



AUBURN

UNIVERSITY

HARRISON

SCHOOL OF PHARMACY

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
FINAL**

May 16, 2011

Table of Contents

	Page(s)
Criteria for appointment and promotion	2
Scope and Relationship to Guidelines, Policies, and Criteria for Faculty Appointments and Promotions	2
Appointment and Promotion	2
General descriptions of Acceptable, Excellent and Highest Distinction	2
Standards of performance for each faculty rank	
Criteria to achieve the rank of Professor	5
Criteria to achieve the rank of Associate Professor	5
Promotion review procedures	
Evaluation of teaching performance	5
Evaluation of research/creative works (i.e., scholarship)	6
Evaluation of outreach	9
Evaluation of service (i.e., citizenship)	11
Evaluation of collegiality	13
Appendices	
Appendix A. Criteria for evaluation of teaching	14
Appendix B. Criteria for evaluating research/creative works - promotion from Assistant to Associate professor	16
Appendix C. Criteria for evaluating research/creative works – promotion from Associate to Full professor	17
Appendix D. Criteria for evaluating <u>outreach</u> – promotion from Assistant professor to Associate Professor	18
Appendix E. Criteria for evaluating outreach – promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor	20
Appendix F. Criteria for evaluating <u>service</u> – promotion from Assistant to Associate professor	22
Appendix G. Criteria for evaluating <u>service</u> – promotion from Associate to Full professor	23

I. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

A. Scope and Relationship to Guidelines, Policies, and Criteria for Faculty Appointments and Promotions

The following section provides guidelines and criteria for appointment and promotion of Full-Time Tenure and Non-Tenure Track or Part-Time Non-Tenure Track Faculty with at least a 50% appointment at the Harrison School of Pharmacy and as defined in the AU Faculty Handbook. Position titles covered by this document include Associate Professor, Professor, Associate Clinical Professor and Clinical Professor.

B. Appointment and Promotion

Appointment to a Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track Faculty position is made at a rank, for a stipulated period of time, and it is generally characterized by a defined scope within one or more of the general areas of teaching, research, outreach, and service. The appointment is subject to periodic administrative review that examines both the continuing need for the position as well as a performance evaluation of the individual faculty member in the position.

For Tenure Track Faculty, the following guidelines define the School's expectations for candidates to be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Full Professor. Further, the Department P&T committee will also determine the candidate's eligibility for Tenure. According to the University's Faculty Handbook, decisions on tenure are different in kind from those on promotion. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described in this Document, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate professional collegiality. Annual review letters from Department Heads and 3 year review letters from Department P&T committees will also be utilized by the promotion and tenure committee in making promotion and tenure decisions.. The percent of designated effort in teaching, scholarship, outreach and service is determined through the annual workload assignment process and may vary according to the school/department and individual faculty requirements to address the School's mission.

Even though the same guidelines are used, non-tenure track faculty are treated distinctly different from tenure track faculty. For Non-Tenure Track Faculty, the following evaluation and review guidelines apply only to promotions (i.e., changes in rank). The difference between a tenure and non-tenure track appointment is based upon the percentage of designated effort for each of the four areas of teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service. Whereas tenure track appointments are typically evaluated on teaching and research/creative work, non-tenure track appointments are evaluated on teaching and outreach. These appraisals and workload assignments establish the percent of designated effort in teaching, scholarship, outreach and service and determine the weighting used to assess a candidate for promotion.

C. General Descriptions of Rating Categories

Each candidate for promotion will receive a rating of highest distinction, excellence, or acceptable for each of the following four components: teaching, scholarship, outreach,

and service based on their effort allocation. The designated effort is based upon assigned workload. Tenure track faculty workload effort allocation primarily focuses on the areas of teaching and scholarship whereas non-tenure track faculty effort is closely tied to clinical practice and instruction as it relates to teaching, outreach, service, and scholarship endeavors. For purposes of promotion and tenure, tenure track appointments are typically evaluated on teaching and research/creative work, whereas non-tenure track appointments are generally evaluated on teaching and outreach for promotion.

General descriptions of these ratings are provided below.

Teaching

Teaching encompasses all activities assigned to the candidate. These activities include classroom teaching and facilitation; student advising, mentoring, coaching & professionalization of students; graduate instruction and guidance, and clinical in-service educational programs. Refer to Appendix A for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate teaching performance.

A performance of “Highest Distinction” in teaching is characterized by evidence of innovative techniques by a pattern of consistently high student and peer evaluations as an outstanding teacher and superior craftsmanship in the preparation of learning experiences.

A rating of “Excellence” in teaching requires a consistent record of student satisfaction with teaching as evidenced by student evaluation, peer review, conscientious performance of a range of teaching duties and skill in the preparation of learning experiences.

