria related to the field and subfield(s), potential teaching and mentoring areas, commitment to educational objectives (such as inclusive curricula and mentoring of diverse student populations), as well as desired technical skills, should be incorporated into the evaluative process for all stages to reinforce the committee’s commitment to a fair and unbiased search. Preferably, the committee will develop a concrete rubric by which each candidate can be assessed, which may include different metrics for different ranks and/or subfields, depending on the breadth of the search.

For details and additional recommendations for developing criteria, see the [Best Practices for Search Committees](#) guide from the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity and the Harvard Chan School Toolkit for Conducting Fair Searches.

Search outreach

To develop a strong applicant pool, the committee and search administrator conduct broad outreach, as follows; these steps may begin before or after the committee’s initial meeting:

- The committee and search administrator **contact the identified women and/or under-represented minority candidates from the list drafted for the search approval request**, encouraging them to apply. Committee members will follow-up with individuals personally, several times if needed, to recruit as diverse a pool as possible. The committee is also encouraged to identify additional women and/or under-represented minority candidates via their professional networks throughout the application phase of the search to ensure a strong pool of diverse candidates.
- **The position is widely advertised in print and electronic media**, with all advertisements including a statement that the School is particularly interested in applications from women and underrepresented minority candidates. Departments are encouraged to include in the posting a description of the department’s culture and approach to mentoring, as well as references to resources and related centers/communities that could benefit new ladder faculty. If exclusively using online advertisement the primary site on which the ad is posted must be a national professional journal and have original content, such as articles, in addition to job postings. The mandatory online recruitment period is a minimum of 30 days. The confirmation email and/or billing invoice confirming the placement of the ad and its exact period of posting should be saved. Departments that rely on online recruiting will need two printouts or screenshots of the full ad from the website: one from the first day of posting and another on the thirtieth day of

posting. These pages must be dated by the actual website printout, not by hand or other addition of the date.

- **The committee identifies an extensive list of individuals, institutions, and organizations** to which it then communicates a request for the nomination of candidates for the position; members are expected to follow up individually with selected recipients and, normally, with all named nominees.
- **The committee and search administrator contact individuals who should be invited to apply**, including any identified internal or external candidates. Committee members are expected to follow up with individuals who have been invited to apply. (See [Appendix V](#) for procedures related to identified internal or external candidates.)
- **To build a strong and diverse pool of applicants** it is advisable to post on websites targeted to women and under-represented minority scholars. [A helpful list of websites](#) is provided by the Office of the Senior Vice Provost. Another useful resource for committees is Harvard's membership in the [New England Higher Education Recruitment Consortium \(HERC\)](#), which provides many relevant discounts and best practice guides.
- All outreach efforts by the search committee and search administrator should be documented – if candidates are contacted over the phone dates and summaries of conversations should be provided to the search administrator.

The short list

Depending on the size of the overall pool, longlist and shortlist stages may be established simultaneously or sequentially. Whether or not a longlist is required, the committee meets to discuss applicants and to prepare a list of candidates who are considered top candidates (the short list), according to their pre-established criteria. In searches for non-tenured positions, letters of recommendation are solicited either before or after preparing the shortlist. Shortlisted candidates are typically invited for a campus visit, which will include interviews and a recorded seminar. Longlist candidates may be held for further assessment if the original shortlist candidates do not yield offers.

For best practices and more detail on how to conduct a search and how to create a long list and short list please review the Provost office's [Best Practices for Conducting Faculty Searches](#).

The search administrator should disposition all candidates in ARIES after the committee has made their determination; please refer to the [ARIES Guide to Closing a Search](#). They may disposition those

candidates who do not make the long list prior to closing the search if they do not plan to use the long list for backups.

Candidate visit(s)

Candidate visits with shortlisted candidates are scheduled. Visits include a recorded seminar, interviews with members of the committee, department chairs, other members of the faculty, and with the Dean for Academic Affairs and a faculty affairs representative. Each candidate visit must be conducted in as standardized a way as possible – e.g., in terms of overall length and structure of the visits, primary meeting list, and any social events. This is to ensure all candidates are treated consistently and receive equitable consideration.

- **The seminars should be widely advertised but not as job talks**; only department faculty should be informed that these seminars are job talks. The same basic materials, question sets, introductory remarks, email communications, and agenda documents should be used across all visits.
- **Candidate CVs** can be shared with department faculty; if the department prefers, research statements can be shared as well. Application materials including LORs, cover letters, or any other materials should not be shared outside the committee during the candidate visit phase of the search. These materials can be shared with department's primary faculty as part of the committee's report later in the process (during the departmental review).
- **Supplemental meetings** with potential collaborators, women and underrepresented minority faculty members, and/or related relevant research and/or technical staff should be customized according to the specific needs and/or expressed interests of a candidate. All supplemental activities should be documented.
- After the visit has completed the search administrator should obtain standardized **faculty evaluations** (see [Appendix XVI](#)) from those who attended the seminar and those who met with the candidate as part of the primary meeting list for the visit. The recorded seminar should be circulated to all primary faculty within a department to try and gain as much faculty input as possible. These evaluations will be important for the search committee to review and will need to be included in the final search report.

Comparison letter process

In searches for tenured professorships, the committee proposes a list of experts who will be asked to write comparison letters, as well as a list of peers with whom the short-listed candidate(s) will be compared. The latter are ideally outstanding scholars deemed potentially suitable for a tenured full professorship at the School. Both comparison letter writers and comparands are vetted by OFA. They

should not be collaborators or mentors of the short-listed candidate(s), should not hold a current Harvard Chan School primary or secondary appointment, and should ideally hold a position as a full professor in a relevant field at a comparable institution.

Approximately 20 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining at least 12 letters, and 5 comparands/peers are listed for comparison. The letters refer to the short-listed candidate(s) alongside the comparands without indicating which of the listed scholars are being considered for the position.

The proposed lists are reviewed by the Dean for Academic Affairs. Once the lists are approved, the chair of the promotion review committee solicits the comparison letters. Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the committee chair, as an alternative.

Promotion review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the short-listed candidate(s) or others who can provide information about the candidate's qualifications from a particular perspective.

Committee recommendation

After meeting to formulate its recommendation, the committee reports its conclusions to the Dean for Academic Affairs and the department chair. The committee is expected to recommend all candidates determined to be qualified for the position, and to rank them according to the committee's preference for appointment. If the department wishes to appoint multiple candidates for two or more different positions, each individual candidate recommended for hire will require a separate search report.

C. Tenured faculty search: approvals phase

Search report and SCARP review

If the deans agree, the search committee completes its report, which is submitted to SCARP for review and a vote. While SCARP may not alter a search report, it may offer suggestions to the deans concerning either the committee's recommendation or contents of the report, which the deans may subsequently convey to the department chair. Appendices to the report include:

- Search initiation** documents
- Agendas** for search committee meetings
- Committee **outreach materials**

- Comparison letters**
- Targeted letters**
- Internal feedback** from School faculty (on seminars, chalk talks, or interviews)
- Candidate **dossier**
 - Candidate's **CV**
 - Candidate's **application materials**
 - Candidate's **selected publications** (ordinarily 10-12, including an annotated bibliography)
- Information on **candidates who were not recommended**, including table with ARIeS dispositioning categories and reasons not hired, and application materials for all short-listed candidates
- Citation report** for candidate and comparands

Ad hoc committee review

Following SCARP review, the deans may submit the recommendation for University-level approval. Recommendations for appointment to tenured positions are forwarded to members of an ad hoc committee of experts chaired by the Provost. Upon SCARP approval the report is sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity with the School's list of proposed ad hoc members. This list often draws from the master list from which the names of letter writers were selected, with additional consultation among promotion review committee members and others; it must be approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs before being sent to the Provost's office. Ad hoc committees comprise three members from outside the University and two from within Harvard but with no School appointment.

Once the Provost's office has approved the list of proposed ad hoc members, a specific date for the ad hoc meeting is confirmed. Because of the difficulty in lining up prominent scholars on short notice, it is highly desirable to allow a minimum of two months between the approval of the list and the ad hoc date.

The ad hoc meeting is held, with the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Senior Vice Provost in attendance as ex officio members. The School also provides several witnesses, including the department chair and the chair of the promotion review committee; other witnesses may be members of the committee with expertise in the candidate's field or members of the department who can provide a different perspective on the case. Subsequently, the decision about the approval or denial of the promotion is conveyed to the deans.

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for recruitment. The search committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended, and no offers are made to candidates by the department chair before ad hoc committee approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

III. Targeted Search

Ordinarily, tenured positions are filled by an open search that is widely advertised and in which vigorous efforts are made to generate an appropriate pool of candidates. On occasion, the School may decide to pursue a targeted search for a tenured professor. To conduct a targeted search, approval from the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity is required. The procedures for a targeted search may be used only when all the following conditions are met:

- There is a **clear definition of the position to be filled**, and the position definition is aligned with the programmatic needs of a department or of the School as a whole.
- An individual external to the School has been identified for this position who, because of their record of nationally/internationally recognized scholarship, distinguished teaching, and significant service, has **outstanding qualifications for the position**.
- The **primary, tenured faculty of the academic department in question have met** for an official **discussion of the proposal** to conduct a targeted search. The views of any faculty members not present should be sought and documented. The Dean for Academic Affairs or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs should attend this meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to provide guidance to the department chair about whether to recommend launching a targeted search.
- The Dean of the Faculty, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity concur with this proposal.

The procedures for requesting and conducting a targeted tenure search are as follows:

A. Targeted search: proposal phase

The department prepares a proposal that addresses the first three conditions listed above, including documentation of the official deliberation of the department's primary, tenured faculty.

The department chair discusses the proposal with the Dean and Dean for Academic Affairs. If the Dean agrees to conduct a targeted search and the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity concurs with this proposal, the deans and the department chair will consider how best to carry it out given the specific circumstances of the case. In some situations, the Dean may instead authorize an open search in which the “targeted” individual may compete.

B. Targeted search: search/review phase

Once the proposal for a targeted search is approved, the normal procedures for a tenure review of an external candidate are followed.

Committee membership

Before OFA invites committee members to serve, written approval of the search and committee membership from the Dean for Academic Affairs (as requested in the chair’s letter) should be obtained. Only tenured professors may serve on tenured faculty search committees.

All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals*. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot serve as search committee chair.

Committee meetings

The targeted search committee convenes in one or more sessions to discuss the position to be filled and the candidate’s qualifications for appointment to a tenured professorship. The candidate may be invited to make a presentation and to interview with the committee and others. Comparison letters are solicited from experts in the field; the list of experts and of peers must be approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs before the letters are sent. The opportunity to comment on the candidate’s qualifications is also extended to tenured faculty in the candidate's department.

C. Targeted search: approvals phase

If the committee concludes that the appointment should go forward, the committee sends its recommendation, report, and supporting documentation to SCARP, whose members must be satisfied that appropriate procedures have been followed and that all conditions have been met for the targeted

appointment. The report must document the committee's process of deliberation and must specifically and thoroughly address the candidate's qualifications. Following SCARP, the deans and department chair will meet prior to the ad hoc meeting.

Ad hoc committee review

Following SCARP review, the case must be submitted for University-level approval. Recommendations for appointment to tenured positions are forwarded to members of an ad hoc committee of experts chaired by the Provost. Upon SCARP approval the report is sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity with the School's list of proposed ad hoc members. This list often draws from the master list from which the names of letter writers were selected, with additional consultation among promotion review committee members and others; it must be approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs before being sent to the Provost's office. Ad hoc committees comprise three members from outside the University and two from within Harvard but with no School appointment.

Once the Provost's office has approved the list of proposed ad hoc members, a specific date for the ad hoc meeting is confirmed. Because of the difficulty in lining up prominent scholars on short notice, it is highly desirable to allow a minimum of two months between the approval of the list and the ad hoc date.

The ad hoc meeting is held, with the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Senior Vice Provost in attendance as ex officio members. The School also provides several witnesses, including the department chair and the chair of the promotion review committee; other witnesses may be members of the committee with expertise in the candidate's field or members of the department who can provide a different perspective on the case. Subsequently, the decision about the approval or denial of the promotion is conveyed to the deans.

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for recruitment. The search committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended, and no offers are to be made to candidates by the department chair before ad hoc committee approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

IV. Other Searches

For non-ladder faculty appointments where a candidate has not already been identified, modified procedures for ladder faculty searches may be used. Consult the Office of Faculty Affairs to discuss requirements.

Procedures for Faculty Reviews

There are several circumstances in which a review for appointment is conducted independently of a faculty search:

1. Appointments for faculty not on the tenure ladder
2. Reappointment of faculty in current rank
3. Reappointment with a change in status
4. Promotion of faculty
5. Appointment as emeritus faculty member

I. Appointment of Faculty Not on the Tenure Ladder

All faculty appointments—ladder and non-ladder—are made based on an existing, identified departmental or School need in a particular area, ideally within the context of department and School strategic plans. Sometimes the need is recognized through contributions already being made to a department’s academic activities by a particular incumbent. In either case, a department chair may nominate an individual for a non-ladder faculty appointment based on how they meet the School’s criteria for a particular rank. See [“Types of Appointment and Related Criteria.”](#)

A. Lecturer/senior lecturer³

Proposal phase

To meet a particular need of an academic department, a department chair may nominate an individual who does not already hold a Harvard Chan School faculty appointment for appointment as a lecturer or senior lecturer. For senior lecturers they must fully satisfy at least two of the following criteria:

- Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising: has taught within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution; has shown national leadership and/or innovation in

3

pedagogy, with outstanding promise of continuing contribution; has an academic advising record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution.

- Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship: has conducted relevant academic research within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution or for at least six years as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School; has significant experience as Principal Investigator for sponsored projects; has a research mentoring record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution.
- Demonstrated record of program development and leadership at the graduate level: has developed and/or managed academic graduate programs in public health education at a peer institution or as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School.

For lecturers they must fully satisfy at least one of the following criteria:

- Relevant experience in teaching: has taught for at least several years as a primary instructor at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution, with promise of continuing independent teaching contribution; has an academic mentorship record typical for early career faculty member at a peer institution
- Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship: has conducted relevant academic research at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution; has a record of sponsored research contributions as Principal or Co-principal Investigator; has supervised research of graduate students and/or postdocs
- Administrative experience: several years as an academic program manager at the graduate level at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution

The department chair is expected to consult with all members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for a senior lecturer appointment: senior lecturers, associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors; for a lecturer appointment: lecturers and senior lecturers, assistant and associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the review should proceed. The department chair then discusses the proposal with the Dean and the Dean for Academic Affairs. (If the need for a lecturer or senior lecturer has been identified, but not a specific individual, the procedures for an open search will be used.)

Written request/proposal contents

Unless the proposal originated with the dean, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean for Academic Affairs providing a position description and a letter addressing the following:

- Position description, including:** the projected role of the nominee at the School and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School.
- Identification of the nominee** and a description of their qualifications and accomplishments (attach CV), including relevant research, teaching, service, and translational achievements.

- ❑ **Projected role** of the nominee at the School and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School. Please specify how they meet the criteria for the position.
- ❑ Details about **financial support** of the position (OTF).
- ❑ Suggestions for **review committee membership**, with explanation of the contribution of each proposed member, if not apparent. Typically, there should be at least three committee members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals*. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot be the search Committee Chair.

Review phase

Launch of review committee

Upon securing both decanal and departmental approval to move forward with the review, the committee is seated, the candidate's materials are solicited, and the process for collecting evaluation letters can begin.

Committee responsibilities

The committee considers the nominee's dossier and qualifications, solicits letters of evaluation from experts familiar with the nominee's field, and formulates a recommendation as to the potential appointment. Three meetings are typically scheduled for reviews, but if two suffice, the committee may use email communications to substitute for one of the meetings.

Candidate dossier

- ❑ **Current CV:** conforming to the School template (see [Appendix VII](#))
- ❑ **Academic report** (see [Appendix VIII](#)): A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate's contributions and what the candidate hopes to accomplish during the appointment in the following areas:
 - ❑ **Research statement:** Detailed summary of the candidate's research and related future plans. Summarize major research accomplishments, including grants activity (in appendix if preferred)
 - ❑ **Teaching statement:** Describe classroom teaching history (complete list of courses taught to be included in CV) and teaching philosophy. Provide any additional evidence of

teaching effectiveness, referring to any teaching awards listed on CV. Append the following materials:

- Syllabi for key courses
- Course materials developed
- Course evaluation reports
- **Advising and mentoring:** Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV.
 - Complete list of students advised at the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral level; dissertations supervised; student practica supervised; and faculty—including post-doctoral fellows—mentored should be included in CV.
- **Service:** Describe service to the field (complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV).
- **Publications:** Five recent publications for senior lecturer or two for lecturer.
- **Candidate’s statement** describing efforts to encourage **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas
- **Suggested list of letter writers:** a list of experts in the field who can comment objectively on the candidate’s area of work, and ideally, who would be aware of the candidate’s work in particular. These individuals should not be current or former colleagues or collaborators of the candidate. Ideally, six letters for senior lecturers and four letters for lecturers should be received and included in the report. Additionally, names of two to four collaborators, colleagues, or mentors may be provided from whom to invite more targeted recommendation letters.
- **Other supporting materials:** The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment.

First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters

- At its first meeting, the committee is briefed by the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. The department chair’s initial written request for the appointment should be provided to the committee to explain the departmental context for the appointment.
- At this or (more likely) a subsequent meeting, the committee may invite the candidate for an informal interview, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate’s record or plans for future work.
- The most important task of the review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation, and at its first meeting the committee focuses primarily on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers.
 - Approximately 8-10 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining 6 letters for a senior lecturer, and approximately 6-8 letters with the goal of obtaining 4 for lecturers.
 - The proposed lists are reviewed by OFA. Once approved, the chair of the review committee solicits the comparison letters.

- Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair, as an alternative.
- Review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who can provide information about the candidate's qualifications from a particular perspective.

***Note:** Letter requests are ordinarily expected to go out no later than two weeks after the initial meeting of the committee. A minimum of eight weeks must be allowed between the date the comparison letter requests are sent and the final meeting; given that time frame, the final meeting will be held on the first available date.*

Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

At this time, the committee can meet with the candidate if needed to ask questions, review any letters that pose concerns (not with the candidate), and plan to write the report.

Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At its final meeting, the committee reviews any remaining letters as well as the draft report and finalizes its recommendation for appointment.

Report contents

- ❑ The finalized report, prepared and signed by the department chair and the chair of the search committee, should include the following sections:
 - ❑ A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate's contributions and the department's recommendation.
 - ❑ **Background and context:** description of the candidate's area and how it fits into the department's academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by a term-limited appointment.
 - ❑ **The search process if an open search:** summary of the search process with copies of correspondence and advertisements, records of telephone conversations, and description of all efforts to identify candidates from diverse populations, including women and minorities; please address the demographics of the pool as displayed in the Departmental EEO Report available in ARIeS.
 - ❑ **External letter writers:** A brief description of the logic underlying the composition of the external letter writer group, especially in cases where the candidate is multidisciplinary.

- **Intellectual case for the candidate**, highlighting the areas most aligned with the goals of the appointment and analyzing how the candidate’s contributions meet the criteria for senior lecturer. This analysis should clearly draw on both the external letters and considered judgments of departmental faculty. The case can draw from the following areas:
 - Summary of the candidate’s relevant **scholarly contributions**.
 - **Teaching, advising, and mentoring**: An evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant)
 - Description and evaluation of **leadership and service contributions** – to the field, the University, the School, and the department
 - Note of any significant efforts to support the School’s **diversity, inclusion, and belonging** goals.
 - Discussion of **the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s case** as noted in the external evaluations and the internal conversations of both the search committee and the department.
- Departmental vote: A record of the department vote, by name, with an “as of” date for the vote tally.
- Appendices
 - Request and approval of **search authorization or appointment**.
 - **Candidate’s dossier** (itemized above).
 - **Letters**:
 - Copy of invitation to letter writers.
 - List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines.
 - Copies of all **responses to invitations**, including declines.
 - **Candidate’s statement** describing efforts to encourage **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
 - If applicable, **total citation count** for the candidate and comparands and **citation count** for each of the candidate’s publications.

Approvals phase

The committee’s final report is submitted to SCARP for review and a vote. This report should describe the projected role of the nominee at the School, the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School, and an assessment of the nominee’s qualifications.

SCARP review is the final determination on a recommendation of lecturer appointment. If the recommendation is at the senior lecturer rank, the deans may submit the recommendation for appointment to the PARC for final approval.

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for recruitment. The search/review committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended, and no offers are made to candidates by the department chair before either SCARP or PARC approval, depending on the rank of the appointment. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

B. Professor of the practice/professor in residence

Proposal phase

A proposal to appoint a specific individual as professor of the practice or professor in residence may be initiated by the Dean or a department chair. Regardless of where the proposal originates, the Dean, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the academic department in which the appointment will be based should discuss the proposal, and the department chair is expected to convene a meeting of the senior members (i.e., tenured and term professors) in their department, documenting the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the review should proceed. (If the need for a professor of the practice has been identified, but not a specific individual, the procedures for an open search will be used.)

Depending on the circumstances, the proposal to the deans or the consultation with senior department faculty may occur first. Please consult with the Dean of Academic Affairs or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs if needed. If on consultation with the Dean or Dean for Academic Affairs, additional School input is warranted to facilitate approval, the department chair may be invited to make a presentation to Academic Council (see [Appendix II](#)).

Written request/proposal contents

Unless the proposal originated with the Dean, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean for Academic Affairs providing:

- Position description.**

- ❑ Identification of the nominee and a **description of their qualifications and accomplishments** (attach CV).
- ❑ Projected **role of the nominee at the School** and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School.
- ❑ Details about **financial aspects of the position**.
- ❑ Suggestions for **review committee membership**, with explanation of the contribution of each proposed member, if not apparent. Typically, there should be at least four committee members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals*. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot be the search committee chair.

Review phase

Presentation by candidate and meeting of senior faculty

The candidate makes a research presentation, which is open to the School community and which tenured members of the department are expected to attend. The department should arrange for this presentation to be recorded, so that it will be available subsequently to members of the promotion review committee. Depending on the circumstances, the presentation may have been conducted prior to the proposal to the deans, in which case, the video link should be distributed for this purpose.

The senior members of the department meet subsequently to discuss the case and to vote on whether the department chair should recommend moving forward with the review. The discussion should encompass both the candidate's qualifications and the department's priorities and resources. The Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs should be present at this meeting.

Launch of review committee

Upon securing both decanal and departmental approval to move forward with the review, the committee is seated, the full dossier solicited, and the process for collecting evaluation letters can begin.

Committee responsibilities

The committee considers the nominee's dossier and qualifications, solicits letters of evaluation from experts familiar with the nominee's field, and formulates a recommendation as to the potential appointment.

Candidate dossier

- ❑ **Current CV** conforming to the School template (see [Appendix VII](#))
- ❑ **Academic report** (see [Appendix VIII](#)): A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate's contributions and what the candidate hopes to accomplish in the next five years in the following areas:
 - ❑ **Research:** Identify specific original ideas, citing significant publications. Describe continuing areas of emphasis and outline future plans. Summarize major research grants (complete list of grants to be included in CV). Document patents or other intellectual property rights.
 - ❑ **Teaching:** Describe classroom teaching activities (complete list of courses taught to be included in CV) and teaching philosophy. Provide any additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, referring to teaching awards listed on CV. Append the following materials:
 - Syllabi for key courses
 - Course materials developed
 - Course evaluation report, summarizing/citing the course evaluation materials included in the dossier (see below)
 - ❑ **Advising and mentoring:** Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV. Complete list of students advised at the master's, doctoral, and postdoctoral level; dissertations supervised; student practica supervised; and faculty—including post-doctoral fellows—mentored should be included in CV.
 - ❑ **Service:** Describe service to the field (complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV).
- ❑ **Course evaluations and materials, from institutions where the candidate has taught:** For courses taught at the School, only the summary pages (not the student comments) of the evaluations (since the last review, for reappointments) should be included. Evaluations from executive education courses or leadership training activities may also be included. The candidate should also provide relevant course materials, such as syllabi and cases the candidate has written.
- ❑ **Publications:** Five recent publications, with a cover sheet (annotated bibliography) explaining why each has been selected and, if co-authored, the candidate's role in their preparation. Peer-reviewed publications should be included when possible, but policy-related reports, articles written for a lay audience, and book excerpts may be included as well, at the candidate's discretion.
- ❑ **Suggested list of independent experts** in the field who can comment objectively on the candidate's area of work, and ideally, who would be aware of the candidate's work in particular. These individuals should not be colleagues or collaborators of the candidate. Ideally 20 names should be suggested to obtain the number of letters required. In addition to the evaluators, a set of "peers" should be suggested – 3-5 individuals who clearly are comparable in important ways: area of expertise, level of seniority, mix of academic and

practice work. Letter writers will be asked to compare the candidate to these identified “peers”.

- ❑ **Other supporting materials:** The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment.

First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters

At its first meeting, the committee is briefed by the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. The department chair’s initial written request for the appointment should be provided to the committee to explain the departmental context for the appointment.

At this or (more likely) a subsequent meeting, the committee may invite the candidate for an informal interview, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate’s record or plans for future work.

The most important task of the review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation, and at its first meeting the committee focuses primarily on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers and comparands/peers. The latter are ideally outstanding scholars deemed potentially suitable for a senior appointment at the School.

- Approximately 20 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining at least 12 letters, and 5 comparands/peers are listed for comparison.
- The proposed lists are reviewed by the Dean for Academic Affairs and then, with their approval.
- Once the lists are approved, the chair of the promotion review committee solicits the comparison letters.
- Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair, as an alternative.

Review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who can provide information about the candidate’s qualifications from a particular perspective.

Note: Letter requests are ordinarily expected to go out no later than two weeks after the initial meeting of the committee. A minimum of eight weeks must be allowed between the date the comparison letter requests are sent and the final meeting; given that time frame, the final meeting will be held on the first available date.

Note: Collected evaluations of the candidates from any public lectures, talk chinks, or interviews should be held for inclusion in the materials supporting the case statement/committee report.

Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

At this time, the committee will meet with the candidate, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate's record or plans for future work. They also review any letters with concerns, and establish a plan to write the research, letter analysis, and summary and recommendation sections of the report.

Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

Once the external letter requests have been sent, the first possible date for the final meeting can be projected and the final meeting scheduled. Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At its final meeting, the committee reviews the letters as well as the draft report and finalizes its recommendation for appointment.

Report contents

The finalized report, prepared and signed by the department chair and the chair of the search committee, should include the following sections:

- A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate's contributions and the department's recommendation.
- Background and context:** description of the candidate's area and how it fits into the department's academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by a term-limited appointment.
- The search process if an open search:** summary of the search process with copies of correspondence and advertisements, records of telephone conversations, and description of all efforts to identify candidates from diverse populations, including women and minorities; please address the demographics of the pool as displayed in the Departmental EEO Report available in ARIeS.
- Comparands:** list of names and home institutions, with a brief rationale for each comparand.
- External letter writers:** brief description of the logic underlying the composition of the external letter writer group, especially in cases where the candidate is multidisciplinary.
- Intellectual case for the candidate:**
 - A summary of the candidate's **scholarly contributions:** analysis of how these contributions meet the intellectual criteria for professor of the practice, including the **impact the candidate has had on the field and the candidate's potential for future contributions.** This analysis should clearly draw on both the external letters and considered judgments of departmental faculty.

- Teaching, advising, and service:** evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant).
- If available, a link to a **recorded talk** (ideally, the candidate’s job talk or suitable alternative).
- A **comparison of the candidate with other leading candidates** (in particular, women and minorities), and reasons why others were not chosen, if an open search was conducted.
- A description of the candidate’s **service activities, to the profession, their discipline, and their institution(s)**.
- Evaluation of contributions related to **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**.
- A discussion of the **strengths and weaknesses** of the candidate’s case as noted in the external evaluations and the internal conversations of both the search committee and the department.
- Departmental vote: **record of the department vote**, by name, with an “as of” date for the vote tally.
- Appendices
 - Request and approval of **search authorization or appointment**.
 - Candidate’s dossier** (itemized above).
 - Letters:**
 - Copy of invitation to letter writers.
 - List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines.
 - Copies of all **responses to invitations**, including declines.
 - Candidate’s statement** describing efforts to encourage **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
 - If applicable, **total citation count** for the candidate and comparands and **citation count** for each of the candidate’s publications.

Approvals phase

There are four stages of approval for appointment as professor of practice or in residence: a review must be approved by the department chair, by SCARP, by the deans, and by the Provost’s office. The progress of a review can be stopped at any of these stages.

1. **Chair:** The final report, with all letters and appendices, is provided to the department chair. These materials are for the sole use of the department chair and may not be shared with others. After reviewing them, the chair decides whether to recommend to SCARP that the appointment be approved.
2. **SCARP:** OFA brings the report to SCARP for review.
3. **Deans:** If SCARP approves the appointment, then the report and appendices are submitted to the deans for approval.

4. **Provost:** Upon the deans' approval the report is sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity for final approval. Subsequently, the decision about the approval or denial of the appointment is conveyed to the deans and department chair.

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for recruitment. The search committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended or approved, and no offers are to be made to candidates by the department chair before PARC approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

C. Secondary and adjunct faculty

Proposal phase

The department collects all materials from the candidate:

- Nomination form:** In consultation with the department chair or department administrator, the candidate is asked to fill out the appointment form listing all qualifying activities as specified on the form (see [Appendix XI](#), and [Appendix XII](#)), which should comprise a minimum of .05% FTE*.
- Current CV:** Please note that any ongoing activities listed on the nomination form should be included on the candidate's CV.
- Letter from primary department chair:** Please note that for new secondary appointments, a letter of support for the appointment from the chair of the candidate's primary Harvard department is required.
- Supporting materials:** Any other supporting materials, such as course evaluations, should also be included. Please note that course evaluations are only required if part of the effort includes teaching.

Upon receipt of the above listed materials the department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for a tenured appointment: tenured professors only; for an associate professor appointment: associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors; for an assistant professor appointment: assistant and associate professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect

to whether the review should proceed. Any dissenting opinions should be documented and explained in a supporting document.

Review and approval phase

If the department agrees to proceed then the nomination form should be reviewed carefully by the department and candidate, signed by the dand the nominee, and forwarded with the nominee's CV, along with any appropriate supporting documents, to OFA so that it can be scheduled for a SCARP review and vote.

ABCD appointments

In addition to those who meet the appointment criteria, each department has five to eight slots for appointments by the chair's discretion (ABCD). These appointments are reserved for the department chair to grant to those who would benefit the department but otherwise may not qualify for a faculty appointment. The department chair will submit the candidate's CV, along with a chair letter explaining the contributions of the candidate to the department and School. **These appointments do not require SCARP review, nor do they have to meet the .05% FTE threshold for approval.**

Final recommendation

Following SCARP review, the deans have authority to make final determination on recommendations of secondary and adjunct faculty appointment, but ordinarily, approvals for these appointments are communicated shortly after approval by OFA, and OFA will draft and distribute the corresponding appointment letters.

D. Visiting faculty

Proposal phase

A proposal to appoint an individual as a visiting faculty member may be initiated by the Dean or a department chair. Regardless of where the proposal originates, the Dean for Academic Affairs, and the chair of the academic department in which the appointment will be based should discuss the proposal; any proposed financial commitment should also be discussed.

Written request and final determination

- The department chair writes to the deans detailing the nominee’s proposed role and qualifications, enclosing the nominee’s CV and an offer terms form (OTF) if there will be a financial commitment. If there will be no financial commitment from the department, this should be specifically mentioned in the written request.
- The deans make a final determination on recommendations of visiting faculty appointments.
- Visiting faculty appointments will not exceed two years, regardless of whether the appointments were consecutive or non-consecutive. This two-year limit also applies even if the faculty member’s rank should change at any point during the duration of appointment.

II. Reappointment of Faculty in Rank

A. Reappointment of primary faculty⁴

Departmental consultation

The department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for reappointment as associate professor or senior lecturer: term professors and tenured professors; for reappointment as assistant professor or lecturer, associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the reappointment should proceed. This consultation is normally expected to take place sufficiently in advance of the expiration of the individual’s current appointment to permit the review to be completed well in advance of the expiration of the current appointment.

Candidate dossier

- Current CV** conforming to the School template (see [Appendix VII](#))
- Academic report:** A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate’s contributions and what the candidate hopes to accomplish in the next five years in the following areas:
 - Research statement:** Detailed summary of the candidate’s **research** (past, present, future) and contributions to the field, citing specific findings and publications and identifying specific original ideas; a description of continuing areas of emphasis and an outline of future plans; a summary of research grants; documentation of patents or other intellectual property rights. Identify specific original ideas, citing significant publications. Describe continuing areas of emphasis and outline future plans.

⁴ Reappointments can be required for assistant professors, associate professors, term professors, lecturers, senior lecturers, professors of practice and professors in residence. Some steps may be modified according to varying rank criteria.

- Summarize major research grants (complete list of grants to be included in CV).
 - Document patents or other intellectual property rights.
- **Teaching statement:** Detailed summary of the candidate’s **educational activities** (teaching, advising, mentoring), including a statement of teaching philosophy, in which the candidate discusses their pedagogical goals, what they have found effective, ways in which they are striving to improve their teaching, and what they would like to pursue in future courses.
 - Syllabi for key courses
 - Course materials developed
 - Course evaluation report, summarizing/citing the course evaluation materials included in the dossier (see below)
- **Advising and mentoring:** Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV.
 - **List of advisees:** complete list of advisees at the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral levels; information about where they are now (insofar as that is known); dissertations supervised; student practica supervised; and faculty or other researchers.
 - Evidence of recognition for outstanding advising.
- **Service activities:** Describe service to the field (NB: a complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV).
 - To the field and profession: detailed summary of service to their field, including membership on study sections and editorial boards, and other leadership roles.
 - At Harvard Chan School: detailed summary of service to the department, School, and University, including committee membership/leadership, leadership of academic programs, and other relevant activities.
- **Translational accomplishments** (if relevant)
- **Diversity, inclusion, and belonging statement:** description of efforts and accomplishments towards the School’s, the University’s, and/or the profession’s diversity and health equity goals.
- **Course evaluations and materials for courses taught:** Note that only the summary pages (not student comments) of the evaluations since the last review should be included. Evaluations from executive education courses or leadership training activities may also be included. The candidate should also provide relevant course materials, such as syllabi and cases the candidate has written.
- **Other supporting materials:** The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment.
- **List of independent experts:** For Professors of Practice and Professors in Residence, experts in the field who can comment objectively on the candidate’s area of work, and ideally, who would be aware of the candidate’s work in particular. These individuals should not be colleagues or collaborators of the candidate.

- For Professors of Practice and Professors in Residence, ideally 20 names should be suggested to obtain the number of letters required. In addition to the evaluators, a set of “peers” should be suggested, 3-5 individuals who clearly are comparable in important ways: area of expertise, level of seniority, mix of academic and practice work. Letter writers will be asked to compare the candidate to these identified “peers”. Letters may only be required for the first re-appointment. For subsequent re-appointments, the letter requirement may be waived with the Provost’s approval.
- **Publications for Professors of Practice and Professors in Residence:** Five recent publications, with a cover sheet (annotated bibliography) explaining why each has been selected and, if co-authored, the candidate’s role in their preparation. Peer-reviewed publications should be included, when possible, but policy-related reports, articles written for a lay audience, and book excerpts may be included as well, at the candidate’s discretion.

Review

A reappointment review is conducted by members of the faculty member’s academic department. The department chair appoints a faculty review committee to evaluate the candidate’s dossier and prepare a written report documenting its conclusions and recommendation. The review committee is typically comprised of two or three, ordinarily tenured, faculty members, although if disciplinary or demographic diversity is a concern, senior non-ladder faculty and advanced associate professors may serve in some cases. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals.*

Report content and SCARP submission

Report contents follow the content and format guidelines for the first appointment in rank. Please review [Appendix IX](#) for a detailed checklist on the components required for reappointment. The department chair prepares a letter, which is submitted to SCARP for review and a vote; the report includes the following components:

- A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate’s contributions and the department’s recommendation.
- **Background and context:** description of the candidate’s area and how it fits into the department’s academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by this appointment.
- A detailed **description of the departmental review process**, which demonstrates conformance with the reappointment procedures, as outlined above.

- ❑ A detailed **assessment of the faculty member’s qualifications** vis-à-vis the criteria for appointment at the current rank, a summary of the faculty member’s achievements over the course of the current term of appointment, and a discussion of the faculty member’s activities in the areas of research, teaching, training and mentoring, and service. Insofar as possible and relevant, this evaluation should explicitly describe the importance of the faculty member’s research and publication record, with influential papers specifically noted.
- ❑ An assessment of the faculty member’s **potential for future contributions** to the department, the School, and the discipline. This section of the report should include a description of the process by which the faculty member has been, and will continue to be, mentored.

The final report should be submitted in the following order:

- ❑ Committee report (see list of contents above)
- ❑ Chair’s letter
- ❑ (If required) sample evaluation request letter, list of evaluators, evaluation letters in alphabetical order
- ❑ Nominee’s academic report (see [Appendix XV](#))
- ❑ Nominee’s CV
- ❑ Nominee’s course evaluations
- ❑ Publications (required for POP and PIR)

Deans and Senior Vice Provost approval

Following SCARP review, the deans have the final approving authority for recommendations for reappointment of assistant professors and lecturers. In the case of senior lecturers, professors of the practice or other term professors, the reappointment must also be approved by the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity.

Note: *In the event of a negative decision regarding reappointment in rank, the faculty member would normally be given notice that his or her appointment will be terminated at the end of the current term. If the time remaining in the term is less than twelve months, the appointment is normally extended to provide a minimum of twelve months’ notice of termination.*

B. Reappointment of secondary and adjunct faculty

Reappointment of secondary and adjunct faculty follows the same procedures as for their initial appointment (see [Section I, letter C](#), above).

C. Reappointment of visiting faculty

Visiting faculty are ordinarily appointed for one year with the option of a one-year renewal. At the request of the department chair and with the approval of the Dean for Academic Affairs, the reappointment is implemented administratively (i.e., without SCARP review). Visiting faculty appointments will not exceed two years, regardless of whether the appointments were consecutive or non-consecutive. This two-year limit also applies even if the faculty member's rank should change at any point during the duration of appointment.

III. Reappointment with a Change of Status

A. Reappointment with a change of status from assistant/associate professor to lecturer/senior lecturer

As described in the section "[Types of Appointment and Related Criteria](#)," an appointment as lecturer or senior lecturer may occasionally be recommended for a faculty member who is leaving the tenure ladder at the rank of assistant professor or associate professor, respectively.

Departmental initiation

The department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for a change of status to lecturer: senior lecturers, associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors; for a change of status to senior lecturer: term professors and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the reappointment should proceed. This consultation is normally expected to take place sufficiently in advance of the expiration of the individual's current appointment to permit the review to be completed at least twelve months prior to the expiration of the current appointment. It is expected that the department chair will consult department faculty at or above the proposed rank and document faculty support before the review commences and after the committee submits its report to the chair and document support for the change of status.

Departmental review

A review for reappointment with a change of status is conducted by members of the faculty member's academic department. Ordinarily the committee is composed of three to four, ordinarily tenured, faculty members in the department. At least one of the committee members must be a woman.

Report content and SCARP submission

The committee prepares a report, which is submitted to SCARP for review and a vote; the report includes the following components:

- ❑ A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate's contributions and the department's recommendation.
- ❑ **Background and context:** description of the candidate's area and how it continues to fit into the department's academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by this appointment.
- ❑ A detailed assessment of the **faculty member's qualifications** vis-à-vis the criteria for appointment at the current rank, a summary of the faculty member's achievements over the course of the current term of appointment, and a discussion of the faculty member's **activities in the areas of research, teaching, training and mentoring, and service**. Insofar as possible and relevant, this evaluation should explicitly describe the importance of the faculty member's research and publication record, with influential papers specifically noted.
- ❑ An **explanation** of the reasons why the faculty member will not continue to advance on the tenure ladder and a description of the process by which the faculty member has been mentored.
- ❑ An **assessment of the faculty member's potential for future contributions** to the department, the School, and the discipline. The case for retaining the individual as a member of the faculty must explicitly be made.
- ❑ Appendices should include the **nominee's CV, academic report, and information about teaching, training, and mentoring activities**, including copies of course evaluation reports.

Submission to Senior Vice Provost

Following SCARP review, the deans have the final approving authority in recommendations of reappointment of assistant professors with a change of status to lecturer. Recommendations of reappointment of associate professor with a change of status to senior lecturer are sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity for final approval.

B. Reappointment with a change of status from primary to secondary or adjunct

A change of status from primary to secondary or adjunct faculty at the same rank may be made administratively (i.e., without SCARP review) to permit a period of transition in cases where a Harvard Chan School appointment is required for service, such as a continuing student's primary dissertation advisor or as the principal investigator on a grant through the Harvard Chan School. The term of such an

appointment will ordinarily be no more than two years; upon expiration of this transitional term, reappointment materials must be submitted to SCARP in the usual way. The department chair should submit a written request to the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Office of Faculty Affairs for the change of status and the expected length.

C. Reappointment with a change of status from secondary or adjunct to primary

Transition from secondary or adjunct to primary faculty follows the School's standard procedures for a search or review for primary appointment, as appropriate to the position. In the case of an individual who held a primary appointment at the Harvard Chan School before assuming secondary or adjunct status, the relevant review procedures may be followed.

IV. Promotion of Faculty

A. Promotion from assistant to associate professor

Timing of the review

Assistant professors are generally reviewed for promotion by the sixth year of appointment with some exceptions: when the decision has been made, communicated, and documented that the faculty member will not be considered for promotion at least one year in advance. Permission must be sought from the Dean for Academic Affairs to review for promotion a faculty member who has been in the rank of assistant professor for less than five years. It is expected that the promotion review process will be completed within twelve months prior to the expiration of the individual's current appointment. It is expected that the Department Chair will consult department faculty at or above the proposed rank and document faculty support before the review commences and then after the committee submits its report to the Department Chair, documenting its support for the promotion.

Proposal phase

Written request/proposal contents

The department chair requests and collects the candidate's dossier, which includes the following:

- An **academic report** (see [Appendix VIII](#)) prepared by the faculty member
- Current CV** in School-approved format

- Course evaluation** reports
- Annotated bibliography**/cover page for the nominee’s publications listing the five publications
- Five selected **publications**
- Suggestions from candidate of **people to contact for independent evaluation letters**
- COVID impact statement (See [Appendix XV](#))

Review phase

Launch of review committee

Upon securing departmental approval to move forward with the review, the committee is seated and (if outstanding) the full/final dossier solicited.

The committee is composed of three or, more commonly, four tenured or senior term professors. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals*. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot be the search Committee Chair. The department will request and obtain agreements to serve from committee members.

First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters

The committee considers the nominee’s dossier and qualifications and solicits letters of evaluation from experts familiar with the nominee’s field, before formulating a recommendation as to the potential appointment.

- The review should include **at least six letters of evaluation from individuals who can provide an independent assessment** of the candidate’s qualifications. These letters should be solicited from leaders in the assistant professor’s field who are able to render an informed, objective evaluation and who have no conflict of interest with respect to the candidate; for example, they may not be collaborators or mentors, and may not hold a Harvard Chan faculty appointment.
- Evaluation requests should ask the recipient to describe their relationship with the candidate and indicate whether there is anything that may be construed as **a conflict of interest** or that would prevent that individual from providing an objective evaluation. It is recommended to generate a list of ten or more names to reach the six required. These letters should be included in an appendix to the report, along with a sample request letter and a list of all individuals who were asked to write.

- In addition to the six or more independent letters of evaluation, more focused **“targeted” letters may be requested from individuals who have a particular relationship with the candidate** that enables those persons to provide a specific piece of information or perspective about the candidate’s work that is both enlightening and which cannot be easily obtained from other sources.
 - The review committee shall identify individuals to contact and solicit these letters of evaluation.
 - If the committee wishes, they may request that the candidate provide some suggestions of individuals to contact, but they must approve of the final list.

- Targeted letters, with a sample request letter, should be placed in a **separate appendix**.

The department will schedule any committee meetings to be held to discuss the candidate’s dossier and when available the letters of evaluation. The review committee will then begin preparing a written report documenting its conclusions and recommendation, which must include a short section noting any development areas of concern and/or a recommendation for the candidate on a set goal(s) going forward.

Approvals phase

The stages of approval for promotion to associate professor include reviews by the department, SCARP, the deans, and PARC.

Department evaluation and recommendation to department chair

The associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors with primary appointments in the department are provided with the committee report, the candidate’s CV, the academic report, the outside letters, and selected publications of the candidate. They then meet for an official discussion of the candidate’s qualifications. The department chair is free to include in this meeting associate and tenured professors with secondary appointments in the department, according to the interests and expertise of individual secondary faculty members but is not obligated to do so. The views of any associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors not present must be sought, documented, and shared at the meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to provide guidance to the department chair about whether to recommend promotion. The department chair communicates the outcome of the meeting, including any negative views expressed by members of the department, to the deans.

Report contents

Following the department meeting, the department chair will prepare a letter to the SCARP committee addressing the following:

- A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate's contributions and the department's recommendation.
- Background and context:** description of the candidate's area and how it continues to fit into the department's academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by this appointment.
- A detailed **description of the departmental review process**, which demonstrates conformance with the promotion procedures, as outlined above.
- A detailed **assessment of the faculty member's qualifications** vis-à-vis the criteria for appointment at the rank of associate professor, commenting on the faculty member's activities in the areas of research, teaching, training and mentoring, and service. Insofar as possible, this evaluation should explicitly describe the importance of the faculty member's research and publication record, with influential papers specifically noted.
- An assessment of the faculty member's **potential for future contributions** to the department, the School, and the discipline, with an explicit assessment of the faculty member's prospects for tenure at the School. This section of the report should include a description of the process by which the faculty member has been, and will continue to be, mentored.
- The **letters of evaluation received from experts** should be referenced in the discussion of the faculty member's qualifications, accomplishments, and potential for future contributions.
- Summary of the current suitability for promotion of any women or minority group members in the department** presently at the same rank.

The committee incorporates the department chair's letter into its final report, which is submitted to SCARP for a review and vote. Detailed instructions for compiling the final report and its appendices can be found in [Appendix X](#). The final report should be sent in the following order:

- Chair's letter
- Review committee report (see list of contents above)
- Sample evaluation request letter, list of evaluators, evaluation letters in alphabetical order
- Focused/targeted evaluation letter request and response
- Nominee's academic report (see [Appendix VIII](#))
- Nominee's current CV
- Course evaluation reports
- Cover page listing the five submitted publications along with the five submitted publications

Submission to PARC

Following SCARP review, the deans may submit the recommendation for promotion to PARC for approval.

Note: *In the event of a negative decision regarding promotion, an assistant professor may be: 1) reappointed in rank (as long as the total number of years at that rank does not exceed eight); 2) in unusual circumstances, be reviewed for transition to an appointment as lecturer; or 3) given notice that his or her appointment will be terminated at the end of the current term. If the time remaining in the term is less than twelve months, the appointment is normally extended to provide a minimum of twelve months' notice of termination.*

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for offers of appointment. The review committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended or approved, and no offers terms are discussed before PARC approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

B. Promotion from associate professor to professor with tenure

Proposal phase

Consultation with department chair about launching promotion reviews

At the beginning of each academic year, the Associate/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs will meet with department chairs individually to discuss the progress of their associate professors towards readiness for tenure review, with special attention paid to those faculty who have reached or exceeded the eight-year mark on the tenure-track. Discussion will take into consideration each faculty member's time left on the tenure clock, any major works in progress that would strengthen a case for tenure, the individual faculty member's interest in starting the tenure review process in the coming academic year, and the department's capacity for conducting the review. Following this conversation, the Associate Dean/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs will confirm, in writing, the reviews that will proceed in the

coming year, and any plans to follow up mid-year on faculty who may soon be ready. The chair will then confirm, in writing, that the candidates wish to proceed or defer as appropriate.

Meeting with department chair and candidate to review procedures

If a review is to proceed for a particular faculty member, the Associate Dean/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs meets with the department chair and the candidate (separately or together) to review the process and answer any questions.

*This meeting ordinarily takes place **within 1-2 months** of the date of the original consultation with the department chair.*

Preparation and distribution of the candidate's dossier

The candidate prepares their dossier, comprising:

- Current CV** conforming to the School template (see [Appendix VII](#))
- Academic report** (see [Appendix VIII](#)): A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate's past accomplishments and contributions and detailing future directions
 - Research:** Identify specific original ideas, citing significant publications. Describe continuing areas of emphasis and outline future plans. Summarize major research grants (complete list of grants to be included in CV). Document patents or other intellectual property rights.
 - Teaching:** Describe classroom teaching activities (complete list of courses taught to be included in CV) and teaching philosophy. Provide any additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, referring to teaching awards listed on CV. Append the following materials:
 - Syllabi for key courses
 - Course materials developed
 - Course evaluation report, summarizing/citing the course evaluation materials included in the dossier (see below)
 - Advising and mentoring:** Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV. Complete list of students advised at the master's, doctoral, and postdoctoral level; dissertations supervised; student practica supervised; and faculty—including post-doctoral fellows—mentored should be included in CV.
 - Service:** Describe service to the field and profession and to the School and University (a complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV).
 - Translational activities.
 - Diversity and inclusion activities.

- ❑ **Course evaluations and materials, from courses taught:** Only the summary pages (not the student comments) of the evaluations (since the last review) should be included. Evaluations from executive education courses or leadership training activities may also be included. The candidate should also provide relevant course materials, such as syllabi and cases the candidate has written.
- ❑ **Field statement:** The candidate should provide a one-sentence statement that broadly describes their work and that would encompass the expertise of experts with whom the candidate would appropriately be compared.
- ❑ **Publications:** 10-12 recent publications, with a cover sheet (annotated bibliography) explaining why each has been selected and, if co-authored, the candidate’s role in their preparation. Peer-reviewed publications should be included when possible, but policy-related reports, articles written for a lay audience, and book excerpts may be included as well, at the candidate’s discretion.
- ❑ **Suggested list of independent experts** in the field who can comment objectively on the candidate’s area of work, and ideally, who would be aware of the candidate’s work in particular. These individuals **should not be** colleagues or collaborators of the candidate. Ideally 20 names should be suggested to obtain the number of letters required.
- ❑ **Suggested list of “peers” or comparands:** In addition to the evaluators, the candidate should also suggest 3-5 individuals who are **clearly are comparable** in important ways: area of expertise, level of seniority, mix of academic and practice work. Letter writers will be asked to compare the candidate to these identified “peers”.
- ❑ **Suggested list of targeted experts** in the field who can comment on the candidate’s area of work, and ideally, who have worked closely with the candidate. These 4-5 individuals **should be** colleagues or collaborators of the candidate.
- ❑ **Other supporting materials:** The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment.
- ❑ **COVID impact** statement.

*The candidate is ordinarily expected to submit their dossier **within one month** after the meeting with the Associate Dean/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and the department chair. Revisions may be requested, and the next step will take place once they are completed.*

The dossier is distributed to the tenured members of the department. The department chair may invite tenured Harvard Chan School faculty with secondary appointments in the department to participate in the review process according to the interests and expertise of individual secondary faculty.

Presentation by candidate and subsequent meeting of tenured faculty

The candidate makes a research presentation, which is open to the School community, and tenured faculty members of the department are expected to attend. The department should arrange for this

presentation to be recorded, so that it will be available to members of the promotion review committee if a full tenure review is pursued.

The tenured faculty members of the department meet subsequently to discuss the case and to vote on whether the department chair should recommend moving forward with the promotion review. The discussion should encompass both the candidate's qualifications and the department's priorities and resources. The Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs must be present at this meeting.

*This meeting, when the vote occurs, is ordinarily expected to follow the research presentation and take place **within three months** of the meeting between the department chair, the candidate, and the Associate Dean/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs.*

Consultation with the department chair of the candidate's affiliate department

If the candidate is a faculty affiliate in another Harvard Chan School department, the primary department chair may consult with the affiliate department chair about their views with respect to moving forward with the promotion review. The role of the affiliate chair in a promotion review will be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on the relevance of and the level of engagement with the affiliated department.

Department chair reports decision about moving forward with promotion review

After consulting with their tenured faculty and, if needed, the affiliate department chair, the department chair sends the candidate's dossier (as described above), with a cover letter describing the departmental review process and indicating whether they wish to proceed with a full promotion review, to the Associate Dean/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs. This letter should also include 1) recommendations for the membership of the candidate's tenure review committee and specifies the intended committee chair, 2) any suggested names of independent experts discussed at the meeting of senior faculty for the departmental vote, and 3) any additional name suggestions of independent experts on behalf of the department chair. These materials will be reviewed by the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, who must give their approval before a tenure review can be launched.

If the department chair chooses not to pursue the promotion review, or if the deans do not authorize a review, the department chair informs the candidate in writing that they will not be considered further for tenure, with a copy to OFA for the candidate's faculty file.

Review phase

Launch of promotion review committee

Upon the deans' approval to move forward with a promotion review, OFA begins the process of seating the tenure review committee, consulting with relevant faculty members to assemble master lists of potential letter writers and comparands/peers, and working with the candidate to finalize their dossier.

The committee is composed of four tenured Harvard professors; ideally, one member will be from a different Harvard Chan School department and one from a different Harvard school. One member of the committee will be designated as the **chair** of the review committee. While it is important to have members who understand the candidate's field, mentors and close collaborators are not preferred over other faculty members, and, in some cases, it may be preferable not to have them as members of a promotion review committee. It may also be useful to avoid using non-Harvard Chan School faculty members who may be eligible to serve as letter writers or ad hoc members.

First meeting of promotion review committee and solicitation of letters

At the first meeting, the committee is briefed by the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. The department chair's initial written request for the appointment should be provided to the committee to explain the departmental context for the appointment.

The most important task of the review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation. At the first meeting, the committee focuses primarily on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers and comparands/peers. The latter are ideally outstanding scholars deemed potentially suitable for a tenured appointment at the School.

Review committees may also request not more than four targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who can provide information about the candidate's qualifications from a particular perspective.

The Dean for Academic Affairs requests confidential letters from tenured members of the candidate's department. Optional letters are also requested from the department's tenured secondary faculty members.

Following the first meeting:

- OFA will confirm the h-indices of the list of possible comparands/peers alongside that of the candidate.

- The proposed lists of independent experts (comparison letter writers), comparand/peers, and collaborators (targeted letter writers), as well as the h-indices, are reviewed by the Dean for Academic Affairs and then, with their approval, letters can be solicited.
- Once the lists are approved, the OFA case administrator solicits the comparison and targeted letters on behalf of the chair of the tenure review committee.

Approximately 20 comparison letters are initially requested, with the goal of obtaining at least 12 letters. These letter requests include the 5 comparands/peers listed for comparison with the candidate being reviewed for tenure. Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule, as an alternative, are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair.

- **Materials included with letter requests:**
 - Harvard tenure criteria and appendices
 - Candidate’s curriculum vitae
 - Candidate’s academic report
 - Candidate’s annotated bibliography

Note: Letter requests are **ordinarily expected** to go out no later than two weeks after the initial meeting of the committee. A minimum of eight weeks must be allowed between the date the comparison letter requests are sent and the second meeting.

Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

Once the external letter requests have been sent, the first possible date for the second meeting can be projected and scheduled.

At this meeting, the committee will invite the candidate for an informal interview. This meeting with the candidate allows the committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate’s record or plans for future work. They also review any letters with concerns, and establish a plan to write the research, letter analysis, and summary and recommendation sections of the report.

In addition to interviewing with the candidate, this meeting will also be the time to discuss the drafting of the committee’s report. OFA will provide an outline of the report to the committee and. Either the committee as a whole or the chair of the committee, will determine the drafting responsibilities of each committee member.

Note: The third and final meeting can be scheduled immediately following the second meeting, allowing time for both the committee to complete drafting the report and for OFA to review the report. The committee’s report must be drafted in its entirety and reviewed by OFA prior to the third and final meeting, at which time the committee will vote to move the report forward to the next available SCARP meeting.

Third/final meeting of the committee and finalization of the report

After the second meeting is completed and drafting responsibilities of the report has been discussed, the final meeting can be projected and scheduled. Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At the final meeting, the committee reviews the draft report, finalizes its recommendation for appointment, and discusses possible *ad hoc* committee membership.

Report contents

The finalized report, prepared and signed by the review committee, should include the following sections:

- A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate's contributions and the department's recommendation.
- Background and context:** description of the candidate's area and how it fits into the department's academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by a term-limited appointment.
- A detailed **description of the departmental review process**, which demonstrates conformance with the promotion procedures as outlined in the faculty appointments handbook.
- Comparands:** list of names and home institutions, with a brief rationale for each comparand.
- Intellectual case for the candidate:**
 - A summary of the candidate's **scholarly contributions:** analysis of how these contributions meet the intellectual criteria for tenured professor, including the **impact the candidate has had on the field and the candidate's potential for future contributions**. This analysis should clearly draw on both the external letters and considered judgments of departmental faculty. It should explicitly describe the importance of the faculty member's research and publication record, with influential papers specifically noted.
 - Teaching, advising, and service:** evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant).
 - If available, a link to a **videotaped talk** (ideally, the candidate's job talk or suitable alternative).

- A **comparison of the candidate with other leading candidates** (in particular, women and minorities), and reasons why others were not chosen, if an open search was conducted.
- A description of the candidate’s **service activities, to the profession, their discipline, and their institution(s)**.
- Evaluation of contributions related to **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**.
- A discussion of the **strengths and weaknesses** of the candidate’s case as noted in the external evaluations and the internal conversations of both the search committee and the department.
- Departmental vote: **record of the department vote**, by name, with an “as of” date for the vote tally.
- Appendices
 - 1) Chair’s letter:** Request and approval of **search authorization or appointment**.
 - 2) Promotion review procedure**
 - 3) Comparison letters:**
 - Copy of invitation to letter writers.
 - Watermarked with “SAMPLE”
 - List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines.
 - Copies of all **responses to invitations**, including declines.
 - Declines should be alphabetized and at the end of the report.
 - 4) Targeted letters:**
 - Copy of invitation to letter writers.
 - Watermarked with “SAMPLE”
 - List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines.
 - Copies of all **responses to invitations**, including declines.
 - Declines should be alphabetized and at the end of the report.
 - 5) Candidate’s curriculum vitae**
 - 6) Candidate’s academic report**
 - 7) Candidate annotated bibliography**
 - 8) Citations report**
 - Candidate’s statement** describing efforts to encourage **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
 - Total citation count** for the candidate and comparands and **citation count** for each of the candidate’s publications.

Approvals phase

There are several stages of approval for promotion to tenure: a promotion must be approved by the SCARP, by the deans and department chair, and by the President of the University, who receives

guidance from the Provost, who normally chairs the ad hoc committee (on occasion the President will chair the ad hoc). The progress of a promotion can be stopped at any of these stages.

- OFA submits the committee’s final report to SCARP for review and approval.
- **Upon SCARP approval**, the report is sent to the deans and department chair, who meet to discuss SCARP’s recommendation and feedback.
- If the deans and department chair concur with SCARP’s approval, they authorize that the case be sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity with the School’s list of proposed ad hoc members and make witness recommendations as appropriate.
 - The list of potential ad hoc members often draws from the master list from which the names of letter writers were selected, with additional consultation with promotion review committee members and others; it must first be approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs before being sent to the Provost’s office.
 - Ad hoc membership comprises three members from outside the University and two from within Harvard but with no Harvard Chan appointment.
- **Once the Provost’s office has approved the list of proposed ad hoc members**, a specific date for the ad hoc meeting is confirmed. Because of the difficulty in lining up prominent scholars on short notice, it is highly desirable to allow a minimum of three months between the approval of the list and the ad hoc date.
- **The ad hoc meeting is held**, with the Dean and, ordinarily, the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Senior Vice Provost in attendance as ex officio members. The School also provides several witnesses, including the department chair and the chair of the promotion review committee; other witnesses may be members of the committee with expertise in the candidate’s field or members of the department who can provide a different perspective on the case. Subsequently, the decision about the approval or denial of the promotion is conveyed to the deans.

For an overview of the timeline for the process from beginning to end, please see [Appendix XVIII](#).

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for offers of appointment. The review committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended or approved, and no offers terms are to be shared with candidates by the department chair before final, University-level approval from the Provost’s Office. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is drafted by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

C. Promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer⁵

Proposal phase

A lecturer who has demonstrated exemplary leadership in either research or education may be recommended for promotion to senior lecturer. For senior lecturers they must fully meet at least two of the following criteria:

- Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising: has taught within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution; has shown national leadership and/or innovation in pedagogy, with outstanding promise of continuing contribution; has an academic advising record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution.
- Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship: has conducted relevant academic research within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution or for at least six years as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School; has significant experience as Principal Investigator for sponsored projects; has a research mentoring record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution.
- Demonstrated record of program development and leadership at the graduate level: has developed and/or managed academic graduate programs in public health education at a peer institution or as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School.

The department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., senior lecturers, associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the promotion review should proceed. The department chair then submits a proposal to the Dean and the Dean for Academic Affairs.

Written request/proposal contents

Unless the proposal originated with the dean, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean for Academic Affairs providing a position description and a letter addressing the following:

- Identification of the nominee** and a description of their qualifications and accomplishments (attach CV), including relevant research, teaching, service, and translational achievements.
- Projected role** of the nominee at the School in their new role and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School. Please specify how they meet the criteria for the position of senior lecturer.
- Details about **financial support** of the position (OTF).
- Suggestions for **review committee membership**, with explanation of the contribution of each proposed member, if not apparent. Typically, there should be at least three committee

5

members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, *while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals*. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot be the search Committee Chair.

Review phase

Launch of review committee

Upon securing both decanal and departmental approval to move forward with the review, the committee is seated, the candidate's materials are solicited, and the process for collecting evaluation letters can begin. Typically, there should be at least three committee members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs.

Committee responsibilities

The committee considers the nominee's dossier and qualifications, solicits letters of evaluation from experts familiar with the nominee's field, and formulates a recommendation as to the potential appointment. Three meetings are typically scheduled for reviews, but if two suffice, the committee may use email communications to substitute for one of the meetings.

Candidate dossier

- ❑ **Current CV:** conforming to the School template (see [Appendix VII](#)).
- ❑ **Academic report** (see [Appendix VIII](#)): A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate's contributions and what the candidate hopes to accomplish during the appointment in the following areas:
 - ❑ **Research background and summary:** Describe continuing areas of interest and outline any future plans. Summarize major research accomplishments. Summarize major research grants (complete list of grants to be included in CV). If relevant, document patents or other intellectual property rights.
 - ❑ **Teaching:** Describe classroom teaching history (complete list of courses taught to be included in CV) and teaching philosophy. Provide any additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, referring to any teaching awards listed on CV. Append the following materials:

- Syllabi for key courses
- Course evaluation report, summarizing/citing the course evaluation materials included in the dossier (see below)
- **Advising and mentoring:** Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV.
 - Complete list of students advised at the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral level; dissertations supervised; student practica supervised; and faculty—including post-doctoral fellows—mentored should be included in CV.
- **Service:** Describe service to the field and profession and to the School and University (a complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV).
- **COVID-19 Impact Statement** (see [Appendix VI-B](#)): In addition to the narrative descriptions of research, educational, service, leadership, translational, and other accomplishments, faculty undergoing review should include a COVID-19 Impact Statement with their academic report.
- **Candidate’s statement** describing efforts to encourage **diversity, inclusion, and belonging**, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
- **Publications:** Five recent publications, with a cover sheet (annotated bibliography) explaining why each has been selected and, if co-authored, the candidate’s role in their preparation. Peer-reviewed publications should be included when possible, but policy-related reports, articles written for a lay audience, and book excerpts may be included as well, at the candidate’s discretion.
- **Translational** activities.
- **Suggested list of letter writers:** a list of experts in the field who can comment objectively on the candidate’s area of work, and ideally, who would be aware of the candidate’s work in particular. These individuals should not be current or former colleagues or collaborators of the candidate. Ideally, six letters for senior lecturers and four letters for lecturers should be received and included in the report. Additionally, names of two to four collaborators, colleagues, or mentors may be provided from whom to invite more targeted recommendation letters.
- **Course evaluations and materials, from courses taught:** Only the summary pages of the evaluations (since the last review) should be included. Evaluations from executive education courses or leadership training activities may also be included. The candidate should also provide relevant course materials, such as syllabi and cases the candidate has written.
- **Other supporting materials:** The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment.

First meeting of review committee and solicitation of letters

- At its first meeting, the committee is briefed by the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. The department chair’s initial written request

for the appointment should be provided to the committee to explain the departmental context for the appointment.

- At this or (more likely) a subsequent meeting, the committee may invite the candidate for an informal interview, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate's record or plans for future work.
- The most important task of the review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation, and at its first meeting the committee focuses primarily on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers.
 - Approximately 8-10 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining 6 letters.
 - The proposed lists are reviewed by OFA. Once approved, the chair of the review committee solicits the comparison letters.
 - Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair, as an alternative.
- Review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who can provide information about the candidate's qualifications from a particular perspective.

*Letter requests are ordinarily expected to go out **no later than two weeks** after the initial meeting of the committee. A minimum of eight weeks must be allowed between the date the comparison letter requests are sent and the final meeting; given that time frame, the final meeting will be held on the first available date.*

Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

At this time, the committee can meet with the candidate if needed to ask questions, review any letters that pose concerns (not with the candidate), and make a plan to write the report.

Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report

Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At its final meeting, the committee reviews any remaining letters as well as the draft report and finalizes its recommendation for appointment.

Report contents

- ❑ The finalized report, prepared and signed by the department chair and the chair of the search committee, should include the following sections:

- A one-paragraph **executive summary** of the candidate’s contributions and the department’s recommendation.
- **Background and context:** A description of the candidate’s area and how it fits into the department’s academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by a term-limited appointment.
- **External letter writers:** A brief description of the logic underlying the composition of the external letter writer group, especially in cases where the candidate is multidisciplinary.
- **Intellectual case for the candidate,** highlighting the areas most aligned with the goals of the appointment and analyzing how the candidate’s contributions meet the criteria for senior lecturer. This analysis should clearly draw on both the external letters and considered judgments of departmental faculty. The case can draw from the following areas:
 - Summary of the candidate’s relevant **scholarly contributions.**
 - **Teaching, advising, and mentoring:** An evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant)
 - Description and evaluation of **leadership and service contributions** – to the field, the University, the School, and the department
 - Note of any significant efforts to support the School’s **diversity, inclusion, and belonging** goals.
 - Discussion of the **strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s case** as noted in the external evaluations and the internal conversations of both the search committee and the department.
- Departmental vote: A record of the department vote, by name, with an “as of” date for the vote tally.
- Appendices
 - Request and approval of **promotion authorization or appointment.**
 - **Candidate’s dossier** (itemized above).
 - **Letters:**
 - Copy of invitation to letter writers.
 - List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines.
 - Copies of all **responses to invitations,** including declines.
 - **Candidate’s statement** describing efforts to encourage **diversity, inclusion, and belonging,** including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
 - If applicable, **total citation count** for the candidate and comparands and **citation count** for the candidate’s publications.

Approvals phase

The committee's report is submitted to SCARP for review and a vote. Following SCARP review, the deans may submit the recommendation for promotion to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity for final approval.

Note: A lecturer who is denied promotion to senior lecturer may continue to be reappointed as a lecturer if the need for the appointment exists and the expectations for performance at that rank are met.

Communication with the candidate(s)

The deans and department chair are responsible for offers of appointment. The review committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended or approved, and no offers terms are shared with candidates by the department chair before the University-level approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.

The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.

D. Promotion of secondary and adjunct faculty

When an individual holding a secondary or adjunct faculty appointment at the Harvard Chan School is promoted at their home school or institution, the individual's rank at the Harvard Chan School can be changed administratively (i.e., without SCARP review) to synchronize the individual's faculty titles. The department should submit documentation providing proof of promotion, along with a Wasabi transaction. This does not extend the end date of the current term.

V. Appointment as Emeritus Faculty Member

Primary senior faculty members (ladder and non-ladder) who have rendered "long and faithful service" under the terms of a 2022 Harvard Corporation vote, are eligible to become emeritus faculty of the Harvard Chan School. Emeritus faculty retain an emeritus title and several ongoing benefits and perquisites, including continued email and other account access, and enjoy opportunities to continue to engage with the School and University communities.

1. Prior to execution of retirement agreement, the Academic Dean will ask OFA for an emeritus "review."
2. The OFA review is a simple audit of relevant records, pursuant to an established internal procedure.
3. When the review is complete, OFA sends their report to the Dean and Academic Dean.

4. Upon review and approval, the Dean recommends the faculty member for an emeritus appointment to the Provost via a signed recommendation letter delivered by OFA (see recommendation language below).
5. Upon Provostial approval, the retirement agreement can be executed by the Academic Dean and the retiring faculty member.

Recommendation to Provost:

“This candidate is a retiring faculty member in good standing holding an eligible academic appointment and has attained at least the age of sixty and has five years of continuous University service. In my judgment, the candidate has fulfilled his/her teaching, research, and service obligations faithfully and should be awarded emeritus status based on this meritorious service. To the best of my knowledge, [other than as may be indicated herein,] the candidate has not been sanctioned or disciplined, or resigned or retired in lieu of sanction or discipline, by Harvard or any other organization or regulatory authority, and has not been convicted of a crime of moral turpitude or a crime of such a nature as to call into question the faculty member’s faithful service to Harvard. Further, there are no pending proceedings that raise questions about the candidate’s faithful service to Harvard.”

In the unlikely event the Dean cannot recommend a candidate for an emeritus appointment, they will confer with the Provost about the School’s findings and reasons for declining to recommend. Likewise, should the Provost have information about a candidate that precludes approval of an emeritus appointment recommended by the School, the Provost will confer with the Dean about the University’s findings and reasons for declining to recommend.

Leaves of Absence and Tenure Ladder Extensions

Clock extension

The total duration as a tenure-track faculty member normally will not exceed eleven years. In the event that a faculty member takes a parental leave of absence or a leave for reasons of disability or illness (their own or that of a family member) during the period of assistant or associate professorship, the eleven-year clock may be extended. Leaves taken for professional purposes are included in the eleven years and do not stop the clock. Two specific policies, “paid parental leave” and “tenure clock extension to meet childcare needs,” may be found in [Appendix XIII](#) and [Appendix XIV](#) .

In **June 2020**, given COVID-19’s broad range of effects on tenure-track careers, a one-year tenure clock extension was offered to all tenure track faculty. This was an **opt in** benefit. Therefore, assistant and associate professors who wished to do so, requested a COVID-19 clock extension in June 2020. Much like a clock extension for the birth or adoption of a child, these extensions were noted in the faculty appointment record upon their request. Faculty who opted in are not obligated to use the extra year and have some flexibility as to whether the extension applies to their current appointment or their final pre-tenure appointment. Those faculty members whose professional activities are determined to have continuing significant negative effects as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic will be allowed to take an additional year’s clock extension if the faculty member, department chair, and Dean for Academic Affairs are all in agreement about the potential benefit of an additional year.

Parental leave

It is important that faculty performance be evaluated in relation to the time that is realistically available for professional contributions given the nature of these family obligations. It is the goal of parental leave policies to:

1. Help faculty balance the responsibilities of family and career development
2. Encourage and enable equal parenting

Paid Parental Leave (faculty on the Harvard payroll)

Policy:

- a. Non-birth parents are entitled to 12 weeks of total bonding leave, eight of which are fully paid, following the birth or adoption of a child. Birth parents are entitled to twenty weeks of total paid leave, sixteen of which are fully paid, following the birth of a child. The additional bonding leave can be paid, but at a reduced rate. The school will continue to pay the faculty member’s current actual salary (annualized salary x FTE*) during the period of fully paid parental leave

assuming that the faculty member is not performing work during the leave that is covered by the sources sponsoring that work. If the faculty member chooses to perform such work, the school will pay any portion of the annualized salary that is not covered by the related sources during the period of the leave. The last four weeks of parental leave for (birth and non-birth parents) are paid at a reduced rate.

- b. If the parental leave occurs during the “start-up period” of a tenure-ladder faculty member’s first term, any salary guarantee and/or salary savings agreement will be extended for the duration of leave. Any other leave-related issues affecting progress during the start-up period will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- c. Parental leave should be requested as far in advance of the child’s expected arrival date as possible to provide departments with reasonable notice for planning purposes.* FTE (full-time equivalent) reflects the percentage of the faculty member’s annualized salary that is compensated on the Harvard Chan School payroll. For example, faculty who do not work for Harvard Chan School in July and August or who have not raised outside funding to cover that portion of their salary have an FTE of 0.833.

Procedure:

1. Complete and submit the “Notification of Intention to Take Paid Parental Leave” section of this [form](#) as early as possible.
2. Once the dates and financial arrangements have been finalized, complete and submit the [Faculty Sabbatical and Paid Leave of Absence Form](#).
3. Submit a claim to Lincoln Financial Group, Harvard’s third-party administrator, at least thirty days prior to your effective date.
4. To file a leave request by phone, employees may call the Harvard dedicated number at 1-844-600-3978
5. To file a leave request online, employees may go to My Lincoln Portal at mylincolnportal.com and click on “Register for an account” under the “Log in” button. Instructions will be provided on the website throughout the leave submission process.

Tenure Clock Extension to Meet Child Care Needs (all faculty regardless of payroll)

Policy:

- a. Tenure ladder faculty who become a parent of a child during their tenure-track period will be granted, upon notification of the birth or adoption, an automatic extension of their tenure clock by one year for each child. This type of extension will ordinarily be granted for up to two years. Faculty seeking subsequent parental clock extensions should please contact the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Jennifer Ivers (ivers@hsph.harvard.edu).
- b. The granting of a tenure-ladder extension will not routinely entail an extension to the faculty member’s current term of appointment (i.e., the clock is generally extended in the final tenure-

track term). A request to extend the faculty member's current term must be submitted jointly by the faculty member and her/his department chair and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

- c. Extensions will not be granted to faculty members who have already been notified that they will not be considered for reappointment or promotion.
- d. The granting of an extension does not imply a guarantee of reappointment or promotion. Neither does it provide a guarantee of additional financial support to cover the period of the extension. Finally, the existence of this policy does not preclude a faculty member being terminated before the end of her/his term for lack of funding, as specified in the financial expectations outlined in the offer letter or in the signed letter of agreement.

Procedure:

1. If the "Notification of Intention to Take Paid Parental Leave" form has been submitted, it is not necessary to submit the additional "Notification" form below. The "Notification of a Birth or Adoption" form should only be used when the faculty member did not request parental leave.
2. Complete and submit the "Notification of a Birth or Adoption" section of this [form](#).

Medical leave

Full-time faculty members (ladder and non-ladder) who are paid by the School, suffering from a serious health condition that prevents the fulfillment of normal duties may be entitled to a paid medical leave of absence of up to twenty six weeks. The School may count medical leaves toward the fulfillment of the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) 12-week leave entitlement; if the reason for the leave meets the FMLA criteria (see the FMLA definition below).

Please complete the paid leave of absence form: [Faculty Sabbatical and Paid Leave of Absence Form](#) and submit completed form to the Office of Faculty Affairs at facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu. In addition, the faculty member must submit a claim to Lincoln Financial within thirty days of their intended leave. In cases of medical emergencies, OFA may submit the claim to Lincoln Financial, while the Department Administrator may submit the request on behalf of the faculty member.

If the illness is expected to continue following the completion of the six-month paid medical leave, use of long-term disability (LTD) coverage, if previously elected by the faculty member, should be investigated during the medical leave. For information about LTD coverage, faculty members should contact the Harvard Benefits Office directly.

Notes:

- Harvard complies with the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) , which provides eligible employees up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave (to be taken and completed during a 12-month

period) for: 1) the birth of a child and to care for an employee's child within 12 months of birth, adoption, or the initiation of foster care; 2) to care for a parent, child, or spouse with a serious health condition; or 3) because the employee's own serious health condition makes the employee unable to perform his or her job.

- Harvard provides all eligible employees with Massachusetts Paid Family and Medical Leave (MAPFML) benefits, modeled after the Massachusetts Paid Family and Medical Leave law.

Unpaid leave

According to university policy, a faculty member may request an unpaid leave of absence of one year with a one-year renewal; there is no option for renewal beyond two years. If the faculty member does not return to Harvard Chan School upon the expiration of the leave, his or her faculty appointment will be terminated as of that date. The tenure clock does not stop during a leave of absence taken for professional reasons, and time taken as a leave of absence does not count toward the years-in-residence requirement for tenured professors' sabbatical eligibility.

It is expected that the purpose of a requested leave of absence is to allow faculty members to conduct personal or professional activities of a temporary nature, and in requesting a leave of absence (rather than submitting their resignation), faculty members are signaling a good-faith intention to return to the school. In particular, a leave of absence will not be granted to an individual who has accepted a regular faculty position at another academic institution on a permanent basis.

While on leave of absence an individual may accept a position as a visiting faculty member at another institution; this is the only status that is permitted by Harvard University, and it is required that the individual's title include the word "visiting." A faculty member may not be a regular (i.e., voting) faculty member at another institution or hold an administrative position at that institution while on leave of absence from Harvard Chan School.

Faculty members on leave of absence are prohibited from participating in certain school or university activities during the period of their leave. For example, they may do occasional teaching, but may not serve as primary instructor of a course; they may serve as a member of a dissertation committee but may not chair such a committee. Faculty members on leave may not be a principal investigator on grants at Harvard University but may be an investigator on a formal subcontract agreement between the university and another institution/organization.

Faculty members wishing to request a leave of absence should write to their department chair, outlining the reasons for the proposed leave and describing how their obligations (e.g., teaching and advising) will be carried out in their absence. The department chair should forward this request, with his or her endorsement, to the dean for academic affairs for approval.

Sabbatical leave

Purpose

A sabbatical leave is defined as a leave for the purpose of engaging in research or other activities that will advance the faculty member's scholarly achievement or that will enhance the reputation of or otherwise benefit the university. A sabbatical leave will not be granted for the purpose of taking regular academic or other employment of financial advantage elsewhere.

Eligibility

Faculty members who have completed six years of service in residence as a tenured professor at Harvard University may request sabbatical leave. Ordinarily, at least six years must elapse between a faculty member's sabbaticals.

The dean may ask a faculty member to defer a sabbatical leave to the following year if the number of applicants for sabbatical leave in any one year in any one department is considered to be excessive or if the dean believes there to be another compelling academic case for deferral. When the dean has initiated the request for deferral, it may be agreed that the faculty member will become eligible for the subsequent sabbatical five rather than six years after returning from the deferred leave.

Forgoing or deferring sabbatical leave does not result in the accrual of a proportional increase in sabbatical time available. Sabbatical time not taken is forfeited.

Term and compensation

Sabbatical leave may be granted for one academic year with 50% support or half an academic year with 100% support. Harvard Chan School funds supporting the faculty member's salary during the sabbatical are provided in proportion to the school's financial responsibility for the faculty member. For example, a faculty member who receives 80% of his/her academic-year salary through a hospital-based appointment and 20% through Harvard Chan School will ordinarily receive sabbatical support from Harvard Chan School at the 20% level.

Insofar as it is permitted by the sponsor, a faculty member who continues to work on a sponsored project during their leave may use sponsored research funding to supplement the school's salary commitment in order to extend the length of the leave, provided that the amount charged to the sponsor is commensurate with the effort worked on the project; for example, the faculty member may take a full academic year of sabbatical leave at full pay if research funding covers the half of the salary that would otherwise not be paid.

Procedure for requesting sabbatical leave

1. The faculty member would ordinarily request a sabbatical by December 31 prior to the academic year in which they wish to take leave. S/he requests the sabbatical in a letter to his/her department chair. The letter should include the following information:
 - a. Dates of proposed sabbatical leave and information about any sponsored funding that will be used to supplement or replace school funds
 - b. Description of the proposed research or creative work to be conducted during the leave, including an explanation of its significance to the applicant, the department/school/university, and the faculty member's field, as well as information about the institution/place where the work will be undertaken
 - c. A plan for coverage of teaching, advising, and administrative responsibilities during the leave, and identification of school and departmental service activities that will require coverage during the sabbatical
2. The department chair forwards the sabbatical proposal with a covering letter to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The cover letter, addressed to the dean, should include the following information:
 - a. Endorsement of the request for sabbatical leave
 - b. Any additional information about the faculty member's proposed activities and/or plan for coverage of responsibilities
 - c. Information about any other sabbatical requests that may be forthcoming from members of the department
3. Once the dean has approved the request, the following steps are taken:
 - a. OFA informs the faculty member and department chair
 - b. Once the dates and financial arrangements have been finalized, complete and submit the Faculty Sabbatical and Paid Leave of Absence Form to effect the leave.

Procedure upon the faculty member's return from sabbatical leave

At the conclusion of the sabbatical leave, the faculty member submits a report of activities and their results carried out during the leave, to the OFA and his/her department chair.

Appendices I-XVIII

Appendix I: Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP): The Role of the Committee Members and Guidelines for Confidentiality

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

SCARP: THE ROLE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND GUIDELINES FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

No committee of the Harvard Chan School bears a weightier responsibility than the Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP). It is responsible for reviewing recommendations for faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the Harvard Chan School; for advising the Dean on the resolution of these recommendations; for ensuring that school policies leading to these recommendations have been adhered to; and for proposing new policies and procedures and revising existing ones as needed, which may be subject to the approval of the full faculty. SCARP thus plays a significant role in making decisions about the careers of individual members of the Harvard Chan School faculty and about the broader academic community, in helping to shape the faculty over time, and ultimately, in determining the future course of the School.

SCARP members are selected because of their academic distinction and integrity. They are also selected to bring disciplinary, departmental, and administrative breadth to the committee. However, it is expected that their allegiance as members of SCARP will be to the School as a whole and that they will not view themselves as representatives of their academic departments.

SCARP's role requires not only wisdom and nonpartisanship, but also discretion: members review confidential information about their colleagues and must feel free to engage in serious and open deliberations about their colleagues' futures. It is essential that this information and all deliberations remain strictly confidential. We owe this to the individuals involved and to the School as a whole. SCARP members should not provide information about the agenda, discuss cases, respond to or make inquiries, or communicate decisions to anyone—the candidates, other faculty, or any other persons outside the committee—unless specifically asked to do so by the dean, the Dean for Academic Affairs, or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. In general, a member of the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) will be responsible for conveying decisions or requests for additional information to the appropriate individuals after a meeting of SCARP. Additionally, the minutes of SCARP meetings, agenda memoranda, and supporting documentation are confidential and should not be shared with anyone outside the committee. These documents should be destroyed once SCARP has completed its discussion of a case and made its recommendations.

If the trust, credibility, and integrity of the review process are to be maintained, it is essential that these simple guidelines be adhered to and respected.

I have read this statement and agree to comply with the guidelines regarding confidentiality.

Signature:

Date:

Name:

Appendix II: Academic Council Role

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ROLE

The Academic Council at the Harvard Chan School comprises the department chairs of each of the nine academic departments, as well as the faculty directors of School-level Centers. Administrative leaders who report directly to the Dean of Faculty are also members of the Academic Council. The Academic Council serves as an advisory group to the Dean of Faculty, providing input to existing and new programs and policies and guiding high-level decisions at the School.

If on consultation with the Dean of Faculty or Dean for Academic Affairs, additional School input is warranted during the approvals process for a faculty appointment, the department chair may be invited to make a presentation to Academic Council.

Appendix III: Checklist for Drafting Tenure-track Search Reports

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

FACULTY SEARCH PROCEDURES: TENURE-TRACK SEARCH REPORTS

<p>The committee report: Summary of recruitment activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title: “Report of the Search Committee for...” • Date: use the date on which the report will be reviewed by the department 	<p>The first paragraph is a statement recommending your candidate for appointment. Please identify the rank proposed for hire. The recommendation is followed by the following sections.</p> <p>I) Summary of recruitment activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Date of request to deans to initiate the search, date of approval, and the committee membership. <input type="checkbox"/> Discussion of the requirements of the position and the qualifications sought in a successful candidate; discussion of the position vis à vis the needs and goals of the department, the School, and the University. <input type="checkbox"/> List of the dates and activities (agenda) of each committee meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation that the committee was charged by the Dean. <input type="checkbox"/> Summary of recruitment procedures, i.e., ads placed, list of their placements, dates of appearance; the number of leaders contacted for nomination of candidates; the number of nominees invited to apply with related follow-up activities. <input type="checkbox"/> Summary of the committee’s procedure for evaluating candidates and the criteria by which candidates were evaluated. <input type="checkbox"/> List of the short-listed candidates, their current title and affiliation, and the dates and titles of presentations. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation of affirmative action efforts made during the recruitment phase of the search. Include the demographics of the overall candidate pool and the shortlist. (Ask OFA for details).
---	--

<p>The committee report:</p> <p>Evaluation of each short-listed candidate who visited the School.</p>	<p>II) Evaluation of short-listed candidates not recommended.</p> <p>Summarize committee’s evaluation of each short-listed candidate, discussing their qualifications in the areas of research, teaching, and professional activities as revealed in letters of reference, department evaluations, the candidate’s CV, interviews, and presentation. In the case that an internal candidate is recommended, pay special attention to highlighting the relative strengths of all shortlisted candidates. <i>The summary should include those candidates who were on the short list and who visited the School but who withdrew from the search.</i></p> <p>Please develop a narrative describing why this candidate stood out in the evaluation process but ultimately why the candidate is considered below the bar for hire.</p> <p>Some questions to consider in developing this narrative are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How is their research unique? What sparked interest in inviting the candidate to the School? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the highlights? Why and how could this research be impactful to the department/school/nationally/internationally? <input type="checkbox"/> Why and how is this research impactful to their field? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators? <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the candidates grants and funding record (or potential for successful grant funding). <input type="checkbox"/> Would their research have filled any gaps in department/school expertise? <input type="checkbox"/> What did you expect for the future of their research? <input type="checkbox"/> What potential shortcomings in their research, teaching, or grant funding placed them below the bar? <input type="checkbox"/> How did this candidate compare against the recommended candidate and other shortlist candidates?
---	---

<p>The committee report:</p> <p>The recommended candidate</p>	<p>III) The recommended candidate</p> <p>Comment on the nominee’s background and experience in the areas of research, teaching, and professional activities as revealed in letters of reference, the candidate’s dossier, interviews, and presentation. Analyze the nominee’s qualifications as related to the requirements of the position, and the needs and goals of the department, the School, and the University. Compare the recommended candidate with the other short-listed candidates, identifying the reasons for the committee’s choice. <i>The summary should also directly address any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations.</i></p> <p><u>Please develop a narrative describing why this candidate stood out in the evaluation process and ultimately why the candidate is considered above the bar for hire.</u></p> <p><u>Some questions to consider in developing this narrative are as follows:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How is their research unique? What sparked interest in inviting the candidate to the School? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the highlights? Why and how is this research impactful to the department/school/nationally/internationally? <input type="checkbox"/> Why and how is this research impactful to their field? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators? <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the candidates grants and funding record (or potential for successful grant funding). <input type="checkbox"/> Would their research have filled any gaps in department/school expertise? <input type="checkbox"/> What do you expect for the future of their research? <input type="checkbox"/> How did this candidate compare against the recommended candidate and other shortlist candidates? <input type="checkbox"/> Are there any areas of concern that should be addressed? If they join our faculty do we have a mentor in mind to help focus on developing those area(s)? <p>Analyze the nominee’s qualifications as related to the requirements of the position, and the needs and goals of the department, the school, and the university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the potential educational contributions to the department and the School
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their teaching (if applicable)? What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their mentorship (if applicable)?
<p>The committee report (cont.):</p> <p>Summary</p>	<p>IV) Summary</p> <p>Summarize the candidate’s major scientific contributions and qualifications for the position. Conclude with a statement of recommendation of the search committee (no “signature page” required).</p> <p>Some questions to consider while developing this narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What would the candidate bring to the department? Would this fill any gaps in the department/branch into new areas for the department? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence does the committee foresee the candidate potentially having on the future of the department/school/university? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence could the candidate have on the future of their field at the School, the University and in the greater world? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the candidate sufficiently connected to both internal and external scholarly networks to build their portfolio and career? How would you assess the candidate’s involvement and leadership role in professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc. in the field? <p>Think of this like closing statements to solidify reasoning for hire. Conclude with a statement of recommendation of the search committee (no “signature page” required). Reiterate the chosen candidate(s) in ranked order and their level of hire (ie Assistant or Associate).</p>

	Remember after the faculty vote to add a new paragraph describing the faculty discussion that took place, and the overall vote tally of the senior faculty.
Appendix 1 Documentation of initiation of search	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The chair’s letter to the deans requesting to initiate the search <input type="checkbox"/> Committee membership list
Appendix 2 Documentation of recruitment efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the position description as advertised. <input type="checkbox"/> List of sites, electronic and material, used for advertising. Please follow HIO guidelines on posting job advertisements – as referenced in the green book. <input type="checkbox"/> Sample copy of an advertisement as published in physical media. <input type="checkbox"/> List of individuals contacted to nominate candidates and a sample copy of the communication. Document any follow-up activities. <input type="checkbox"/> List of individuals contacted by phone to nominate candidates, with dates and summaries of conversations. <input type="checkbox"/> List of individuals invited to apply for the position and a sample copy of the communication.
Appendix 3 Candidate evaluations	<p>The search administrator will provide a table of all candidates with the following three columns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Candidate name ➤ ARleS dispositioning category ➤ University approved “reasons not hired” (3 a/b/c/d/ note for each candidate indicating why they were rejected). Please do not include any gender or ethnicity information on this list. <p><i>If needed, contact OFA for further details.</i></p>
Appendix 4 (5, 6, etc.)	<p>The recommended candidate’s dossier in this order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Letter of application

<p>Dossier of recommended candidate(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> CV <input type="checkbox"/> Research statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reference letters (4 for a nominee at the assistant level; 6 for a nominee at the associate level) in alphabetical order <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations from faculty who interviewed the candidate and/or attended the presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluations (if available) <input type="checkbox"/> A cover page listing publications (2 for a nominee at the assistant level; 5 for a nominee at the associate level) <input type="checkbox"/> Publications <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate’s statement describing efforts to encourage diversity, inclusion, and belonging, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
<p>Appendix 5 (6, 7, etc.)</p> <p>The dossiers of the unsuccessful short-listed candidates <i>if</i> the nominee is internal* or was named in the department chair’s request for the search</p> <p>*Current or former Harvard Chan student, fellow, or academic appointee</p>	<p>Each dossier in this order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Letter of application <input type="checkbox"/> CV <input type="checkbox"/> Research statement <input type="checkbox"/> Reference letters (4 for a nominee at the assistant level; 6 for a nominee at the associate level) in alphabetical order <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations from faculty who interviewed the candidate and/or attended the presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluations (if available) <input type="checkbox"/> A cover page listing selected publications (2 for a nominee at the assistant level; 5 for a nominee at the associate level) <input type="checkbox"/> Publications
<p>When sending draft materials (please allow OFA enough time to review prior to department vote):</p>	<p>Send the draft committee report and the accompanying appendices as PDFs for review as a Microsoft Word document to OFA. Send each appendix separately, bookmarked by section.</p> <p>For the candidate dossiers, bookmark the PDF to correspond to the list below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Letter of application (if submitted) <input type="checkbox"/> CV <input type="checkbox"/> Research statement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Reference letters (4 for a nominee at the assistant level; 6 for a nominee at the associate level) in alphabetical order <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluations from faculty who interviewed the candidate and/or attended the presentation, in alphabetical order <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluations (if available) <input type="checkbox"/> A cover page listing selected publications (2 for a nominee at the assistant level; 5 for a nominee at the associate level) <input type="checkbox"/> Publications
<p>After review, OFA will send you:</p>	<p>The draft committee report and the appendices with any suggested edits. The search administrator will ensure that the search committee has signed off on the report before sending the edited version to OFA.</p>
<p>When sending final materials (after department faculty vote):</p>	<p><u>Submit to OFA:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> One combined PDF of the report and appendices, bookmarked <input type="checkbox"/> PDF of the report only <input type="checkbox"/> PDF for each appendix <p>Update ARleS with dispositioning information for each candidate prior to SCARP submission. Once candidate signs offer letter, update ARleS to show that the position has been filled.</p> <p>Contact the Office of Faculty Affairs, facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu, to remove posting from School website.</p>

If you have questions or comments about these procedures, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs, facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu.

Appendix III-A: Departmental Process for Tenure-track Faculty Search Report Approval

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
DEPARTMENTAL PROCESS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY SEARCH REPORT APPROVAL

Summary

In fall 2019, following requests from departments to find ways to expedite the process of making offers to tenure-track faculty candidates in a competitive and often time-sensitive market, the Academic Council deliberated on and endorsed a proposal to permit tenure-track search committees to bypass SCARP approval, instead requiring departments to review and approve the search committee reports before the deans consider and submit the search report to the Provost's Appointments Review Committee (PARC) for final approval.

In addition to accelerating the timeline to offers, enlisting the tenured faculty in a department to vote on the committee's report will invite more departmental engagement earlier in tenure-track onboarding (which may further facilitate earlier mentoring, etc.). By inviting the tenure-track faculty to participate in the discussion, we invite them to take an active role in shaping departmental culture; however, by restricting the vote to senior faculty, we avoid creating a conflict of interest for tenure-track faculty and/or a reluctance to vote differently from senior colleagues.

Beginning in 2020, tenure-track search committees have presented their completed reports and recommendations to department faculty for review. After a corresponding discussion of the full primary faculty, senior faculty in the department vote to move a case forward. This vote is followed (as has previously been the norm) by decanal and then provostial review and approval.

Please note that SCARP will continue to approve reappointments for tenure-track faculty, promotion cases, senior non-ladder, or secondary and adjunct appointments. This proposal relates to new assistant and associate professor appointments only.

Logistics of the departmental review and vote

1. **The search committee writes and signs off on search report** and sends it to the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) for feedback, cc'ing the department chair.
2. **The department pre-circulates the search report and the dossiers of recommended candidates (excluding letters of reference, if preferred) to primary faculty** and schedules a meeting to discuss the report's recommendations. The department should circulate the search report to

primary faculty via secure file transfer prior to the meeting and should mark it CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE

3. Either a member of the search committee, the departmental SCARP representative, or the department chair **“presents” the report to the department.**
4. Departmental discussion should generally focus on the report as written and as a whole. Clarification and/or revisions to the report may be offered for the committee’s consideration. Any **dissenting opinions should be documented** and explained in an appendix to the report. The discussion will include all primary departmental faculty, but voting is restricted to senior (tenured and term) professors. By inviting the tenure-track faculty to participate in the discussion only, we invite them to take an active role in shaping department without creating a conflict of interest or pressure to align with senior colleagues.
5. There should be a **discussion about the potential mentoring plan(s)** and any School and University resources that can be brought to bear on the candidate(s) being recommended for offer. Ideas should be documented and summarized in the final report, but do not represent binding decisions.
6. **Primary senior faculty must attend the meeting (at least by Zoom) to vote.** Primary senior faculty votes should be solicited at a subsequent executive session after the discussion with tenure-track colleagues, or by email immediately following the meeting, with a very short deadline. It is recommended not to let too much time pass before the vote (e.g., ~24 hours).
7. Vote phrasing: “Are you in favor of the recommendations presented in this report, Yes or No?” **Tallies should be noted for the final report** (which will now include at the end a summary of the discussion and vote).
8. The department submits the final search report to OFA for review and feedback, after **adding a summary of the departmental discussion** (including mentoring recommendations) and vote, as well as any changes to the report recommended by department faculty that the committee wants to incorporate.
9. **OFA will submit the report for a decanal and then a provostial review** and approval.

Appendix IV - Search Committee Guidelines and Pledge

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA) SEARCH COMMITTEE AND RESPONSIBILITIES, GUIDELINES, AND PLEDGE

At the Harvard Chan School, the search committee is the chief mechanism for selecting individuals to fill specific faculty positions. Search committees play a pivotal role in helping to shape the faculty over time and, thus, in determining the future course of the School.

Searches are expected to be thorough, vigorous, critical, impartial, and efficient to attract the largest possible number of qualified candidates. Each search committee must make a sincere effort to recruit women and faculty from backgrounds underrepresented in public health, as faculty searches are the School's best opportunity to increase faculty diversity and thus achieve and maintain our standards of institutional excellence. All tenure-track searches are to be conducted as genuinely open searches, even when internal and/or known candidates have been identified, all of whom must be held to the same requirements and procedures as the broader pool. Finally, the aim of a search committee must always be to fill the position with the individual whose qualifications, experience, and interests best meet the stated/advertised needs of the program, the department, and the School.

Adherence to the School's established policies and procedures in the conduct of a search must be documented in the final report and will be reviewed by the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) and the Office of the Dean. An addendum to this document outlines the specific duties and responsibilities of search participants. In general, the role of the search committee is to:

- advertise the position
- communicate with experts in the field to solicit the names of appropriate candidates, suggest and make special efforts to invite applications from women and/or under-represented groups
- review and evaluate application materials
- arrange candidate visits and conduct interviews
- recommend the leading candidate(s) to the dean
- prepare the final report

Maintaining Confidentiality

It is imperative that the proceedings of all search committees be held in absolute confidence regarding discussions of the committee, views of committee members, outcome of votes, and content of the final report, including reference letters*. The only individuals authorized to read confidential materials obtained by or prepared by the committee are the members and staff of the search committee; the Dean's office; the Office of Faculty Affairs; the Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions (for tenure searches); the ad hoc committee (for tenure searches); the President and Provost of the University and their designees; and the governing boards of the University. Other than carrying out routine communications with candidates in the search and consulting with the Department Chair, committee members should not provide information about their agenda, discuss candidates, respond to inquiries, or communicate decisions to anyone—the candidates, other faculty, or any other persons outside the committee—unless specifically asked to do so by the dean, the Dean for Academic Affairs, the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Because it is important that the committee fully understand the nature of the position to be filled and the department's expectations of the successful candidate, the search committee or its chair should feel free to consult with the Department Chair at any point in the search; it is expected that the Department Chair will keep the substance of any such conversation confidential. The committee should also seek feedback from faculty members who participate in candidate interviews or attend candidate seminars (it is not generally appropriate to solicit feedback from students). However, the committee must be scrupulous in maintaining the confidentiality of its own deliberations.

*The committee report, including candidate dossiers and reference letters, requires special handling within the context of tenure-track searches. The committee report contents are strictly confidential *until* the department faculty review and vote takes place. At that time, the discussions, views of committee members, outcome of votes, candidate dossiers, letters of reference, and content of the final report, may be distributed with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of current members of the department (faculty, students, research trainees and/or internal candidates) and their reviewers. Committees and department chairs will consult with OFA on their preferred redactions before distributing any materials.

Disclosing and Managing Conflicts of Interest

Search committee members are selected both for their individual familiarity with the relevant field and for disciplinary and departmental breadth or balance on the committee as a whole. While it is understandable that members of the committee may have a strong personal or programmatic interest in the outcome of a search, it is expected that they will demonstrate objectivity throughout the search process, keeping in mind the overall interests of the School and the critical role they are playing in the development of the faculty. Before commencing the search it is vital for the department chair and committee members to provide the names of any known candidates who are likely to apply. This list should be included, with CV's for candidates if available, in the initiation of a search request. If a potential member of the search committee has a real or perceived conflict with a likely applicant in an upcoming search, it is best to proactively avoid including that faculty member on the search committee.

For searches in narrow fields, or where few or no faculty are available with the necessary expertise, a modified process may be followed. The Office of Faculty Affairs will still determine what constitutes a conflict of interest dependent on the circumstances of the connection between committee member and candidate. For discussion of the long list, faculty who have a conflict of interest with a candidate may participate in non-comparative discussions of candidates with whom they do not have a conflict. They must recuse themselves (physical or remote) from the discussion involving the candidate with whom they have a clear conflict. If the candidate is eliminated the committee member can return and participate fully. If the candidate with whom they have a conflict advances to the short list, the committee member should step down from the committee for the remainder of the committee's activities when deemed appropriate by the Office of Faculty Affairs. In cases where a close past or present relationship exists, faculty members should not attend departmental discussions concerning the search for the period of time during which the candidate is under consideration. In cases where the expertise of the faculty member is needed, the faculty member may attend a committee discussion, or submit in writing, answering specific questions posed by the committee regarding the candidate's scholarship. The faculty member with the conflict of interest should not interject opinions or information beyond what is asked. For further clarification of the policy please consult with the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Real and perceived conflicts of interest will naturally arise from time to time during the course of a search. For purposes of a faculty search, a conflict exists wherever the committee member's interests or activities have any potential to: compromise their judgment, biasing the nature or direction of the recruitment and selection (in either direction), influence other search committee members, or put them in a position to gain personally or professionally from the outcome of the search. When a committee member becomes aware of any conflict of interest (real or perceived) with any candidate at any stage of the search, they are obligated to disclose the substance of it to the search committee and the Office of Faculty Affairs immediately and proceed in accordance with the following principles:

- In the case of an obvious direct conflict with a candidate who has progressed to the shortlist, the committee member will recuse themselves from the search committee entirely (prior to the shortlist stage, they will abstain from discussions of the candidate and refrain from evaluating the candidate for long list inclusion. Examples of such conflicts include:
 - committee member has been a research supervisor of the candidate (during graduate school or as a principal investigator or postdoctoral advisor), or has been the graduate student or direct research advisee of the candidate
 - committee member has provided letters of support for the applicant (not objective/arm's-length letters)
 - committee member is, will be soon, or has been a research collaborator or co-author of the candidate
 - A business, commercial, or financial relationship with a candidate.
 - An emotional relationship with a candidate (such as a personal friend, near relative, current/former romantic partner or any personal connection from past or present whether positive or negative).
 - committee member has a history of interaction or conflict with the candidate that would make an objective evaluation difficult
- In the case of a potential, indirect, and/or perceived conflict that might draw unhelpful skepticism or suspicion of the eventual outcome of the search, the committee member will consult with OFA about the nature of the concern and take steps to address the risks. Solutions could include:
 - committee member will be recused from chairing the committee
 - committee member will be recused from serving on the committee
 - committee member will be recused from evaluating the candidate(s) in question
 - committee member will not participate in interviewing the candidate
 - committee member will submit a summary of their knowledge of the candidate for use in the committee's written report

Faculty who step down from the committee may attend the candidates' job talks. Faculty with conflicts may not attend meetings where the candidates are discussed, ranked, or voted upon during the committee's discussions.

Committee Member Pledge

If the trust, credibility, and integrity of the search process are to be maintained, it is essential that the principles and guidelines above be adhered to and respected. Please indicate by your signature that you have **read this statement and agree to comply with all the guidelines regarding confidentiality.**

Signature:

Date:

Please print name:

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SEARCH PARTICIPANTS ADDENDUM:

<p>Search Committee Members</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in editing the job description • Contribute names of women and under-represented minorities who would be appropriate for the position before posting • Provide feedback on where to advertise the position (e.g., academic journals, listservs, job boards, etc.) • Contribute names of experts in the field to solicit appropriate candidate(s) and/or to circulate the job ad to their groups • Initiate personal contact (where appropriate) with key individuals to help generate a viable candidate pool. Be communicative with search administrator about these instances. • Be responsive and flexible with respect to scheduling meetings and candidate visits • Review all application materials and provide evaluations of all candidates • Participate in candidate visits and conduct interviews • Participate in discussions involving the shortlist and ultimately who to recommend for the position • Assist in drafting the search report • Be sure to copy all committee members, search administrator(s), and the Office of Faculty Affairs on all communications • Disclose any potential conflict of interest with a candidate and recuse themselves from the search if deemed necessary
<p>Search Committee Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes a leading role in all committee discussions and deliberations • Assist search administrator in candidate outreach as well as answering candidate questions about the position (where appropriate) • Interview all shortlist candidates and attend all candidate seminars • Aid search administrator in obtaining candidate feedback • Convey committee’s decision to department chair

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oversees preparation of the search report – writes appropriate section(s) and assigns sections to the most appropriate committee members • Prepares to present the report (where appropriate) to department faculty • Disclose any potential conflict of interest with a candidate and recuse themselves from the search if deemed necessary
Search Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible for posting job within ARleS after the committee has finalized the draft • Keeping records of all candidates and committee feedback on them • Keeps notes of all deliberations related to the search process • Places advertisements where committee has designated and keeps copies of ads placed • Drafts and sends communications to nominators, nominees, and any other appropriate communications. Will keep copies of all these communications. • Schedules all committee meetings and candidates' visits • Drafts agendas and keeps detailed notes on all discussions amongst the committee • Keeps records of committee evaluations (including but not limited to tracking each candidate and reasoning for either rejecting or moving forward) • Aids in drafting the search report with a major role in writing the process piece of the report (chronology, recruitment steps, review procedures, affirmative action information, etc.) • Sends drafts of search report and appendices to Office of Faculty Affairs prior to department faculty review • Schedule department faculty discussion and tally all votes • Send final edited versions of report and appendices to Office of Faculty Affairs

Appendix IV-A: Charge to the Faculty Search Committee

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA)

CHARGE TO THE FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE

Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

Department: Choose an item.

Search (include area and rank):

Committee members:

CHARGE TO THE FACULTY SEARCH COMMITTEE

The department has identified the need for a faculty member in the area and at the rank being sought, and the School's administration has endorsed the launching of a search for such an individual. The search committee is charged with identifying a diverse pool of candidates for the open position and with recommending candidates to the department chair and dean for academic affairs.

For a fair search and the subsequent recruitment to be successful, it is essential that the committee:

❖ **BE THOROUGH.**

- The search committee is expected to develop a diverse and credible pool of applicants. It is generally expected that there will be a minimum of 25-30 applicants, and recommendations in searches with fewer applicants are often not approved.
- If an acceptable pool has not developed, the committee is expected to renew its outreach efforts (even if the committee thinks it has already identified a suitable candidate) which will delay the conclusion of the search and the potential recruitment of the desired candidate. For that reason, the committee should conduct an aggressive outreach campaign from the outset, and it is expected that members will actively and personally contact experts in the field to solicit the names of potential candidates. Your role as a committee is to develop the pool as much as it is to evaluate it.

❖ **BE EFFICIENT.**

- It is increasingly the case across fields that offers are extended in the winter and early spring. While this time frame may not be relevant for all Harvard Chan School searches, if you want to maximize your chances with the most attractive and diverse candidates, the search committee will need to be efficient in conducting its outreach efforts, identifying a short list, and scheduling candidate visits to meet this timeline. Committee members must be flexible with their calendars and should inform their assistants that search committee meetings and candidate visits are a priority. Be sure these assistants are in communication with the search administrator.

❖ **BE ACTIVE IN PURSUING APPLICATIONS FROM WOMEN AND UNDERREPRESENTED MINORITIES.**

- Searches represent our only opportunity to diversify our faculty, which is a priority of the School and of the university. Committees are thus expected to place the highest priority on efforts to

solicit applications from women and minority candidates, and to consider such applications carefully and fairly.

- The committee will be required to substantiate why each self-identified minority and female applicant was not considered further, if they are excluded as viable candidates at any point in the process. This will be documented in the search committee's report.

❖ **BE ENGAGED.**

- All committee members are expected to review and comment on all applications. The committee must meet to discuss the applicants to allow for an open exchange of views and to ensure that each applicant is carefully considered. A plurality of voices is to be encouraged; no one committee member is to be granted a de facto spokesperson role for other members of the committee (or the department).
- It is important that all committee members attend candidate seminars (or view the taped seminar if it is impossible to be present on a particular occasion) and interview each candidate.
- Committees should ensure that hospitality is shown to each candidate who visits (for example, the candidate should be greeted at the beginning of the day, escorted from meeting to meeting, hosted at dinner, etc.). [DURING PERIODS OF SOCIAL DISTANCING, THE SAME PRINCIPLE APPLIES TO VIRTUAL OUTREACH AND MEETINGS.]
- Participation by department faculty (candidate interviews, seminars) is expected and candidate evaluations will be requested. After the search committee makes its recommendation, the department chair will formally ask the tenured members of the department to comment on the qualifications of the nominee(s).

❖ **BE CRITICAL.**

- A candidate should be recommended not just because s/he is the best of the pool, but because s/he meets a standard of scholarly excellence. There will be searches that do not ultimately yield viable candidates.
- The committee must rank order their preferences if they are recommending more candidates than they have positions. Furthermore, when more than one candidate is above the bar, committee members should revisit their initial criteria (re: sub-specialty, teaching potential, commitment to diversity, etc.) before commencing the rank ordering. Often a "gut feeling" or "best athlete" approach is not going to bring you closest to the hire you were intending when the search began.

❖ **BE CONFIDENTIAL.**

- Each committee member must keep the deliberations of the committee in confidence, and all members will be required to sign a statement pledging to do so.
- Members should not provide information about their agenda, discuss candidates, or communicate decisions to anyone other than the deans or department chair, unless specifically asked to do so.
- Members should not indicate to a candidate that s/he is being recommended or that an offer may be extended.

- Members should not communicate with mentees or students in the pool whom they know personally. If a mentee or student of a committee member is chosen to receive an offer, then the committee member in question may be able to assist with the recruitment efforts at the request of the department chair.

Finally, the committee should:

❖ **ADDRESS CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**

- Search committee members are obligated to disclose any potential conflict of interest with the committee. If a mentee or a collaborator of a search committee member is short-listed, the committee member will be recused from the search committee.

❖ **COMMUNICATE BROADLY.**

- Substantive emails about the search should be received by all members, including the search administrator, and the Faculty Affairs representative. Informal (i.e., outside a committee meeting) conversations contributing to conclusions/decisions should be documented and shared with all of these parties as well.

Appendix V: The Conduct of Searches with Identified Internal or External Candidates

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
THE CONDUCT OF SEARCHES WITH IDENTIFIED INTERNAL OR EXTERNAL CANDIDATES

Impartiality

All search committees must adhere strictly to the School's search procedures. Searches should be thorough, impartial, and vigorous to attract the largest possible number of qualified candidates. Because we seek to identify the best candidate for every position, we are committed to genuinely open searches, even when there is an identified internal or external candidate. This process begins with the appointment of the search committee: When there is an identified candidate, **the committee will include at least one faculty member from outside the Harvard Chan School**, and a **mentor or close associate of the identified candidate will not be invited to serve on the search committee**, though such individuals may be consulted during a search. **The Committee Chair must be external to the research group** with which the designated candidate is affiliated.

Rigor

For searches in which there are identified candidates, the committee is expected to make every effort to develop a strong pool of applicants. Before advertising the position, the search committee must make certain that **the position description is framed broadly enough to attract a reasonable pool** of external candidates, while reflecting any constraints posed by funding requirements. The search committee must be able to document that the position has been **advertised aggressively**, that a comprehensive list of individuals and institutions has been contacted for nomination of candidates, that serious efforts have been made to identify individuals who can be invited to apply for the position, and that **committee members have followed up personally with individuals** who have received both the nominator and invitation letters.

Credibility

If a tenure-track search committee with a designated candidate is unsuccessful in attracting a reasonable pool of applicants and in developing a short list that includes other strong candidates, the committee is expected to **revisit the first steps of the search**: consider whether the position description is too narrowly framed, re-advertise the position, communicate with additional individuals and institutions to announce the re-opening of the position and to solicit candidates, and so forth. If these efforts fail to yield an appropriate number of candidates, **the committee must make a case for the credibility of the pool** by discussing the likely reasons for this in its search report. For example, if there is a small number of degree programs in the field, this information should be provided in the report. If the

committee has information about why potential candidates may be applying for positions at competing institutions rather than for positions at the Harvard Chan School, that should be discussed.

Search committees should **recommend the strongest candidate** for appointment and **should not assume that a second position will be made available to allow both the identified candidate and an additional candidate** to be appointed. If more than one candidate is recommended the individuals should still be ranked according to preference for hire.

Throughout the process, search committees should ensure that **all candidates are subject to the same requirements (for example, for letters of recommendation) and receive the same treatment as other candidates in every respect (for example, in arrangements for presentations and interviews).**

Note: In any search, with or without a designated candidate, if an individual applies who has a close association with a member of the search committee (e.g., mentor/mentee, collaborator, coauthor), and if that applicant advances to the short list, **the search committee member will be recused from service on the committee** but may be consulted as the search proceeds, and may be invited back if, subsequently, there is no longer a conflict.

Note: whether there are identified or targeted search candidates or not, searches for tenured professors will necessarily involve the **solicitation of comparison letters that do not indicate who any potential identified or targeted candidates may be.** Sometimes this process is referred to as a “blinded letters” process. By any name, the goal of comparison letters without a specified candidate is to solicit the most objective feedback from experts in the field possible and to confirm that any identified (before or during the search) or targeted candidates organically rise to the top of the field in the eyes of an unrelated but eminently qualified set of reviewers.

Appendix VI: Review for Promotion to a Tenured Professorship

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

REVIEW FOR PROMOTION TO A TENURED PROFESSORSHIP

<p>Notification to department chair about launching promotion reviews.</p>	<p>Ordinarily, associate professors will be reviewed for promotion to tenure after at least eight years on the tenure ladder.</p> <p>At the beginning of each academic year, the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) will write to department chairs to discuss eligibility of and readiness for tenure reviews among their associate professor faculty (i.e., those who have reached 8+ years on the tenure clock). If a faculty member has been granted a ladder extension, they will be deemed eligible in the ninth or tenth year, as appropriate. Reviews should begin before the final year of each faculty member’s tenure clock. Chairs will discuss readiness with each eligible associate professor as part of their regular annual mentoring meetings so that there are no surprises and to ensure decisions are made in consultation with individual faculty members and their mentors.</p> <p>The chair is informed that they should confirm with OFA for each eligible associate professor that the review will proceed, be deferred, or if the associate professor wishes to decline the review, the chair should immediately discuss this possibility with the Dean for Academic Affairs. If the review will be deferred, the chair documents this with the candidate in writing, with a copy to OFA for the candidate’s faculty file.</p>
<p>Meeting with department chair and candidate to review procedures.</p>	<p>If the review is to proceed, the Associate Dean/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs meets with the department chair and the candidate to explain the process.</p>
<p>Preparation and distribution of the candidate’s dossier.</p>	<p>The candidate prepares their dossier, comprising their CV; a professional statement (the academic report), which provides details about past accomplishments and future directions with respect to research, teaching/advising (including course evaluations and documentation of teaching history), service, translational activities, COVID 19 Impact and Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging statements; and selected papers. In the</p>

	<p>absence of the department chair’s instructions to the contrary, candidates are encouraged to prepare their dossier in accordance with OFA guidelines. These guidelines will have been provided to the candidate at an earlier stage of the tenure ladder and are provided again at the meeting described above.</p>
	<p><i>The candidate is ordinarily expected to submit their dossier within one month after the meeting with the associate dean/assistant dean and the department chair. Consultation with the Associate/Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs about the dossier prior to submission is welcome and encouraged.</i></p>
	<p>The dossier is distributed to the tenured members of the department. The department chair may invite tenured Harvard Chan faculty with secondary appointments in the department to participate in the review process according to the interests and expertise of individual secondary faculty.</p>
<p>Presentation by candidate and subsequent meeting of tenured faculty.</p>	<p>The candidate makes a research presentation, which is open to the School community and which tenured members of the department are expected to attend. The department should arrange for this presentation to be recorded, so that it will be available subsequently to members of the promotion review committee if a full tenure review is pursued.</p> <p>The tenured members of the department meet subsequently to discuss the case and to vote on whether the department chair should recommend moving forward with the promotion review. The discussion should encompass both the candidate’s qualifications and the department’s priorities and resources. The Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs must be present at this meeting.</p>
<p>Consultation with the department chair of the candidate’s affiliated department.</p>	<p>If the candidate holds a faculty affiliation in another Harvard Chan department, the primary chair also consults with the affiliated chair about their views with respect to moving forward with the promotion review. The subsequent role of the affiliated chair in a promotion review will be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p>

Department chair reports decision about moving forward with promotion review.

After consulting with their tenured faculty and with their fellow department chair (if the candidate holds an affiliation in another department), the department chair sends the candidate’s dossier (as described above), with a brief cover letter describing the departmental review process and indicating whether they wish to proceed with a full promotion review, to the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean for Faculty Affairs. These materials will be reviewed by the dean and Dean for Academic Affairs, who must provide approval before a tenure review can be launched.

If the department chair chooses not to pursue the promotion review, or if the deans do not authorize a review, the chair informs the candidate in writing that they will not be considered further for tenure, with a copy to OFA for the candidate’s faculty file.

Launch of promotion review committee.

Upon the deans’ approval to move forward with a promotion review, OFA begins the process of identifying and inviting committee members, consulting with relevant faculty members to assemble master lists of potential letter writers and comparands/peers and working with the candidate to finalize their dossier.

The committee is composed of three or, more commonly, four tenured Harvard professors; ideally, one member will come from a different Harvard Chan department and another from a different Harvard school. It is important to have members who understand the candidate’s field, and it is not prohibited for mentors and close collaborators to serve, although this is not a requirement. Depending on the candidate’s field, it also may be useful to preserve non-Harvard Chan faculty who would be eligible to serve as letter writers or ad hoc members.

Ideally, department staff will take the lead on scheduling committee meeting(s), but backup support can be provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA). However, as soon as the committee members have all agreed to serve, the process of scheduling the first meeting, which will be held on the first available and feasible date, should begin.

First meeting of promotion review committee and solicitation of letters.

At its first meeting, the committee is briefed by the Dean for Academic Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. At this or a subsequent meeting, the committee interviews the candidate, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate’s record or plans for future work.

The most important initial task of the promotion review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation. At the first meeting the committee will also receive a report template with estimated timeline but they will primarily focus on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers and comparands/peers. The latter are ideally outstanding scholars deemed potentially suitable for a tenured full professorship at the School. Approximately 20 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining at least 12 letters, and 5 comparands/peers are listed for comparison. The proposed lists are reviewed and approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs. Once the lists are approved, the chair of the promotion review committee solicits the comparison letters. Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair, as an alternative.

Promotion review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who can provide information about the candidate’s qualifications from a particular perspective.

The Dean for Academic Affairs requests confidential letters from tenured members of the candidate’s department.

The department chair provides a letter explaining the departmental context for the review for promotion, including a report on the vote of the tenured faculty.

Letter requests are ordinarily expected to go out no later than two weeks after the initial meeting of the committee.

Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report.

At this time, the committee will meet with the candidate, review any letters with concerns, and if not already done, divide the responsibility of drafting the report sections, and determine a date for completion.

Third/Final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report.

Once the external letter requests have been sent, the first possible date for the final meeting can be projected and the final meeting scheduled. Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At its final meeting, the committee reviews the letters and the draft report.

A minimum of eight weeks must be allowed between the date the comparison letter requests are sent and the final meeting; given that time frame, the final meeting will be held on the first available date.

Approval process.

There are three stages of approval for promotion to tenure: a promotion must be approved by SCARP, the department chair and the deans, and by the President of the University, who receives guidance from the Provost, who chairs the ad hoc committee. The progress of a promotion can be stopped at any of these stages.

1. The final report, with all letters (except confidential letters from members of the candidate's department) and appendices, is provided to SCARP.
2. If the SCARP decision is affirmative, the materials are provided to the Dean and the Dean for Academic Affairs. The Department Chair meets with the deans to present the case, and the deans subsequently decide whether the approval process should continue.
3. If the deans' and department chair's decision is affirmative, the report is sent to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity with the School's list of proposed ad hoc members. This list draws from the master list from which the names of letter writers were selected, with additional consultation with promotion review committee members and others; it must be approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs before being sent to the Provost's office. Ad hoc membership comprises three members from outside the University and two from within Harvard but with no Harvard Chan appointment.

Once the Provost's office has approved the list of proposed ad hoc members, a specific date for the ad hoc meeting is identified. Because of the difficulty in lining up prominent scholars on short notice, it is highly desirable to allow a

minimum of three months between the approval of the list and the ad hoc date.

The ad hoc meeting is held, with the Dean and, ordinarily, the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Senior Vice Provost in attendance as ex officio members. The School also provides several witnesses, including the department chair and the chair of the promotion review committee; other witnesses may be members of the committee with expertise in the candidate's field or members of the department who can provide a different perspective on the case. Subsequently, the decision about the approval or denial of the promotion is conveyed to the deans.

Appendix VI-A: Tenure Criteria and Appendices

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

TENURE CRITERIA (2010)

Appointments at the rank of professor (unmodified) are made with tenure, i.e., without limit of time. Criteria considered in evaluating a candidate's qualifications for a tenured professorship include all the following:

- Originality, independence, and excellence in science and scholarship
- National and international recognition as a scholar whose research has had a significant impact on their field
- In collaborative research, evidence of intellectual leadership and identifiable individual contributions to science and scholarship
- National or international leadership within the candidate's field
- Promise of future productivity and innovation
- Contributions to classroom teaching, research training and mentorship, and/or leadership of educational programs
- Impact of translational activities that foster improvements in public health

In evaluation, primary importance will be placed on research, although all faculty are expected to contribute to educational activities. A well-developed academic career will integrate research, teaching, and translation so that these are mutually reinforcing.

Appendices to the 2010 criteria

The following three appendices were developed to clarify and expand the guidelines for candidates in preparing their promotion review dossier. It is recommended that these appendices be included as part of the procedural framework made available to faculty and ad hoc committees as they review candidates.

Appendix A: Educational Activities

Appendix B: Evaluating Individual Contributions to Collaborative Research

Appendix C: Translational Activities

2010 TENURE CRITERIA APPENDIX A:

Educational Activities

Given the importance of the educational mission of the Harvard Chan School, it is expected that, with rare exception, all faculty will engage in teaching, mentoring, and/or educational leadership. The candidate will prepare a dossier (*or teaching portfolio*) of educational activities and indicate specific contributions. Faculty will be evaluated for contributions to teaching and educational activities at the Harvard Chan School and its affiliates. Teaching and mentoring of Harvard Chan students and fellows will be particularly noted. Examples of measures, that would constitute the dossier, and may be used to evaluate educational activities include:

Educational Activities	Examples of Measures
<p>Teaching</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Statement of teaching philosophy ➤ Statement of teaching responsibilities, including course numbers and titles, enrollments, teaching method and a brief description of how the courses fit into the overall mission of the School/department ➤ Course syllabi ➤ Quality measured by teaching awards and evaluations (e.g., students and/or peer evaluation) ➤ Development of innovative methods in teaching and/or lectures on issues related to education; course materials developed and used externally ➤ Scholarship on discipline-related pedagogy; contributions to, or editing of a professional journal on teaching in the discipline; textbooks published and adopted at other universities ➤ Assessment of curricular materials by experts in the discipline ➤ Postgraduate and CME teaching at international/national conferences, professional training workshops (list courses, number of students, course objectives, course syllabi, etc.)
<p>Research training and mentorship</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ List of theses supervised ➤ Stature and accomplishments of all trainees including their current and past positions ➤ Publications with trainees ➤ Nomination and receipt of mentoring awards
<p>Practicum Experiences</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ List of practicum experiences supervised

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Quality of practicum as measured by evaluations by students and practicum partners
Educational Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Quality as measured by evaluations and peer review of programs for which the candidate was a leader➤ Participation in expanding the diversity of the student body and attracting minority graduate students

2010 TENURE CRITERIA APPENDIX B:

Evaluating Individual Contributions to Collaborative Research

In discussion with Dr. Judith Singer, James Bryant Conant Professor of Education and Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, the following considerations emerged that could be used to evaluate the independent contributions of a faculty member who has been engaged in collaborative research:

- The independent role is clearest when a faculty member is the only person in the group from their discipline, such as the only biostatistician on a substantive project.
- Did the faculty member only use the existing tools or resources to apply to a different question?
- If the primary contribution involved the development of new tools or methods, have these been shown to have important applications?
- Would work deemed to be important have happened without the specific faculty member having been involved in the collaboration, or could others from the same discipline have accomplished the same?
- The independent role of the faculty member should be clearly specified in letters(s) by the senior leader(s) of the collaboration.

2010 TENURE CRITERIA APPENDIX C:

Translational Activities

Given the importance of translating research into practice to the mission of the Harvard Chan School, it is expected that, with rare exception, all faculty will engage in translational activities. The candidate will prepare a dossier (or public health impact statement) describing translational activities and their impact and indicate specific measures of contributions. Faculty will be evaluated for the impact of their activity on public health. Examples of measures, that would constitute the dossier, and may be used to evaluate educational activities include:

Translational Activities	Examples of Metrics
Research Products	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Discoveries, inventions, patents, vaccines, drugs, delivery systems or other commercial products➤ Software, programs, or other copyrighted products
Professional Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Serving in senior positions (e.g., editor, editorial boards) on scholarly, high impact journals➤ Leadership positions (e.g., President) for professional organizations➤ Leadership in organizing national and international conferences, symposium, etc.
Scholarly Translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Publication of senior author original research, editorials, chapters, reviews and/or books that are widely recognized as influencing the field➤ Development of guidelines and/or protocols for public health practice that are adopted nationally and/or internationally➤ Materials that document the impact of the candidate's science on public health practice➤ Invited plenary lectures to major national/international conferences

<p>Translation to Policy Makers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Testimony (oral or written) to regulatory agencies or legislative bodies (local, national, international) affecting public health policy ➤ Leadership on committees, panels, and advisory committees evaluating and/or recommending public health policy or practice
<p>Translation to Community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development of material related to health conditions for use by educators/lay public ➤ Development of programs and materials that improve health literacy and educate the public about biomedical sciences ➤ Writing for magazines, newspapers, health letters or websites on issues related to health ➤ Speaking to lay populations to educate them about important health issues ➤ Presenting information related to health through the media, including radio, television, or podcasts ➤ Educating and mentoring pre-professional students in biomedical science ➤ Service to communities locally, nationally, or abroad that improves the health of populations

Appendix VI-B: Tenure Candidate Dossier Components

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

TENURE CANDIDATE DOSSIER COMPONENTS

The candidate’s materials should be reviewed by OFA, and the candidate should be informed about any information that is missing, unclear, or in need of further formatting. See complete list below the table of tips.

DOSSIER COMPONENT	REMINDERS/TIPS
<input type="checkbox"/> CV in Harvard Chan School format	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CV is dated at the top; each new version should have a new date ➤ Page numbers ➤ Advisees listed, including current institutions of past advisees, unless these details appear in the academic report ➤ Grants section lists status (e.g., PI, co-PI, etc.) and \$ amount ➤ Publications have all authors listed for each entry, even if there are hundreds. Using “et al.” or an ellipsis (...) is not sufficient.
<input type="checkbox"/> Academic report (narrative statement, see details below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Narrative summary of the candidate’s teaching philosophy, in addition to the research statement and service activities.
<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The candidate should provide teaching evaluations for as many years as possible, and ordinarily for a minimum of the last five years. ➤ If the candidate has taught at other institutions or Harvard schools in the past five years, they should submit these evaluations as well. ➤ If the candidate has taught as part of the School ECPE course offerings they should include the course evaluations from these courses as part of their dossier.

<input type="checkbox"/> Publication cover page with annotated bibliography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The publications on the list should match the information on the articles provided – check titles, author name spellings and order, journal title, date, volume, and page numbers. ➤ OFA will indicate needed corrections for any publications not matching up with CV.
<input type="checkbox"/> 10-12 publications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The publications submitted by the candidate should be identical to the ones listed on the publication cover sheet.
<input type="checkbox"/> Translational, Applied, and Practice Activities Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Any other relevant professional information not covered in another section.
<input type="checkbox"/> Funding History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Description of the candidate’s approach to and experience with sponsored funding efforts.
<input type="checkbox"/> Field statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The candidate should provide a one-sentence statement that broadly describes their work and that would encompass the expertise of experts with whom the candidate would appropriately be compared.

Complete list of materials provided by the candidate in connection with a tenure review

- Current CV:** The CV should be up-to-date and provided in Word; it should be dated at the top. It should include details about grants – dates, sources, amounts, the candidate’s role (e.g., PI, co-PI) – a complete list of publications (papers submitted but not accepted should be in a separate section), and information about all trainees.
- Academic report:** The narrative of the academic report, which should be provided in MS Word, ordinarily ranges from 15 to 30 pages in length. The report should be written in first person (“I”), not third person (“he/she”). It should be preceded by a table of contents and followed by relevant appendices. The first page should have the candidate’s name and the date at the top. The main sections are as follows:

- **Research Statement:** Statement about the candidate’s **research** (past, present, future), citing specific findings and publications.
- **Teaching and Mentoring Statement:** Report on the candidate’s **educational activities** (teaching, advising, mentoring), including a statement of teaching philosophy, in which the candidate discusses their approach to teaching, what they have found effective, ways in which they are striving to improve their teaching, and what they would like to pursue in future courses. Appendices to this section should include a table showing all courses taught since joining the faculty (with enrollment and course ratings), all course evaluations (numeric results only), syllabi and other relevant course materials, and a list of advisees and information about where they are now (insofar as that is known), unless this list appears elsewhere in the dossier.
- **Service Statement:** Summary of the candidate’s **service** to department, School, University, field.
- **Diversity Statement:** Description of the candidate’s describing efforts to encourage diversity, inclusion, and belonging, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas.
- **COVID-19 Impact Statement:**
 - This supplemental statement should describe any significant effects the pandemic had on the candidate’s regular activities and plans, indicating ways that their focus or priorities may have necessarily shifted and articulating any deliberate choices they made to concentrate on specifically accessible opportunities and goals, given the myriad constraints.
 - It is not necessary to explain why work was or is still being impacted (by describing specific childcare or health issues, for example), but only to explain *how* (e.g., critical reduction in available working hours, inaccessible field site, loss of funding or unexpected new research expenses, etc.).
 - Candidates should concentrate on the primary impacts rather than cataloguing every particular instance of impact.
 - Candidates should also highlight examples of innovation, training, additional mentoring or other service activities (e.g., clinical or first-responder service), new directions in research, or other unplanned but concrete accomplishments that came out of this period.
-
- **Peer-reviewed publications**
 - 10-12 papers (as individual PDFs)
 - Ordinarily a mix of first-author and senior-author papers
 - Cover document (annotated bibliography) that lists each of the selected papers and briefly describes their significance and, if co-authored, the candidate’s role in its preparation (please submit this document in in MS Word)

- ❑ **Translational, Applied, and Practice Activities Statement:** Any other relevant professional information not covered in another section.
- ❑ **Funding History:** Description of the candidate’s approach to and experience with sponsored funding efforts.
- ❑ **Field statement:** The candidate should provide a one-sentence statement that broadly describes their work and that would encompass the expertise of experts with whom the candidate would appropriately be compared.

Appendix VI-C: Tenure Review: Guidelines for Compiling Names of Experts

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

GUIDELINES FOR COMPILING NAMES OF EXPERT LETTER WRITERS AND COMPARANDS FOR THE COMPARISON LETTER (2013)

Experts List

The committee is required to collect at least twelve comparison letters from evaluators who can comment objectively on the candidate's area of work, and ideally, who would be aware of the candidate's work. To reach the required number of twelve, we ordinarily send twenty requests. Evaluators are expected to be:

- Typically, tenured full professors.
- Where relevant, a few may hold senior positions outside of academia, depending upon the candidate's field (e.g., senior researcher from a prestigious institute or a very senior and well-respected practitioner in the field).
- Sufficiently active that they are knowledgeable about most individuals on the comparison list and the current and future state of the field.
- In a position to render an informed, objective evaluation and have no conflict of interest with the candidate (e.g., collaborators, dissertation advisors, recent or current mentors). Letter writers will be asked to describe their relationship, if any, with all individuals on the comparison list, including the candidate.
- No history of having unsuccessfully been reviewed for a faculty position at Harvard. Should not hold a primary or secondary Harvard Chan faculty appointment, though an adjunct faculty member may be asked for a letter.
- There should be a proportional number of women experts on the final letter list, as well as international experts (i.e., from outside North America).
- Duplication of institution/organization should be avoided in selecting letter writers, though an exception may be made if they are from different parts of the institution.

Targeted List

Targeted letters may be requested from individuals who have a particular relationship with the candidate that enables them to provide a specific piece of information or a perspective about the candidate's work that is both enlightening and which cannot be easily obtained from other sources. These may be individuals who would be ineligible to write comparison letters. Ordinarily, no more than four targeted letters will be requested.

Comparands List

- Four or five outstanding scholars deemed potentially suitable for a tenured full professorship in the relevant Harvard department or school.
- Typically, tenured full professors at peer institutions.
- Should not be junior to the candidate in number of years since receipt of their doctoral degree and one or more comparands should be a “stretch” (notably more senior).
- Ordinarily, no more than one person from the same institution.
- At least one woman, but preferably 2-3.

Appendix VII: Harvard Chan School CV Format

**HARVARD T. H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
REQUIRED CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT**

NAME: **Date Prepared:**
ACADEMIC TITLE:
WORK ADDRESS:
EMAIL:
HOME ADDRESS:

List all entries in chronological order

EDUCATION:

Date	Discipline	Degree	Institution
------	------------	--------	-------------

POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING (if applicable):

Research Fellowships:

Dates	Field of Research	Place	Title (if applicable)
-------	-------------------	-------	-----------------------

Internships and Residencies:

Dates	Specialty	Hospital
-------	-----------	----------

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS:

Dates	Title	Department	Institution
-------	-------	------------	-------------

HOSPITAL/AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONAL APPOINTMENTS (if applicable):

Dates	Title	Hospital/Institution
-------	-------	----------------------

LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION (if applicable):

Date	Type of license or certification
------	----------------------------------

OTHER ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (including visiting appointments):

Dates	Title	Department	Institution
-------	-------	------------	-------------

OTHER PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS (for example scientific boards):

Dates	Title	Organization
-------	-------	--------------

MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES:

Dates	Position Title	Department/Institution
-------	----------------	------------------------

COMMITTEE SERVICE:

Departmental, School, and University Service:

Dates	Committee & Role	Institution/Organization
-------	------------------	--------------------------

Professional Societies:

Dates	Role	Society Name
-------	------	--------------

Grant Review Activities:

Dates	Committee	Organization
-------	-----------	--------------

Editorial Roles:

1. Ad hoc reviewer (journals for which you serve as a reviewer)
2. Other editorial roles (for example editorial boards, guest /section editor)

Dates Role Journal

Other Public Service (for example expert testimony, interviews):

HONORS AND DISTINCTIONS:

Date Honor/Distinction Organization Achievement

FUNDED GRANTS AND UNFUNDED PROJECTS:

Completed Grants:

Dates Grant Title
Grant Type and Number
Role on Project (if PI, site-PI or co-PI, include total direct cost/year)
Description of major goals

Active Grants:

Dates Grant Title
Grant Type and Number
Role on Project (if PI, site-PI or co-PI, include total direct cost/year)
Description of major goals

Pending Grants:

Dates Grant Title
Grant Type and Number
Role on Project (if PI, site-PI or co-PI, include total direct cost/year)
Description of major goals

Unfunded Projects:

Dates Project Title
Description of major goals

TEACHING AND TRAINING:

Harvard Chan School Teaching:

Dates Course number/Title Responsibility

Executive and Continuing Education Teaching:

Dates	Course number/Title	Responsibility
-------	---------------------	----------------

Other Courses:

Dates	Course number/Title/Institution	Responsibility
-------	---------------------------------	----------------

ADVISORY AND SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES

Dates	Name of trainee	Type of supervision	Current position
-------	-----------------	---------------------	------------------

INVITED PRESENTATIONS:

Dates	Title or topic of presentation	Organization/Location
-------	--------------------------------	-----------------------

INVENTIONS/PATENTS (if applicable):

Dates	Type of invention/patent
-------	--------------------------

COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES (if applicable):

Dates	Type of activity	Organization
-------	------------------	--------------

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Peer-reviewed publications
 - a. Original research
 - b. Other peer-reviewed
2. Non-peer reviewed publications (including books and monographs)
3. Educational materials (including teaching cases and innovative curricula)
4. Non-print materials (including computer software and web content)
5. Published abstracts (last two years only)

Instructions:

- Do not include papers submitted or in preparation unless they have been accepted for publication, in which case list the journal in which they will appear and indicate "in press."
- Number references consecutively in the order in which they were published.
- Separate publications by category, in the order shown above.
- For each reference, provide all authors (in order listed in the reference itself, do not use et. al), title, journal, inclusive pages, and year of publication. Please bold your name on author list.

SAMPLE CITATIONS

Examples of correct citation format are given below.

1. Standard Journal Article (List all authors)

Ashbaugh DG, Petty TL, Bigelow DB, Harris TM. Continuous positive-pressure breathing (CPPB) in adult respiratory disease syndrome. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1969; 57:31-41.

2. Corporate Author

The Committee on Enzymes of the Scandinavian Society for Clinical Chemistry and Clinical Physiology. Recommended method for the determination of gamma-glutamyltransferase in blood. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest.* 1976; 5:224-5.

3. Personal Author(s)

Osler AG, Complement: mechanisms and functions. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

4. Corporate Author

American Medical Associate Department of Drugs. AMA drug evaluations. 3rd ed. Littleton: Publishing Sciences Group, 1977.

5. Editor, Compiler, Chairman as Author

Rhodes AJ, Van Rooyen CE, comps. Textbook of virology: for students and practitioners of medicine and other health sciences. 5th ed. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkens, 1968.

6. Chapter in Book

Weinstein L, Swartz MN. Pathogenic properties of invading microorganisms. In: Sodeman WA Jr, Sodeman WA, eds. Pathologic physiology: mechanisms of disease. Philadelphia: WB Saunders, 1974:457-72.

7. Agency Publication

National Center for Health Statistics. Acute conditions: incidence and associated disability, United States July 1968-June 1969. Rockville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, 1972.

(Vital and health statistics. Series 10: Data from the National Health Survey, no. 69) (DHEW publication no. (HMS)72-1036).

Appendix VIII: Candidate Academic Report Guide for Tenure-track Reviews and Promotions

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA) ACADEMIC REPORT GUIDE FOR TENURE-TRACK REVIEWS AND PROMOTIONS

The narrative of the academic report, which should be provided in a Word document, ordinarily ranges from 5 to 15 pages in length, with some flexibility in use of appendices and/or organization. The report should be written in first person (“I”), not third person (“he/she/they”). It should be preceded by a table of contents and followed by relevant appendices. The first page should have the candidate’s name and the date at the top. All academic reports should contain the following:

- Research Statement:** Detailed summary of the candidate’s **research** (past, present, future) and contributions to the field, citing specific findings or original ideas, as well as publications. Include a description of continuing areas of emphasis and an outline of future plans, along with a summary of research grants, documentation of patents or other intellectual property rights, and other related materials (use appendices as preferred).
- Teaching and Mentoring Statement:** Detailed summary of the candidate’s **educational activities** (teaching, advising, mentoring), including a statement of their teaching philosophy and practice, what they have found effective, ways in which they are striving to improve their teaching, and what they would like to pursue in future courses. Include a description of any teaching awards or honors as appropriate.
 - This section should include a table showing all courses taught since joining the faculty (with enrollment and course ratings).
 - Syllabi for courses taught (as an appendix, if preferred)
 - All course evaluations (numeric results only), syllabi, and other relevant course materials, should be provided as appendices.
 - List of advisees/mentees: current and former advisees at the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral levels; information about where they are now (insofar as that is known); a list of dissertations supervised; student practice experiences supervised; evidence of recognition for outstanding advising (use appendices as preferred).
- Service Activities:** Detailed description of significant service positions and efforts (selected from, and corresponding with, the complete listing on candidate’s CV)
 - To the field and profession: detailed summary of service to their field, including membership on study sections and editorial boards, and other leadership roles.
 - At the Harvard Chan School: detailed summary of service to the department, School, and University, including committee membership/leadership, leadership of academic programs, and other relevant activities.
 - Awards and Recognition
- Translational Accomplishments** (if relevant)

- Research products, such as patents, software, commercial products
- Professional service, such as conference leadership, editorial positions, other professional positions.
- Scholarly translation, such as governmental publications, formal protocols, plenary lectures.
- Policy translation, such as testimony, panel recommendations, legislation.
- Community translation, such as program materials, mainstream publications, events for lay populations.
- Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Statement:** description of efforts and accomplishments towards the School's, the University's, and/or the profession's diversity and health equity goals. [Appendix XVII: Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Statement](#)
- COVID-19 Impact Statement:** In addition to the narrative descriptions of research, educational, service, leadership, translational, and other accomplishments, faculty undergoing review should include a COVID-19 Impact Statement with their academic report. [Appendix XV: COVID-19 Impact Statement Guidelines](#)
 - This supplemental statement should describe any significant effects the pandemic has had on the candidate's regular activities and plans during the period under review, indicate ways that their focus or priorities may have necessarily shifted, and articulate any deliberate choices they made to concentrate on specifically accessible opportunities and goals, given the myriad constraints.
 - It is not necessary to explain why work was or is still being impacted (by describing specific childcare or health issues, for example), but only to explain *how* (e.g., critical reduction in available working hours, inaccessible field site, loss of funding or unexpected new research expenses, etc.).
 - Candidates should concentrate on the primary impacts rather than cataloguing every particular instance of impact.
 - Candidates should also highlight examples of innovation, training, additional mentoring or other service activities (e.g., clinical or first-responder service), new directions in research, or other unplanned but concrete accomplishments that came out of this period.
 - If impact was negligible across all primary activities, it is sufficient to include a brief attestation to this fact.
- Potential appendices*:
 - Selected publications (required or supplemental, depending on appointment and related review requirements)
 - Summary of grants history
 - Syllabi for courses taught
 - Course evaluations
 - Other teaching and advising materials
 - For tenure promotions:

- Annotated bibliography (corresponding to the list of required publications)
- List of suggested letter writers, external and targeted
- List of suggested potential comparands
- Field statement

*Each academic report will be unique in terms of length, structure, level of detail across sections, and use of appendices and other formatting devices. In other words, there is no absolute template. Rather, a report's structure, length, and formatting should directly serve the specific portfolio being presented. This means that some candidates will have little to no applied activity; others will have a great deal to report in that area. The proportions of didactic teaching to mentoring to curricular leadership will vary widely across reports. Research statements may have several subsections due to the number of discrete research areas addressed or may be primarily focused on one or two areas of expertise. Service accomplishments will also naturally vary greatly from person to person. Don't overthink the number of pages, types of appendices, or use of subheadings, but do structure the report in a way that corresponds to the substance being conveyed. And do try to tie all sections together coherently, through a consistent use of language and style and inter- and intra-section references where warranted (e.g., when a course ties back to a research goal or a research goal is further exemplified in a service or practice activity). It will be tremendously helpful to the readers of the reports to have such connections spelled out.

Appendix IX: Checklist for Recommendations of Reappointment

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

CHECKLIST FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF REAPPOINTMENT OF PRIMARY FACULTY, FOR SUBMISSION TO SCARP

Submit, for review, the following components to the Office of Faculty Affairs,

facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu.

(Please submit the department chair's recommendation letter electronically, as a Word document.)

COMPONENTS OF THE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW PACKET	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Letter from department chair supporting recommended reappointment</p>	<p>The letter should be dated with the date on which the recommendation will be reviewed by SCARP. The following should be included in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A detailed description of the departmental review process, which demonstrates conformance with the reappointment procedures, as outlined in this handbook. <input type="checkbox"/> A detailed assessment of the faculty member's qualifications vis-à-vis the criteria for appointment at the current rank, a summary of the faculty member's achievements over the course of the current term of appointment, and a discussion of the faculty member's activities in the areas of research, teaching, training and mentoring, and service. Insofar as possible, this evaluation should explicitly describe the importance of the faculty member's research and publication record, with influential papers specifically noted. <input type="checkbox"/> An assessment of the faculty member's potential for future contributions to the department, the School, and the discipline. This section of the report should include a description of the process by which the faculty member has been, and will continue to be, mentored. <input type="checkbox"/> * for PoP and PIR reappointments where letters are required, inclusion of the letters and analysis of letter-writer feedback.

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Department Subcommittee Report</p>	<p>A department review committee should be comprised of two or three, ordinarily tenured, faculty members, although if disciplinary or demographic diversity is a concern, senior non-ladder faculty and advanced associate professors may serve in some cases. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, <i>while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals.</i></p> <p>Summarize committee’s evaluation of the candidate, discussing their qualifications in the areas of research, teaching, and professional activities utilizing the candidate’s dossier. Please develop a narrative in describing why the candidate merits reappointment.</p> <p>Some questions to consider in developing this narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How is their research unique? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the highlights? Why and how could this research be impactful to the department/school/nationally/internationally? <input type="checkbox"/> Why and how is this research impactful to their field? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators? <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the nominees’ grants and funding record (or potential for successful grant funding). <input type="checkbox"/> What strengths does their research bring to the department/school/etc? Does this research fulfill an important need in expertise in the department/school? <input type="checkbox"/> What do you expect for the future of their research? <input type="checkbox"/> Are there any challenges or weaknesses in the candidate’s dossier that should be addressed? What is the best path forward for the candidate to address these areas of concern? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators? <p>Analyze the nominee’s qualifications as related to the needs and goals of the department, the school, and the university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the potential educational contributions to the department and the School <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their teaching (if applicable)? <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their mentorship (if applicable)? <p>Summarize the candidate’s major scientific contributions and qualifications for reappointment. Conclude with a statement of</p>
---	---

	<p>recommendation of the review committee (no “signature page” required).</p> <p>Some questions to consider when developing this recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What does the candidate bring to the department? Do they help fill needed areas of expertise in the department/branch into new areas for the department? <input type="checkbox"/> How is the nominee’s research/teaching/service impactful to the department? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence does the committee foresee the nominee potentially having on the future of the department/school/university? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence could the nominee have on the future of their field at the School? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence does the committee foresee the nominee potentially having in the field throughout the university and in the greater world? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the candidate sufficiently connected to both internal and external scholarly networks to build their portfolio and career? How would you assess the candidate’s involvement and leadership role in professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc. in the field? <p>Think of the closing statement as a way to solidify reasoning for reappointment. Conclude with a statement of recommendation of the review committee (no “signature page” required).</p> <p><i>The summary should also address any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations (where applicable).</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Supporting materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Department subcommittee report <input type="checkbox"/> An academic report prepared by the nominee <input type="checkbox"/> A current CV in School-approved format, dated <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluation reports <input type="checkbox"/> * for PoP and PIR reappointments where letters are required, inclusion of the letters and analysis of letter-writer feedback is required

Appendix X: Checklist for Recommendations of Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (Promotion Review Packet)

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

CHECKLIST FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs, facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu.

COMPONENTS OF THE PROMOTION REVIEW PACKET	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Letter from department chair recommending promotion</p>	<p>Please submit, for review, the following to OFA.</p> <p>The letter should be dated with the date on which the recommendation will be reviewed by SCARP. The following should be included in the letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A detailed description of the departmental review process, which demonstrates conformance with the promotion procedures as outlined in the faculty appointments handbook. <input type="checkbox"/> A detailed assessment of the faculty member’s qualifications vis-à-vis the criteria for appointment at the rank of associate professor, commenting on the faculty member’s activities in the areas of research, teaching, training and mentoring, and service. Insofar as possible, this evaluation should explicitly describe the importance of the faculty member’s research and publication record, with influential papers specifically noted. <input type="checkbox"/> An assessment of the faculty member’s potential for future contributions to the department, the School, and the discipline, with an explicit assessment of the faculty member’s prospects for tenure at the School. This section of the report should include a description of the process by which the faculty member has been, and will continue to be, mentored. <input type="checkbox"/> The letters of evaluation received from experts should be referenced in the discussion of the faculty member’s

	<p>qualifications, accomplishments, and potential for future contributions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A summary of the suitability for promotion of any women or minority group members in the department currently at the same rank. <input type="checkbox"/> The report of the departmental review committee is normally used by the chair in the preparation of this letter but should be appended.
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Department Subcommittee Report</p>	<p>A department review committee should be formed with three or, more commonly, four tenured or senior term professors. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, <i>while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals.</i></p> <p>Comment on the candidate’s background and experience in the areas of research, teaching, and professional activities as revealed in letters of reference, and the candidate’s dossier. Analyze the nominee’s qualifications for promotion, and how they fill the needs and goals of the department, the School, and the University. <i>The summary should also directly address any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations.</i> Please develop a narrative describing why the candidate should be considered for promotion.</p> <p>Some questions to consider in developing this narrative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How is their research unique? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the highlights? Why and how is this research impactful to the department/school/nationally/internationally? <input type="checkbox"/> Why and how is this research impactful to their field? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators? <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the candidates’ grants and funding record (or potential for successful grant funding). <input type="checkbox"/> What strengths does their research bring to the department/school/etc? Does this research fulfill an important need in expertise in the department/school? <input type="checkbox"/> What do you expect for the future of their research? <input type="checkbox"/> Are there any challenges or weaknesses in the candidate’s dossier that should be addressed? What is the best path forward for the candidate to address these areas of concern?

	<p>Analyze the candidate’s qualifications as related to the needs and goals of the department, the school, and the university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the potential educational contributions to the department and the School <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their teaching (if applicable)? <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their mentorship (if applicable)? <p>Summarize the candidate’s major scientific contributions and qualifications for promotion. Some questions to consider when developing this recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What does the candidate bring to the department? Do they help fill needed areas of expertise in the department/branch into new areas for the department? <input type="checkbox"/> How is the candidate’s research/teaching/service impactful to the department? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence does the committee foresee the candidate potentially having on the future of the department/school/university? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence could the candidate have on the future of their field at the School, the University and in the greater world? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the candidate sufficiently connected to both internal and external scholarly networks to build their portfolio and career? How would you assess the candidate’s involvement and leadership role in professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc. in the field? <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge any challenges or weaknesses in their career with a recommendation on the best path forward for the candidate to address those concerns <p>Think of the closing statement as a means to solidify reasoning for promotion. Conclude with a statement of recommendation of the review committee (no “signature page” required).</p> <p><i>The summary should also address any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Letters of evaluation received from experts <input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the letter sent to experts 	<p>A review for promotion to associate professor includes the solicitation of letters from individuals who can provide an independent assessment of the candidate’s qualifications. These letters should be solicited from leaders in assistant professor’s field who are able to render an informed, objective evaluation and who have no conflict of interest with respect to the candidate (e.g., they may not be mentors</p>

<p>requesting evaluation of the candidate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A list of individuals from whom letters were requested <input type="checkbox"/> If solicited, focused evaluation request(s), recipient(s), and response 	<p>or collaborators). It is ordinarily expected that at least six letters from independent evaluators will be obtained.</p> <p>More focused (targeted) letters may be obtained from individuals who can provide a more specific piece of information or a perspective about the candidate’s work which cannot be easily obtained from other sources. The request letter should specifically state the question the committee wishes to have answered.</p> <p>See Guide for letters of evaluation for tenure-track faculty promotions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty member’s dossier: academic report, CV, course evaluations, publications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> An academic report prepared by the faculty member (including COVID Impact Statement) <input type="checkbox"/> Current CV in School-approved format <input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluation reports <input type="checkbox"/> Annotated bibliography/cover page for the nominee’s publications listing the five publications <input type="checkbox"/> Five selected publications

PREPARATION OF THE FINAL MATERIALS FOR SCARP	
	<p>OFA reviews the draft of the department chair’s recommendation letter and the supporting documentation and will contact the department concerning any suggested revisions.</p>
<p>Submission of materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> PDF with bookmarks of the recommendation package 	<p>After any suggested revisions have been incorporated, please submit the following to the OFA:</p> <p>A PDF with bookmarks of the recommendation package in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Chair’s letter <input type="checkbox"/> Department subcommittee report

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation request letter<input type="checkbox"/> List of evaluators<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation letters in alphabetical order<input type="checkbox"/> If requested, focused evaluation request and response<input type="checkbox"/> Nominee’s academic report (including COVID Impact Statement)<input type="checkbox"/> PDF of the nominee’s up-to-date CV<input type="checkbox"/> Course evaluation reports<input type="checkbox"/> Annotated bibliography/cover page listing the five submitted publications<input type="checkbox"/> The five submitted publications
--	--

Appendix X-A: Guide for Letters of Evaluation for Tenure-track Faculty Promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

LETTERS OF EVALUATION FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (2011)

The Harvard Chan School procedures for the promotion of an assistant professor to associate professor call for the department chair to appoint a faculty committee to conduct a review of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. A review for promotion to associate professor includes the solicitation of letters from individuals who can assess the candidate's qualifications. All requests should make clear that "associate professor" is not a tenured rank at Harvard.

Letters of evaluation

At least six letters of evaluation from individuals who can provide an independent assessment of the candidate's qualifications must be included in the report. These letters should be solicited from leaders in the assistant professor's field who are able to render an informed, objective evaluation and who have no conflict of interest with respect to the candidate; for example, they may not be collaborators or mentors, and may not hold a Harvard Chan faculty appointment. (See below for guidance on requesting targeted letters from individuals who have a particular relationship with the candidate.)

The request letter should describe the candidate's area of scholarly expertise and the major characteristics the committee is seeking to assess. Even though request recipients will have been screened for potential conflicts of interest, the request should also ask the recipient to describe their relationship, if any, with the candidate. The candidate's CV should be enclosed, and the committee may also choose to provide key publications.

To focus the respondent's comments, the committee is encouraged to include specific questions that are designed to elicit detailed, useful responses. The following are some examples:

- What is the importance of the candidate's field of inquiry? What is the candidate's position in it, and what are the principal strengths the candidate offers in this area?
- With respect to the candidate's choice and treatment of research problems and topics, to what extent is the candidate's work creative and innovative? Are the results presented in a scholarly manner?
- What are the candidate's specific contributions in the case of publications with multiple authorship, insofar as the respondent can assess this? In the evaluator's view, how much of the

candidate's published work represents their own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators?

- How does the evaluator assess the candidate's involvement and leadership role in service activities (e.g., professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc.) in the field?
- How does the evaluator assess the candidate's teaching accomplishments and communication skills (recognizing that the respondent may not have direct knowledge of this)?
- How do the candidate's accomplishments and promise in the areas of research, service, and teaching compare with those of with others in the field at a similar stage of professional career?

An appendix to the report should include, along with the letters received, a sample request letter and a list of all individuals who were asked to write; if any requests were declined, the reason must be provided.

Targeted letters

In addition to the six or more independent letters of evaluation, more focused letters may be requested from individuals who have a particular relationship with the candidate that enables those persons to provide a specific piece of information or perspective about the candidate's work that is both enlightening and which cannot be easily obtained from other sources. For example, if the candidate has published numerous papers with the same research group or consortium, the committee may choose to ask a co-author to comment on the candidate's contributions to that effort, or if the candidate has published a textbook, the review committee may wish to solicit feedback from faculty members at other institutions who have used the book; Harvard Chan faculty who have worked closely with the candidate may also be asked for feedback in this category. The request letter should specifically state the question the committee wishes to have answered.

A separate appendix to the report should include a sample targeted request, along with the letters received, the list of individuals who were asked to write and what they were asked to comment on, and the reasons why anyone declined the request.

Appendix X-B: Sample Evaluation Letter Request for Promotion to Associate Professor Cases

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
SAMPLE EVALUATION LETTER REQUEST FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR CASES

***ON DEPARTMENT LETTERHEAD**

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Dr.

The Department of XX at the Harvard Chan School is currently reviewing Dr. XX for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor of XX. I am writing to request your help in evaluating their qualifications for such a promotion. Although the rank of associate professor is non-tenured (Harvard provides tenure only at the full professor level), your assessment will help guide us regarding tenure potential.

It would be of great assistance to us if you would provide us with an assessment that addresses but is by no means restricted to the following points. If you are not able to assess the candidate in all these dimensions, please indicate. Additionally, please describe any relationship with the candidate, indicating whether there is anything that may be construed as a conflict of interest or that would prevent you from providing an objective evaluation. To aid in your evaluation, I have enclosed copies of Dr. X's CV, their most recent academic report, and select publications.

1. What is the importance of the candidate's field of inquiry? What is the candidate's position in it, and what are the principal strengths the candidate offers in this area?
2. With respect to the candidate's choice and treatment of research problems and topics, to what extent is the candidate's work creative and innovative? Are the results presented in a distinguished, scholarly manner?
3. What are the candidate's specific contributions in the case of studies with multiple authorship, insofar as you can assess this? In your view, how much of the candidate's published work represents their own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators?
4. How would you assess the candidate's involvement and leadership role in professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc. in the field?

5. How do you assess the evidence of the candidate's teaching/mentoring accomplishments and communication skills (recognizing that the respondent may not have direct knowledge of this)?
6. How do the candidate's accomplishments and promise in the areas of research, service, and teaching compare with others in the field at a similar stage of professional career? Can you please provide us with a couple of names of such peers?
7. Any other aspects of the candidate's scholarly and professional work that you see as important?

The letter should be addressed to:
NAME OF REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIR
Title, etc.
Chair, Review Committee

For ease of transmission, please feel free to email a copy of your letter (on official letterhead) to our Director of Administration, XX XX, <EMAIL HERE>, <phone number here>.

I would like to assure you that our committee appreciates the time and effort that is required to respond to this type of request. Your comments and evaluation will be treated with the utmost concern for confidentiality and thus will be seen only by those at the School and University responsible for this evaluation. I thank you in advance for your willingness to consider this request. I hope to receive your response as soon as possible, preferably no later than **[ADVISABLE TO PROVIDE AT LEAST 4 WEEKS]**.

Sincerely,

NAME
Chair, Review Committee

Enclosures: Curriculum Vitae
Academic Report
Publications

Appendix XI - Checklist for Recommendations of Appointment as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
CHECKLIST FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF APPOINTMENT AS LECTURER OR SENIOR LECTURER

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs, facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu.

LAUNCHING REVIEW	
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Phase	<p>To meet a particular need of an academic department, a department chair may nominate an individual who does not already hold a Harvard Chan School faculty appointment for appointment as a lecturer or senior lecturer. For senior lecturers they must fully satisfy at least two of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising: has taught within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution; has shown national leadership and/or innovation in pedagogy, with outstanding promise of continuing contribution; has an academic advising record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution. • Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship: has conducted relevant academic research within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution or for at least six years as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School; has significant experience as Principal Investigator for sponsored projects; has a research mentoring record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution. • Demonstrated record of program development and leadership at the graduate level: has developed and/or managed academic graduate programs in public health education at a peer institution or as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School. <p>For lecturers must fully satisfy at least one of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relevant experience in teaching: has taught for at least several years as a primary instructor at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution, with promise of continuing independent teaching contribution; has an academic mentorship record typical for early career faculty member at a peer institution 2. Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship: has conducted relevant academic research at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution; has a record of sponsored research contributions as Principal or Co-principal Investigator; has supervised research of graduate students and/or postdocs

	<p>3. Administrative experience: several years as an academic program manager at the graduate level at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The department chair is expected to consult with all members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for a senior lecturer appointment: senior lecturers, associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors; for a lecturer appointment: lecturers and senior lecturers, assistant and associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the review should proceed. The department chair then discusses the proposal with the Dean and the Dean for Academic Affairs. (If the need for a lecturer or senior lecturer has been identified, but not a specific individual, the procedures for an open search will be used.)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Department Chair Proposal Contents 	<p>Unless the proposal originated with the dean, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean for Academic Affairs providing a position description and a letter addressing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Position description, including: the projected role of the nominee at the School and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School. ❑ Identification of the nominee and a description of their qualifications and accomplishments (attach CV), including relevant research, teaching, service, and translational achievements. ❑ Projected role of the nominee at the School and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School. Please specify how they meet the criteria for the position. ❑ Details about financial support of the position (OTF). ❑ Suggestions for review committee membership, with explanation of the contribution of each proposed member, if not apparent. Typically, there should be at least three committee members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, <i>while also</i>

	<p><i>ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals.</i></p> <p>The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot be the search Committee Chair.</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Review Phase</p>	<p>Upon securing both decanal and departmental approval to move forward with the review, the committee is seated, the candidate’s materials are solicited, and the process for collecting evaluation letters can begin.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> First Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the committee is briefed by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. The department chair’s initial written request for the appointment should be provided to the committee to explain the departmental context for the appointment. ○ At this or (more likely) a subsequent meeting, the committee may invite the candidate for an informal interview, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate’s record or plans for future work. ○ The most important task of the review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation, and at its first meeting the committee focuses primarily on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 8-10 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining 6 letters for a senior lecturer, and approximately 6-8 letter requests with the goal of obtaining 4 for lecturers. ▪ The proposed lists are reviewed by OFA. Once approved, the chair of the review committee solicits the comparison letters. ▪ Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair, as an alternative. ○ Review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who

	<p>can provide information about the candidate’s qualifications from a particular perspective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Second Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At this time, the committee can meet with the candidate if needed to ask questions, review any letters that pose concerns (not with the candidate), and make a plan to write the report. ❑ Third/Final Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At its final meeting, the committee reviews any remaining letters as well as the draft report and finalizes its recommendation for appointment. For information regarding report contents please refer to the components of the appointment review packet below.
--	--

COMPONENTS OF THE APPOINTMENT REVIEW PACKET	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Department Report 	<p>A department review committee should be formed with three or four tenured or senior term professors. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, <i>while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals.</i></p> <p>Make an intellectual case for the candidate, highlighting the areas most aligned with the goals of the appointment and analyzing how the candidate’s contributions meet the criteria for lecturer or senior lecturer. Please refer to the Faculty Handbook for this criteria. <i>The analysis should also directly address any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations.</i> Please develop a narrative describing why the candidate should be considered for appointment.</p> <p>The finalized report, prepared by the committee and reviewed and signed by the department chair, should include the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ A one-paragraph executive summary of the candidate’s contributions and the department’s recommendation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Background and context: description of the candidate’s area and how it fits into the department’s academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by a term-limited appointment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For reference an appointment as Lecturer requires at least one of the three following criteria to be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Relevant experience in teaching:</u> has taught for at least several years as a primary instructor at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution, with promise of continuing independent teaching contribution; has an academic mentorship record typical for early career faculty member at a peer institution • <u>Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship:</u> has conducted relevant academic research at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution; has a record of sponsored research contributions as Principal or Co-principal Investigator; has supervised research of graduate students and/or postdocs • <u>Administrative experience:</u> several years as an academic program manager at the graduate level at the Harvard Chan School or a peer institution ▪ For reference an appointment as Senior Lecturer requires at least two of the following criteria be met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising:</u> has taught within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution; has shown national leadership and/or innovation
--	---

	<p>in pedagogy, with outstanding promise of continuing contribution; has an academic advising record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship</u>: has conducted relevant academic research within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution or for at least six years as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School; has significant experience as Principal Investigator for sponsored projects; has a research mentoring record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution. • <u>Demonstrated record of program development and leadership at the graduate level</u>: has developed and/or managed academic graduate programs in public health education at a peer institution or as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The search process if appointment made through an open search: summary of the search process with copies of correspondence and advertisements, records of telephone conversations, and description of all efforts to identify candidates from diverse populations, including women and minorities; please address the demographics of the pool as displayed in the Departmental EEO Report available in ARIeS. □ External letter writers: A brief description of the logic underlying the composition of the external letter writer group, especially in cases where the candidate is multidisciplinary. □ Intellectual case for the candidate, highlighting the areas most aligned with the goals of the appointment and analyzing how the candidate’s contributions
--	---

	<p>meet the criteria for lecturer or senior lecturer. This analysis should clearly draw on both the external letters and considered judgments of departmental faculty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of the candidate’s relevant scholarly contributions. ▪ Teaching, advising, and mentoring: An evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant) ▪ Description and evaluation of leadership and service contributions – to the field, the University, the School, and the department ▪ Note of any significant efforts to support the School’s diversity, inclusion, and belonging goals. ▪ Discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s case as noted in the external evaluations and the internal conversations of both the search committee and the department. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Closing Statement: Solidify the reasoning for promotion. Any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations should be explicitly addressed. Include the tally of the department vote, by name, with an “as of” date for the tally. Conclude with a statement of recommendation of the review committee.</p> <p>Some questions to consider in developing the intellectual case for the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How is their research unique? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the highlights? Why and how is this research impactful to the department/school/nationally/internationally? <input type="checkbox"/> Why and how is this research impactful to their field? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators?
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the candidates' grants and funding record (or potential for successful grant funding). <input type="checkbox"/> What strengths does their research bring to the department/school/etc? Does this research fulfill an important need in expertise in the department/school? <input type="checkbox"/> What do you expect for the future of their research? <input type="checkbox"/> Are there any challenges or weaknesses in the candidate's dossier that should be addressed? What is the best path forward for the candidate to address these areas of concern? <p>Analyze the candidate's qualifications as related to the needs and goals of the department, the school, and the university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the potential educational contributions to the department and the School <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their teaching (if applicable)? <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their mentorship (if applicable)? <p>Summarize the candidate's major scientific contributions and qualifications for appointment. Some questions to consider when developing this recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What does the candidate bring to the department? Do they help fill needed areas of expertise in the department/branch into new areas for the department? <input type="checkbox"/> How is the candidate's research/teaching/service impactful to the department? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence does the committee foresee the candidate potentially having on the future of the department/school/university? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence could the candidate have on the future of their field at the School, the University and in the greater world? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the candidate sufficiently connected to both internal and external scholarly networks to build their portfolio and career? How would you assess the candidate's involvement and leadership role in professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc. in the field? <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge any challenges or weaknesses in their career with a recommendation on the best path forward for the candidate to address those concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Letters of evaluation received from experts 	<p>A review for appointment to lecturer or senior lecturer includes the solicitation of letters from individuals who can provide an independent assessment of the candidate's qualifications. These letters should be solicited from leaders in the candidate's field who are able to render an informed, objective evaluation and who have no conflict of interest with respect to the candidate (e.g., they may not be mentors or collaborators). It is ordinarily expected that at least six</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the letter sent to experts requesting evaluation of the candidate. <input type="checkbox"/> A list of individuals from whom letters were requested <input type="checkbox"/> If solicited, focused evaluation request(s), recipient(s), and response 	<p>letters from independent evaluators will be obtained for senior lecturers and at least 4 letters for lecturers. Please refer to the Faculty Handbook for further instruction.</p> <p>More focused (targeted) letters may be obtained from individuals who can provide a more specific piece of information or a perspective about the candidate’s work which cannot be easily obtained from other sources. No more than four targeted letters from colleagues should be requested. The request letter should specifically state the question the committee wishes to have answered.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate Dossier 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Current CV conforming to School-approved format <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Report: A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate’s contributions and what the candidate hopes to accomplish during the appointment in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research statement: Detailed summary of the candidate’s research and related future plans. Summarize major research accomplishments, including grants activity (in appendix if preferred) ○ Teaching statement: Describe classroom teaching history (complete list of courses taught to be included in CV) and teaching philosophy. Provide any additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, referring to any teaching awards listed on CV. Append the following materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabi for key courses • Course materials developed • Course evaluation reports ○ Advising and mentoring: Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete list of students advised at the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral level; dissertations supervised; student practica

	<p>supervised; and faculty—including post-doctoral fellows—mentored should be included in CV.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Service: Describe service to the field (complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV). ❑ Annotated bibliography/cover page for the nominee’s publications listing either 2 publications (for lecturers) or five publications (for senior lecturers) ❑ Two (for lecturers) or Five (for senior lecturers) selected publications depending on appointment being recommended ❑ Candidate’s statement describing efforts to encourage diversity, inclusion, and belonging, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas. ❑ Other supporting materials (if applicable): The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment such as course evaluations, syllabi, etc.
<p>❑ Appendices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Request and approval of search authorization or appointment. Please refer to the Faculty Handbook for instructions related to the proposal requirements. ❑ If applicable, total citation count for the candidate and comparands and citation count for each of the candidate’s publications.

PREPARATION OF THE FINAL MATERIALS FOR SCARP	
	<p>OFA reviews the draft of the department report and the supporting documentation and will contact the department concerning any suggested revisions.</p>
<p>Submission of materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ PDF with bookmarks of the recommendation package 	<p>After any suggested revisions have been incorporated, please submit the following to the OFA: A PDF with bookmarks of the recommendation package in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Department Report ❑ Candidate’s dossier (itemized above). ❑ Letters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Copy of invitation to letter writers.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines. ▪ Copies of all responses to invitations, including declines. ☐ Department Chair request and approval of search authorization or appointment. ☐ If applicable, total citation count for the candidate and comparands and citation count for each of the candidate’s publications.
<p>☐ Approvals Phase</p>	<p>OFA will submit the committee’s final report and all supporting documentation to SCARP for a review and vote. SCARP review is the final determination on a recommendation of lecturer appointment. If the recommendation is at the senior lecturer rank, the deans may submit the recommendation for appointment to PARC for final approval.</p>
<p>☐ Communication with Candidate</p>	<p>The deans and department chair are responsible for recruitment. The search/review committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended, and no offers are be made to candidates by the department chair before either SCARP or PARC approval, depending on the rank of the appointment. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.</p> <p>The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.</p>

Appendix XII - Checklist for Recommendations of Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA) CHECKLIST FOR RECOMMENDATIONS OF PROMOTION FROM LECTURER TO SENIOR LECTURER

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Faculty Affairs, facultyaffairs@hsph.harvard.edu.

LAUNCHING REVIEW	
<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal Phase	<p>A lecturer who has demonstrated exemplary leadership in either research or education may be recommended for promotion to senior lecturer. To qualify for promotion to senior lecturer at least two of the following criteria must be fully met:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising</u>: has taught within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution; has shown national leadership and/or innovation in pedagogy, with outstanding promise of continuing contribution; has an academic advising record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution. 2. <u>Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship</u>: has conducted relevant academic research within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution or for at least six years as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School; has significant experience as Principal Investigator for sponsored projects; has a research mentoring record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution. 3. <u>Demonstrated record of program development and leadership at the graduate level</u>: has developed and/or managed academic graduate programs in public health education at a peer institution or as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School. <p><input type="checkbox"/> The department chair is expected to consult with all primary members of the department at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., senior lecturers, associate professors, term professors, and tenured professors) and to document the views of these faculty members with respect to whether the promotion review should proceed. The department chair then submits a proposal to the Dean and the Dean for Academic Affairs.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Department Chair Proposal Contents	<p>Unless the proposal originated with the dean, the department chair addresses a formal, written request to the Dean for Academic</p>

	<p>Affairs providing a position description and a letter addressing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Identification of the nominee and a description of their qualifications and accomplishments (attach CV), including relevant research, teaching, service, and translational achievements. ❑ Projected role of the nominee at the School in their new role and the relationship of the position to the mission and goals of the department and School. Please specify how they meet the criteria for the position of senior lecturer. ❑ Details about financial support of the position (OTF). ❑ Suggestions for review committee membership, with explanation of the contribution of each proposed member, if not apparent. Typically, there should be at least three committee members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, <i>while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals</i>. The chair of a department may serve on the committee but cannot be the search Committee Chair.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Review Phase 	<p>Upon securing both decanal and departmental approval to move forward with the review, the committee is seated, the candidate’s materials are solicited, and the process for collecting evaluation letters can begin. Typically, there should be at least three committee members, ordinarily tenured faculty. Committee membership is approved by the Dean for Academic Affairs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ First meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Committee is briefed by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and, ordinarily, by the department chair. The department chair’s initial written request for the appointment should be provided to the

	<p>committee to explain the departmental context for the appointment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At this or (more likely) a subsequent meeting, the committee may invite the candidate for an informal interview, which allows committee members to fill any gaps in their understanding of the candidate’s record or plans for future work. ○ The most important task of the review committee is the solicitation of external comparative letters of evaluation, and at its first meeting the committee focuses primarily on selecting its proposed lists of letter writers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 8-10 letters are requested, with the goal of obtaining 6 letters. ▪ The proposed lists are reviewed by OFA. Once approved, the chair of the review committee solicits the comparison letters. ▪ Individuals who decline the request for a letter because of a busy schedule are offered an interview with a member of the committee, ordinarily the chair, as an alternative. ○ Review committees may also request several (not more than four) targeted letters from colleagues and/or collaborators of the candidate or others who can provide information about the candidate’s qualifications from a particular perspective. <p>➤ Second Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ At this time, the committee can meet with the candidate if needed to ask questions, review any letters that pose concerns (not with the candidate), and make a plan to write the report. <p>➤ Third Meeting/Final Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ordinarily, a draft of the report is circulated to committee members in advance of the final meeting. At its final meeting, the committee reviews any remaining letters as well as the draft report and finalizes its recommendation for
--	--

	appointment. For information regarding report contents please refer to the components of the promotion review packet below.
--	---

COMPONENTS OF THE PROMOTION REVIEW PACKET

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Department Report</p>	<p>A department review committee should be formed with three or four tenured or senior term professors. All efforts should be made to form a diverse committee membership, including at least one woman faculty member and, when possible, at least one underrepresented minority faculty member, <i>while also ensuring that those faculty are not being excessively burdened by concurrent obligations due to diversity goals.</i></p> <p>Make an intellectual case for the candidate, highlighting the areas most aligned with the goals of the appointment and analyzing how the candidate’s contributions meet the criteria for senior lecturer. Please refer to either the Faculty Appointments Handbook or below for this criteria. <i>The analysis should also directly address any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations.</i> Please develop a narrative describing why the candidate should be considered for promotion.</p> <p>The finalized report, prepared by the committee and reviewed and signed by the department chair, should include the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A one-paragraph executive summary of the candidate’s contributions and the department’s recommendation. ○ Background and context: description of the candidate’s area and how it fits into the department’s academic plan (and, if applicable, administrative needs) and why this position is best served by a term-limited appointment. For reference an appointment as a senior lecturer requires at least two of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrated excellence in teaching and advising: has taught within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution; has shown national leadership and/or innovation in pedagogy, with outstanding promise of continuing contribution; has an academic advising record
--	---

	<p>typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demonstrated record of relevant scholarship and related intellectual mentorship: has conducted relevant academic research within the tenured associate or full professor ranks at a peer institution or for at least six years as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School; has significant experience as Principal Investigator for sponsored projects; has a research mentoring record typical for a tenured associate or full professor at a peer institution. ▪ Demonstrated record of program development and leadership at the graduate level: has developed and/or managed academic graduate programs in public health education at a peer institution or as a lecturer at the Harvard Chan School. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ External letter writers: A brief description of the logic underlying the composition of the external letter writer group, especially in cases where the candidate is multidisciplinary. ○ Intellectual case for the candidate, highlighting the areas most aligned with the goals of the appointment and analyzing how the candidate’s contributions meet the criteria for senior lecturer. This analysis should clearly draw on both the external letters and considered judgments of departmental faculty. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of the candidate’s relevant scholarly contributions. ▪ Teaching, advising, and mentoring: An evaluation of teaching and advising effectiveness in a variety of settings with both undergraduate and graduate students (and postdocs, as relevant) ▪ Description and evaluation of leadership and service contributions – to the field, the University, the School, and the department
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Note of any significant efforts to support the School’s diversity, inclusion, and belonging goals. ▪ Discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s case as noted in the external evaluations and the internal conversations of both the search committee and the department. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Closing Statement: Solidify the reasoning for promotion. Any significant issues raised by internal or external evaluations should be explicitly addressed. Include the tally of the department vote, by name, with an “as of” date for the tally. Conclude with a statement of recommendation of the review committee. <p>Some questions to consider in developing the intellectual case for the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How is their research unique? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the highlights? Why and how is this research impactful to the department/school/nationally/internationally? <input type="checkbox"/> Why and how is this research impactful to their field? <input type="checkbox"/> In your view, how much of the candidate’s published work represents his/her own intellectual leadership, as opposed to collective knowledge or the expertise of collaborators? <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the candidates’ grants and funding record (or potential for successful grant funding). <input type="checkbox"/> What strengths does their research bring to the department/school/etc? Does this research fulfill an important need in expertise in the department/school? <input type="checkbox"/> What do you expect for the future of their research? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the strengths of the candidate’s case? <input type="checkbox"/> Are there any challenges or weaknesses in the candidate’s dossier that should be addressed? What is the best path forward for the candidate to address these areas of concern? <input type="checkbox"/> What are the strengths or weaknesses in the candidate’s teaching, advising, and mentoring? Evaluate the teaching and advising effectiveness across a variety of settings with students (and postdocs, as relevant) <input type="checkbox"/> What are the candidate’s leadership and service contributions – to the field, the University, the School, and the department?
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What are the most significant efforts the candidate has done to support the School’s diversity, inclusion, and belonging goals? <p>Analyze the candidate’s qualifications as related to the needs and goals of the department, the school, and the university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the potential educational contributions to the department and the School <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their teaching (if applicable)? <input type="checkbox"/> What does the committee feel is important or notable to highlight with regard to their mentorship (if applicable)? <p>Summarize the candidate’s major scientific contributions and qualifications for promotion. Some questions to consider when developing this recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What does the candidate bring to the department? Do they help fill needed areas of expertise in the department/branch into new areas for the department? <input type="checkbox"/> How is the candidate’s research/teaching/service impactful to the department? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence does the committee foresee the candidate potentially having on the future of the department/school/university? <input type="checkbox"/> What influence could the candidate have on the future of their field at the School, the University and in the greater world? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the candidate sufficiently connected to both internal and external scholarly networks to build their portfolio and career? How would you assess the candidate’s involvement and leadership role in professional societies, advisory groups, study sections, etc. in the field? <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledge any challenges or weaknesses in their career with a recommendation on the best path forward for the candidate to address those concerns.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Letters of evaluation received from experts <input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the letter sent to experts requesting evaluation of the candidate 	<p>A review for promotion to senior lecturer includes the solicitation of letters from individuals who can provide an independent assessment of the candidate’s qualifications. These letters should be solicited from leaders in the candidate’s field who are able to render an informed, objective evaluation and who have no conflict of interest with respect to the candidate (e.g., they may not be mentors or collaborators). It is ordinarily expected that at least six letters from independent evaluators will be obtained.</p> <p>More focused (targeted) letters may be obtained from individuals who can provide a more specific piece of information or a perspective about the candidate’s work which cannot be easily obtained from</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A list of individuals from whom letters were requested <input type="checkbox"/> If solicited, focused evaluation request(s), recipient(s), and response 	<p>other sources. The request letter should specifically state the question the committee wishes to have answered. No more than four targeted letters should be requested.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Candidate Dossier 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Current CV conforming to School-approved format <input type="checkbox"/> Academic Report: A first-person narrative focusing on the candidate’s contributions and what the candidate hopes to accomplish during the appointment in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research background and summary: Describe continuing areas of interest and outline any future plans. Summarize major research accomplishments. Summarize major research grants (complete list of grants to be included in CV). If relevant, document patents or other intellectual property rights. ○ Teaching: Describe classroom teaching history (complete list of courses taught to be included in CV) and teaching philosophy. Provide any additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, referring to any teaching awards listed on CV. Append the following materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Syllabi for key courses • Course evaluation report, summarizing/citing the course evaluation materials included in the dossier (see below) ○ Advising and mentoring: Describe advising activities, and provide any additional evidence of excellence in mentoring, referring to mentoring awards listed on CV. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete list of students advised at the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral level; dissertations supervised; student

	<p>practica supervised; and faculty—including post-doctoral fellows—mentored should be included in CV.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Service: Describe service to the field and profession and to the School and University (a complete list of service positions both to the field and at the institutional level should be included in CV). ○ COVID-19 Impact Statement (see Appendix VI-B): In addition to the narrative descriptions of research, educational, service, leadership, translational, and other accomplishments, faculty undergoing review should include a COVID-19 Impact Statement with their academic report. ○ Candidate’s statement describing efforts to encourage diversity, inclusion, and belonging, including past, current, and anticipated future contributions in these areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Annotated bibliography/cover page for the nominee’s publications listing five publications explaining why each has been selected and, if co-authored, the candidate’s role in their preparation. Peer-reviewed publications should be included when possible, but policy-related reports, articles written for a lay audience, and book excerpts may be included as well, at the candidate’s discretion. ☐ Publications: Five selected publications as listed in annotated bibliography ☐ Translational activities ☐ Course evaluations and materials, from courses taught: Only the summary pages of the evaluations (since the last review) should be included. Evaluations from executive education courses or leadership training activities may also be included. The candidate should also provide relevant course materials, such as syllabi and cases the candidate has written. ☐ Other supporting materials: The candidate may include any other documents they feel will support the case for appointment/reappointment.
--	--

<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices	<input type="checkbox"/> Request and approval of promotion authorization or appointment . Please refer to the Faculty Handbook for instructions related to the proposal requirements. <input type="checkbox"/> If applicable, total citation count for the candidate and comparands and citation count for each of the candidate’s publications.
--	--

PREPARATION OF THE FINAL MATERIALS FOR SCARP	
	<p>OFA reviews the draft of the department report and the supporting documentation and will contact the department concerning any suggested revisions.</p>
<p>Submission of materials:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> PDF with bookmarks of the recommendation package	<p>After any suggested revisions have been incorporated, please submit the following to the OFA: A PDF with bookmarks of the recommendation package in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Department Report ○ Candidate’s dossier (itemized above). ○ Letters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Copy of invitation to letter writers. ▪ List of invited evaluators and tally of replies, including reasons for declines. ▪ Copies of all responses to invitations, including declines. ○ Department Chair proposal request and approval of promotion authorization or appointment. ○ If applicable, total citation count for the candidate and comparands and citation count for each of the candidate’s publications.
<input type="checkbox"/> Approvals Phase	<p>OFA will submit the committee’s final report and all supporting documentation to SCARP for a review and vote. Following SCARP review, the deans may submit the recommendation for promotion to the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity for final approval.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Communication with Candidate	<p>The deans and department chair are responsible for offers of appointment. The review committee does not communicate directly with candidates who are recommended or approved, and no offers terms are be shared with candidates by the department chair before the University-level approval. With final approval, the department chair may contact the incumbent(s) to let them know an offer is forthcoming.</p>

	<p>The appointment letter is developed by OFA in consultation with the department, the Office of Financial Services (OFS), and the deans, who provide final approval of the offer terms.</p>
--	--

Appendix XIII: Appointment and Reappointment Process Guide for Secondary Faculty

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS GUIDE FOR SECONDARY APPOINTMENTS

Appointment Criteria:

- A secondary appointment may be proposed for a member of another Harvard faculty who is expected to make or who continues to make a **significant contribution to Harvard Chan academic/educational activities**.
- Contributions are ordinarily expected to constitute a **minimum of 5 percent FTE** and should be described in detail on the required form.
- Appointment and reappointment of such an individual are ordinarily made for **terms that are coterminous with the primary appointment**; the term may not extend beyond that of the primary appointment, and no single term may be longer than five years.
- Secondary faculty have the privilege of voting in school-wide faculty meetings.
- The titles of secondary faculty take the form of, for example, “Professor *in the Department of Epidemiology*.” **Harvard Chan School ordinarily honors rank held** (assistant, associate, or full professor) in primary appointment.

The procedure for nominating an individual for a secondary appointment/reappointment is as follows:

1. The **department chair consults with primary members of the department** at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for a tenured appointment: tenured professors only; for an associate professor appointment: associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors; for an assistant professor appointment: assistant and associate professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors) and documents their views about whether the review should proceed. Any demurrals are noted on the nomination form.
2. The **department chair completes the required form**, providing an explicit description of how the 5 percent commitment will be met during the proposed term (see below). If this is a reappointment, the chair also provides an explicit description of how the 5 percent commitment was met during the previous term. The form is signed by both the nominee and the department chair.
3. The **form and a current CV are forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA)** for submission to the Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP). If this is a

new appointment, a letter from the head of the department where the nominee holds a primary affiliation must be enclosed, agreeing to the secondary appointment.

CRITERIA FOR SECONDARY APPOINTMENT

Activities that always meet the 5 percent criterion include the following:

- **Serving as a program or course developer, primary instructor, or co-instructor** of a Harvard Chan School course, with at least 50 percent of responsibility for a 2.5-credit course or 25 percent responsibility for a 5-credit course (**Note: the provision of occasional lectures in someone else's course does not meet the 5 percent criterion**)
 - NB: If the nominee's 5 percent contribution will include classroom teaching, SCARP requires that the candidate submit teaching evaluations. In cases where the nominee has no teaching record (or no evaluations to supply) he or she should ordinarily be appointed first as instructor (or offered another role-appropriate annual appointment) for one year. Subsequently, if the appointee's course evaluations meet CEP standards, the department can submit a recommendation of secondary or adjunct appointment.
- **Primary dissertation advisor** to a Harvard Chan School student
- **Member of dissertation committee of three** or more Harvard Chan students
- **Mentor to a postdoctoral fellow** at Harvard Chan School
- **Supervisor of a student practicum** at Harvard Chan School
- **Principal investigator on a training grant** that supports Harvard Chan students

Activities that may meet the 5 percent criterion include:

- **Facilitation of exchange programs** between Harvard Chan doctoral students and students at another university
- Ongoing **assistance in placing Harvard Chan students** in practica, dissertation projects, or research experiences

ABCD appointments:

Occasionally, the appointment or reappointment of an individual whose contributions are important to the department but do not meet the above criteria may be considered. In such a case, a rationale for appointment should be provided. Such appointments are known as ABCD (for "[appointment by chair's discretion](#)") and are limited to 5-8 per department. Contact Katie Hayes (617-432-7217; khayes@hsph.harvard.edu) for updated guidance relating to ABCD appointments.

While research collaborations are not sufficient grounds to grant a secondary appointment, it is a School requirement that an individual who serves as principal investigator on a grant funded through the School hold a Harvard Chan appointment. In such cases, a secondary appointment may be granted

administratively (i.e., without SCARP review). Secondary appointments should not be sought, however, *for the purpose* of applying for grants at the School.

Appendix XIII-A: Nomination Form for Secondary Appointments and Reappointments

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)
NOMINATION FORM FOR SECONDARY APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

NOMINATION FOR SECONDARY APPOINTMENT OR REAPPOINTMENT

Name of nominee:	<input type="text"/>	Date:	<input type="text"/>
Harvard Chan department in which the appointment will be based:	<input type="text"/>		
Is this a new appointment as a secondary faculty member at the School?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, assumed Harvard Chan title:	<input type="text"/>		
Is this a reappointment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, current Harvard Chan title:	<input type="text"/>		
Proposed title/rank, if different:	<input type="text"/>		
Current Harvard Chan appointment dates:	<input type="text"/>		
Dates of proposed secondary appointment/reappointment:	<input type="text"/>		
Is secondary re-appointment contingent on primary reappointment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Is the end date of this appointment coterminous with the primary appointment end date?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Harvard faculty where nominee holds their primary appointment:	<input type="text"/>		
Nominee's title in their primary faculty:	<input type="text"/>		
Dates of current primary appointment	<input type="text"/>		
Department chair has consulted with faculty in the department as specified in the instructions:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Did any faculty members demur? (If yes, attach explanation.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	

Documentation required for secondary and adjunct appointments

Each criterion below meets the 5% commitment for secondary and adjunct appointment.

Appointment based on:	Documentation needed:
<i>Program or course developer, primary instructor, or co-instructor of a Harvard Chan course, with at least 50 percent responsibility for a 2.5-credit course or 25 percent responsibility for a 5-credit course (note: the provision of occasional lectures in someone else’s course does <u>not</u> meet the 5 percent criterion)</i>	<i>Complete course evaluations for the past 3 years, from relevant Harvard Chan School courses or, if the instructor has not yet taught the course being used as criterion, any other course Relevant Harvard Chan teaching included in CV</i>
<i>Primary dissertation advisor of record to a Harvard Chan student</i>	<i>Name of student and their expected graduation date noted on nomination form</i>
<i>Member of dissertation committee of three or more Harvard Chan students</i>	<i>Students’ names and expected graduation dates noted on nomination form</i>
<i>Mentor to a Harvard Chan postdoctoral fellow</i>	<i>Name of fellow and their appointment end date noted on nomination form</i>
<i>Supervisor of a Harvard Chan student practicum</i>	<i>Name of student and their expected graduation date noted on nomination form</i>
<i>Principal investigator on a training grant that supports Harvard Chan students</i>	<i>Name and start and end date of grant noted on nomination form and in nominee’s CV</i>
<i>ABCD: Appointment by Chair’s Discretion</i>	<i>Limited to 5-8 appointments per department, normally reserved for highly distinguished individuals whose activities do not meet the outlined 5 percent FTE criteria but who are considered important to the department</i>

Check one activity by which the nominee will fulfill the 5% commitment (Please refer to the criteria for appointment, and provide details below):

- Harvard Chan program or course developer; primary instructor or co-instructor of a Harvard Chan course with 50% responsibility for a 2.5-credit course or 25% responsibility for a 5-credit course (include program/course details). *Note: teaching evaluations required.*
- Primary dissertation advisor to a Harvard Chan doctoral student (include advisee’s name, anticipated graduation date)
- Member of dissertation committees of three or more Harvard Chan doctoral students (include advisees’ names, anticipated graduation dates)
- Mentor to a Harvard Chan postdoctoral fellow (include Fellow’s name, appointment dates)

- Supervisor of a Harvard Chan student practicum (include name of student, anticipated degree and degree date)
- Principal investigator on a training grant that supports Harvard Chan students
- ABCD

Please provide details about the activity checked above.

Please describe any other significant contributions of the nominee that will advance the School's mission. *Note: research collaboration does not on its own make a nominee eligible for appointment.*

For reappointments, also provide an explicit description of how the 5% commitment was met during the previous term.

We, the undersigned, have discussed and agreed upon the expectations of this appointment as outlined above.

Nominee

Department Chair

Appendix XIV: Appointment and Reappointment Process Guide for Adjunct Faculty

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCESS GUIDE FOR ADJUNCT FACULTY

Appointment Criteria:

- An adjunct appointment may be proposed for an individual whose primary affiliation is not at Harvard University and who is expected to make or who continues to make a **significant contribution to Harvard Chan academic/educational activities**.
- Contributions are ordinarily expected to constitute a **minimum of 5 percent FTE** and should be described in detail on the required form.
- **Terms are ordinarily five years** (for adjunct professor, associate professor, and senior lecturer) **or three years** (for adjunct assistant professor and lecturer) and may be renewed indefinitely.
- Adjunct faculty do not have the privilege of voting in school-wide faculty meetings.
- While Harvard Chan School **ordinarily honors the rank of the home institution**, consideration may also be given to whether the nominee would be a finalist (“short-listed”) in a search at the proposed rank at Harvard Chan School. Persons who have not held an academic rank will ordinarily be appointed at the rank of lecturer. **Titles of adjunct faculty** at Harvard Chan School are preceded by the modifier “adjunct”; for example, “Adjunct Professor of Epidemiology.”

The procedure for nominating an individual for an adjunct appointment/reappointment is as follows:

1. The **department chair consults with primary members of the department** at ranks equivalent to or higher than that of the proposed appointment (i.e., for a tenured appointment: tenured professors only; for an associate professor appointment: associate professors, senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors; for an assistant professor appointment: assistant and associate professors, lecturers and senior lecturers, term professors, and tenured professors) and documents their views about whether the review should proceed. Any demurrals are noted on the nomination form.
2. The **department chair completes the required form**, providing an explicit description of how the 5 percent commitment will be met during the proposed term (see below). If this is a reappointment, the chair also provides an explicit description of how the 5 percent commitment was met during the previous term. The form is signed by both the nominee and the department chair.
3. The **form and a current CV are forwarded to the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA)** for submission to the Standing Committee on Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions (SCARP).

CRITERIA FOR ADJUNCT APPOINTMENT

Activities that always meet the 5 percent criterion include the following:

- **Serving as a program or course developer, primary instructor, or co-instructor** of a Harvard Chan School course, with at least 50 percent of responsibility for a 2.5-credit course or 25 percent responsibility for a 5-credit course (**Note: the provision of occasional lectures in someone else's course does not meet the 5 percent criterion**)
 - NB: If the nominee's 5 percent contribution will include classroom teaching, SCARP requires that the candidate submit teaching evaluations. In cases where the nominee has no teaching record (or no evaluations to supply) he or she should ordinarily be appointed first as instructor (or offered another role-appropriate annual appointment) for one year. Subsequently, if the appointee's course evaluations meet CEP standards, the department can submit a recommendation of secondary or adjunct appointment.
- **Primary dissertation advisor** to a Harvard Chan School student
- **Member of dissertation committee of three** or more Harvard Chan students
- **Mentor to a postdoctoral fellow** at Harvard Chan School
- **Supervisor of a student practicum** at Harvard Chan School
- **Principal investigator on a training grant** that supports Harvard Chan students

Activities that may meet the 5 percent criterion include:

- **Facilitation of exchange programs** between Harvard Chan doctoral students and students at another university
- Ongoing **assistance in placing Harvard Chan students** in practica, dissertation projects, or research experiences

ABCD appointments:

Occasionally, the appointment or reappointment of an individual whose contributions are important to the department but do not meet the above criteria may be considered. In such a case, a rationale for appointment should be provided. Such appointments are known as ABCD (for "[appointment by chair's discretion](#)") and are limited to 5-8 per department. Contact Katie Hayes (617-432-7217; khayes@hsph.harvard.edu) for updated guidance relating to ABCD appointments.

While research collaborations are not sufficient grounds to grant an adjunct appointment, it is a School requirement that an individual who serves as principal investigator on a grant funded through the School hold a Harvard Chan appointment. In such cases, an adjunct appointment may be granted

administratively (i.e., without SCARP review). Adjunct appointments should not be sought, however, *for the purpose* of applying for grants at the School.

A change of status from primary to secondary or adjunct faculty at the same rank may be made administratively (i.e., without SCARP review) to permit a period of transition in cases where a Harvard Chan School appointment is required for service, such as a continuing student's primary dissertation advisor or as the principal investigator on a grant through the Harvard Chan School. The term of such an appointment will ordinarily be no more than two years; upon expiration of this transitional term, reappointment materials must be submitted to SCARP in the usual way. The department chair should submit a written request to the Dean for Academic Affairs and the Office of Faculty Affairs for the change of status and the expected length.

Appendix XIV A: Nomination for Adjunct Appointments and Reappointments

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

NOMINATION FORM FOR ADJUNCT APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS

NOMINATION FOR ADJUNCT APPOINTMENT OR REAPPOINTMENT

Name of nominee:	<input type="text"/>	Date:	<input type="text"/>
Harvard Chan School department in which the appointment will be based:	<input type="text"/>		
Is this a new appointment as an adjunct faculty member at the School?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, assumed Harvard Chan School title:	<input type="text"/>		
Is this a reappointment?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
If yes, current Harvard Chan School title:	<input type="text"/>		
Proposed title/rank, if different:	<input type="text"/>		
Current Harvard Chan School appointment dates:	<input type="text"/>		
Dates of proposed adjunct appointment/reappointment:	<input type="text"/>		
Institution where nominee holds their primary appointment:	<input type="text"/>		
Nominee's title in their primary faculty:	<input type="text"/>		
Department chair has consulted with faculty in the department as specified in the instructions:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Did any faculty members demur? (If yes, attach explanation.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	

Documentation required for secondary and adjunct appointments

Each criterion below meets the 5% commitment for secondary and adjunct appointment.

Appointment based on:	Documentation needed:
------------------------------	------------------------------

<i>Serving as a program or course developer, primary instructor, or co-instructor of a Harvard Chan School course, with at least 50 percent of responsibility for a 2.5-credit course or 25 percent responsibility for a 5-credit course (note: the provision of occasional lectures in someone else's course does not meet the 5 percent criterion)</i>	<i>Complete course evaluations (for the last 3 years' worth). These may be from Harvard Chan School courses or, if the instructor has not taught the course being used as criterion, any other course. Relevant Harvard Chan School teaching included in c.v.</i>
<i>Primary dissertation advisor of record to a Harvard Chan School student</i>	<i>Name of student and their expected graduation date noted on nomination form.</i>
<i>Member of dissertation committee of three or more Harvard Chan School students</i>	<i>Students' names and expected graduation dates noted on nomination form.</i>
<i>Mentor to a Harvard Chan School postdoctoral fellow</i>	<i>Name of fellow and their appointment end date noted on nomination form.</i>
<i>Supervisor of a Harvard Chan School student practicum</i>	<i>Name of student and their expected graduation date noted on nomination form.</i>
<i>Principal investigator on a training grant that supports Harvard Chan School students</i>	<i>Name and start and end date of grant noted on nomination form and in nominee's CV.</i>
<i>ABCD- Appointment by Chair's Discretion</i>	<i>Limited to 5-8 appointments per department. Normally reserved for highly distinguished individuals whose activities do not meet the outlined 5% FTE criteria but are considered important to the department.</i>

Check one activity by which the nominee will fulfill the 5% commitment (Please refer to the criteria for appointment, and provide details below):

- Harvard Chan School program or course developer; primary instructor or co-instructor of a Harvard Chan School course with 50% responsibility for a 2.5-credit course or 25% responsibility for a 5-credit course (include program/course details). *Note: Teaching Evaluations Required.*
- Primary dissertation advisor to a Harvard Chan School doctoral student (include advisee's name, anticipated graduation date)
- Member of dissertation committees of three or more Harvard Chan School doctoral students (include advisees' names, anticipated graduation dates)
- Mentor to a Harvard Chan School postdoctoral fellow (include Fellow's name, appointment dates)
- Supervisor of a Harvard Chan School student practicum (include name of student, anticipated degree and degree date)
- Principal investigator on a training grant that supports Harvard Chan School students

ABCD

Please provide details about the activity checked above.

Please describe any other significant contributions of the nominee that will advance the School's mission. *Note: research collaboration does not on its own make a nominee eligible for appointment.*

For reappointments, also provide an explicit description of how the 5% commitment was met during the previous term.

We, the undersigned, have discussed and agreed upon the expectations of this appointment as outlined above.

Nominee

Department Chair

Appendix XV: Paid Parental Leave Policy

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

PAID PARENTAL LEAVE POLICY

The Harvard Chan School paid parental leave policy for faculty on the Harvard payroll is as follows:

- Non-birth parents are entitled to twelve weeks of total bonding leave, eight of which are fully paid, following the birth or adoption of a child. Birth parents are entitled to twenty weeks of total paid leave, sixteen of which are fully paid, following the birth of a child. The School will continue to pay the faculty member's current actual salary (annualized salary x FTE*) during the period of the parental leave, assuming that the faculty member is not performing work during the leave that is covered by the sources sponsoring that work. If the faculty member chooses to perform such work, the school will pay any portion of the annualized salary that is not covered by the related sources during the period of the leave.
- If the parental leave occurs during the "start-up period" of a tenure-ladder faculty member's first term, any salary guarantee and/or salary savings agreement will be extended for the duration of leave. Any other leave-related issues affecting progress during the start-up period will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Parental leave should be requested as far in advance of the child's expected arrival date as possible to provide departments with reasonable notice for planning purposes.
- FTE (full-time equivalent) reflects the percentage of the faculty member's annualized salary that is compensated on the Harvard Chan School payroll. For example, faculty who do not work for Harvard Chan School in July and August or who have not raised outside funding to cover that portion of their salary have an FTE of .833.

Procedure:

1. Once the dates and financial arrangements have been finalized, complete and submit the Faculty Sabbatical and Paid Leave of Absence Form to OFA.
2. Submit a claim to Lincoln Financial Group, Harvard's third-party administrator, at least thirty days prior to your effective date.
3. Notify OFA and claims specialist at Lincoln Financial upon child's birth.

Appendix XVI: Tenure Clock Extension to Meet Child Care Needs

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

TENURE CLOCK EXTENSION (FOR CHILD CARE) POLICY

The Harvard Chan School tenure clock extension policy for all primary tenure-track faculty is as follows:

- Tenure ladder faculty who become a parent of a child will be granted, upon notification, an automatic extension of their tenure clock by one year for each child born or adopted. This type of extension is ordinarily granted for up to two years.
- The granting of a tenure-ladder extension will not routinely entail an extension to the faculty member's current term of appointment. A request to extend the faculty member's current term must be submitted jointly by the faculty member and their department chair and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Requests for extension submitted after the eighth-year review has been scheduled to begin will be considered but are not automatic.
- Extensions will not be granted to faculty members who have already been notified that they will not be considered for reappointment or promotion.
- The granting of an extension does not imply a guarantee of reappointment or promotion. Neither does it provide a guarantee of additional financial support to cover the period of the extension. Finally, the existence of this policy does not preclude a faculty member being terminated before the end of her/his term for lack of funding, as specified in the financial expectations outlined in the offer letter or in the signed letter of agreement.

Appendix XVII: COVID-19 Impact Statement Guidelines

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

COVID-19 IMPACT STATEMENT GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

REQUIRED COVID-19 Impact Statement (to be included in candidate's academic report):

In addition to the narrative descriptions of their research, educational, service, leadership, and translational accomplishments, faculty undergoing review should include a **COVID-19 Impact Statement** with their academic report.

This supplemental statement should describe any significant effects the pandemic has had on the candidate's regular activities and plans, indicating ways that their focus or priorities may have necessarily shifted and articulating any deliberate choices they made to concentrate on specifically accessible opportunities and goals, given the myriad constraints and their myriad aftereffects.

It is not necessary to explain why work was or is still being impacted (by describing specific childcare or health issues, for example), but only to explain *how* (e.g., critical reduction in available working hours, inaccessible field site, loss of funding or unexpected new research expenses, etc.). Candidates should concentrate on the primary impacts rather than cataloguing every particular instance of impact.

Please also highlight examples of innovation, training, additional mentoring or other service activities (e.g., clinical or first-responder service), new directions in research, or other unplanned but concrete accomplishments that came out of this period. All impact is relevant, whether positive, negative, or neutral.

Resources: COVID-19 Impact Statements

- *Opinion: In the wake of COVID-19, academia needs new solutions to ensure gender equity.* Jessica L. Malisch, Breanna N. Harris, Shanen M. Sherrer, Kristy A. Lewis, Stephanie L. Shepherd, Pumtiwitt C. McCarthy, Jessica L. Spott, Elizabeth P. Karam, Naima Moustaid-Moussa, Jessica McCrory Calarco, Latha Ramalingam, Amelia E. Talley, Jaclyn E. Cañas-Carrell, Karin Ardon-Dryer, Dana A. Weiser, Ximena E. Bernal, Jennifer Deitloff Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Jul 2020, 117 (27) 15378-15381; DOI:10.1073/pnas.2010636117 <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/27/15378> and [online supplement](#).
- *Using the curriculum vitae to promote gender equity during the COVID-19 pandemic.* Vineet M. Arora, Charles M. Wray, Avital Y. O'Glasser, Mark Shapiro, Shikha Jain. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Sep 2020, 117 (39) 24032; DOI:10.1073/pnas.2012969117. <https://www.pnas.org/content/117/39/24032>. [Including: COVID19 Contribution Matrix

Addendum for CV. Vineet Arora MD MAPP, Mark Shapiro MD, Avital O'Glasser MD FACP FHM, Charlie Wray DO MS, Shikha Jain MD FACP. <https://shikhajainmd.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/cv-matrix.pdf>.]

- *Documenting COVID-19 Impacts: Best Practices*. Joya Misra. 2020. University of Massachusetts Amherst ADVANCE Program. <https://www.umass.edu/advance/documenting-pandemic-impacts-best-practices>
- *Achievement Relative to Opportunity*. Marcia Garcia de la Banda. 2019. Monash University. https://www.monash.edu/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1975422/Achievement-Relative-to-Opportunity.pdf
- *Guidelines for Assessing Achievement Relative to Opportunity*. Monash University. https://www.monash.edu/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/1798460/Guidelines-for-Assessing-Achievement-Relative-to-Opportunity.pdf
- *The Effect of COVID-19 on UM Faculty Life*. Results from a Limited Survey conducted by the ADVANCE Program. September, 2020. <https://advance.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/COVID-study-report.pdf>
- *COVID-19 INFORMATION & RESOURCES*. Faculty & Instructional FAQs. University of Texas. <https://covid.provost.utexas.edu/faculty/search/COVID+Professional+Impact+Statements/>
- *Faculty Evaluation and COVID-19 COVID*. Impact Statements. North Carolina State University. <https://provost.ncsu.edu/faculty-resources/faculty-evaluation-and-covid-19/>
- *COVID Impact Statements Guidance*. Office of the Provost. University of Connecticut. <https://provost.uconn.edu/covid-19/covid-impact-statements-guidance/>
- *Documenting Impact of COVID-19 on Faculty*. Susan Bulkeley Butler Center for Leadership Excellence. 2020. SBBCLE. Purdue University. <https://www.purdue.edu/butler/documents/Best-Practices-Tool-1-Documenting-Impact-of-COVID-19-for-tenure-track-and-tenured-faculty.pdf>

Appendix XVIII: Candidate Evaluation Sheet

HARVARD T.H. CHAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH | OFFICE OF FACULTY AFFAIRS (OFA)

CANDIDATE EVALUATION SHEET

Many thanks for meeting with and/or reviewing the presentation or materials of this candidate. Please use this form to provide an evaluation of the candidate.

Alternatively, please send feedback via email to the Office of Faculty Affairs. The search committee values your response and finds this evaluation to be extremely helpful. Your feedback form or message will be included in an appendix to the search report.

Position to be filled:	
Reviewer's name:	
Candidate's name:	

Please indicate which of the following are true for you (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's CV | <input type="checkbox"/> Met with candidate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Attended meal with candidate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Read candidate's letters of recommendation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please explain) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Attended candidate's job talk | |

Please comment on the candidate's scholarship as reflected in the job talk and/or interview:

Please comment on the candidate's teaching ability as reflected in the job talk:

Please provide other comments on the candidate's qualifications:

	excellent	good	neutral	fair	poor	Unable to judge
Please rate the candidate on each of the following:						
Potential for or evidence of scholarly impact						
Potential for or evidence of research productivity						
Potential for or evidence of obtaining research funding						
Potential for or evidence of successful collaboration						
Fit of research area with department's priorities						

Potential or demonstrated ability to attract and supervise graduate students and postdoctoral fellows						
Ability to be a constructive member of the department and school community						
Potential impact on School Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging efforts						

Appendix XIX: Diversity, Inclusion, and Belonging Statement

Statement of Faculty Commitment to Inclusive Excellence

At the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, the ability to establish an environment that is affirming and creates a sense of community and belonging for all individuals is central to our work as a school. We are committed to the ongoing efforts of creating a community where students, faculty, trainees, and employees of all identities, backgrounds and life experiences can thrive and equitably access all opportunities for learning and working at the Harvard Chan School.

In a brief statement, candidates should articulate the approach they bring to diversity, inclusion, and belonging in their work at the Harvard Chan School and/or more broadly in the field of public health. The following prompts are designed to help frame statements, but do not comprise an absolute template*:

1. **Mentorship**: Please articulate the guiding principles that have informed your current and/or future approach(es) to mentoring students or early-career researchers from racially and culturally diverse backgrounds and historically marginalized communities.
2. **Inclusive Pedagogy**: How have you (or will you in the future) ensure an inclusive teaching, learning, training, and mentoring environment for students and early-career researchers and peers?
3. **Equity in Research and Scholarship**: What steps have you taken, or will you take, to minimize cultural bias in your field of research, as well as any assumptions that may influence your own research practices and scholarship?
4. **Health Equity Commitment**: How do you see your research goals and current professional activities as contributing to a broader vision of (public) health equity?

*Each statement will be unique in terms of length, structure, and/or level of detail across the above topics. In other words, there is no absolute template. Statements should directly reflect the specific past efforts and sincere future plans of the candidate.

Appendix XX: Tenure Review Timeline

Illustration of a Typical Case for Internal Tenure Review

Harvard Chan School Office of Faculty Affairs

Step	Cue	Example
<p>OFA & department consult about launching promotion review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can be initiated by department or OFA • Should come with support of candidate mentors and informal polling of department senior faculty • May follow OFA and/or department review of academic report draft and other materials 	<p>Ordinarily, no sooner than the faculty member's eighth year on tenure ladder, OR ninth or tenth year if faculty member has been granted extension(s).</p> <p>Acceleration is possible in special cases but must be approved by the deans in advance of any steps.</p> <p>Reviews should be launched at least one year prior to tenure clock end date (preferably 18+ months in advance).</p>	<p>September: department chair lets OFA know candidate is ready to begin review process</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Schedule procedure review with OFA</p>
<p>OFA meeting with department chair and candidate to review procedures</p>	<p>~Within one month of the date of the original notice from the department chair.</p>	<p>October: procedure review</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Schedule (recorded) talk + senior faculty vote to move forward with review</p>
<p>Preparation and distribution of the candidate's dossier</p>	<p>~Within one month after the meeting between OFA and the department chair.</p>	<p>November-December: schedule talk and distribute material</p>
<p>Presentation by candidate and subsequent meeting of tenured faculty for vote to move forward</p>	<p>~Within three months after OFA's initial communication with the department chair about the review.</p>	<p>January: scheduled (recorded) talk and senior faculty vote</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Chair letter to deans formally requesting launch of review</p>
<p>(OPTIONAL) Consultation with the chair of the candidate's affiliate department</p>	<p>Around the same time as the meeting of tenured faculty in the candidate's primary department, if affiliate department input would be helpful to decision-making process in the primary department.</p>	

Step	Cue	Example
<p>Department chair reports decision about moving forward with promotion review in a letter to the deans</p>	<p>As soon as possible after department vote.</p>	<p>February: formal request sent to academic dean to launch the review</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Committee is seated; review is launched</p>
<p>Launch/seating of promotion review committee ↑↑↑</p>	<p>As soon as the academic dean has approved the launch and committee members have all agreed to serve.</p>	<p>March: NB: For OFA, this is the technical “launch date” of the tenure review.</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> First committee meeting</p>
<p>First meeting of promotion review committee</p>	<p>Ideally within a month of the promotion committee’s launch, although scheduling issues may necessitate a longer timeline.</p>	<p>March-April: first committee meeting</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Solicitation of letters</p>
<p>Solicitation of letters</p>	<p>Ordinarily, no later than two weeks after the initial meeting of the committee.</p>	<p>May: solicitation of letters</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Second committee meeting; candidate attends</p>
<p>Second meeting of the committee and preparation of the report; includes candidate attendance</p>	<p>At least eight weeks after the solicitation of letters, to allow time for the committee to receive and review the letters.</p>	<p>July: second committee meeting, including candidate appearance</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Third committee meeting; writing of report</p>
<p>Third/final meeting of the committee and preparation of the report</p>	<p>Usually within a month of the second meeting.</p>	<p>August: third committee meeting</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> SCARP review</p>
<p>SCARP meeting (case is presented, discussed, and voted on)</p>	<p>Normally, the first SCARP meeting after the third committee meeting and final revision of the report. See SCARP schedule for guidelines.</p>	<p>September: SCARP review</p> <p><u>Next step:</u> Deans and department chair meeting</p>
<p>Deans and department chair meeting to approve SCARP</p>	<p>As soon after SCARP as is schedulable.</p>	<p>October: deans and department chair meeting</p>

Step	Cue	Example
recommendation and/or discuss ad hoc plans		<u>Next step:</u> Ad hoc meeting
Ad hoc committee meeting	At least two months after SCARP meeting (NB: ad hoc members cannot be invited to serve until SCARP and deans have approved the case; provost's office must approve ad hoc committee members)	November-December: ad hoc committee meeting Results normally announced within a week after ad hoc meeting

The above 18-month timeline assumes some minor delays. Potential reasons for more extended timeline:

- Committee member schedules don't align well; all members are required at all meetings
- Low response rate from letter writers; extension requests from letter writers
- Summer month delays (no SCARP in August; no ad hocs in May, July, or August)
- Not enough ad hoc date options; unavoidable delays that cause ad hoc date forfeit
- Prolonged seating of ad hoc committee members, due to declines/scheduling conflict