A rating of “Acceptable” in teaching requires satisfactory performance of assigned teaching duties as evidenced by student and peer evaluation.

If the rating of “Acceptable” is not met in teaching, the faculty performance is classified as unacceptable.

Scholarship (i.e., Research/Creative Work)

A major contribution to the University is the scholarship of its individual members. Scholarship may be expressed through activities leading to discovery, integration, outreach, application, instruction or education. Scholarship is actually exhibited by research in those areas leading to publication and presentation. Refer to Appendix B for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate Scholarship. Criteria for evaluating Scholarship include publication record, presentations, grants and contracts, honors and awards, copyrighted, patented, or licensed works, and sustainability of focused research. The weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP. For example, evidence of copyrights, patents, or other licensed works may carry more weight toward promotion in one department versus another. Sustainability of focused research is defined as evidence of extramural funding to sustain independent research program and demonstrate a significant impact on science of discipline at a national/international level.

To be of benefit to society, the results of scholarly or creative activity must be disseminated beyond the borders of the University by appropriate written or oral means.

To be rated "Highest Distinction" in scholarship requires recognition by one's academic or professional peers as one who has made a significant contribution to the field. This recognition, supported by substantial documentation, may be international, national, or regional and in the form appropriate to the field. In general, a performance of highest distinction should be demonstrated by some of the following: consistent record of extramural funding, publications that have substantial scholarly, professional or public policy impact, invited presentations or speeches of a similar nature.

"Excellence" in scholarship requires a consistent record of productivity and publication or public presentations. The work should be considered scientifically sound and innovative by outside reviewers in the same field as the candidate and should show a clear pattern of growth and development in their research program.

To be rated "Acceptable" requires sufficient evidence of scholarly activity in their research program. A ranking of "acceptable" indicates general productivity.

If the rating of "Acceptable" is not met for the area of research/creative work, the faculty performance is classified as unacceptable.

Outreach

AU HSOP has a strong history of outreach. As identified in the AU Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.8.C., "outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit mission." In order to be considered outreach for the purposes of promotion and tenure, the faculty activity must meet the six criteria detailed in Chapter 3.8.C. in the AU Faculty Handbook.

Daily outreach activities, outreach program development and/or implementation, and teaching/research/outreach activities may contribute to outreach scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts. Refer to Appendices D and/or E for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate outreach performance. The weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP.

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

1. Community Engagement (see page 9, section III.3.b.(i))
2. Presentations and Publications (see page 10, section III.3.b.(ii))
3. Other Activities (see page 10, section III.3.b.(iii))

To be rated "Highest Distinction" in outreach requires a consistent record of meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts on a national/international level. This may include receipt of outreach awards from a national agency, outreach-related publications in peer-reviewed journals leading to

impact on a national/international level, or reports/poster presentations at national/international venues.

To receive a rating of “Excellence” in outreach, one must demonstrate activity in more than 1 area listed in section.III.3.b.(i)1-8, 3.b.(ii)1-3, pages 9-10, typically occurring at local or regional venues.

To receive a rating of “Acceptable” in outreach, one must demonstrate activity in any area listed in III.3.b (i)1-8, 3.b.(ii)1-3, pages 9-10, typically occurring at local or regional venues.

If the rating of “Acceptable” is not met for outreach, the faculty performance is classified as unacceptable.

Service (i.e., Citizenship)

Service may encompass such diverse areas as service to the University and the School and service in professional affairs. All faculty are expected to make contributions in the area of service. Refer to Appendices F and/or G for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate teaching performance. The weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP.

A performance of "Highest Distinction" in service requires a long term record of noteworthy leadership and achievement in Department, School, University, governmental, regulatory and/or professional organizations. The candidate's actual accomplishments and contribution should be recognized and attested by peers as outstanding. Generally, the highest distinction rating requires the candidate's willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty to accept and accomplish tasks despite the difficulty he/she may encounter.

A rating of “Excellence” in service requires a record of leadership and/or consistent record of active participation in committees and/or service activities in intramural (e.g., Department, School, University) and extramural organizations (i.e., professional organizations, governmental and/or regulatory agencies). The candidate with an excellent rating should provide significant contribution to the committee(s) he/she serves. The evidence of the candidate's leadership and/or contribution must be recognized by peers.

To be rated “Acceptable” requires a consistent record of active participation in committees and/or service activities in intramural (Department, School, University) and extramural organizations (i.e., professional organizations).

If the rating of “Acceptable” is not met for service, the faculty performance is classified as unacceptable.

II. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR EACH FACULTY RANK

A description of what is required to achieve the rank of Professor and Associate Professor within the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Works, Outreach, and Service are summarized below. The criteria for evaluating faculty candidates are the same for tenure and non-tenure track faculty. The key difference between a tenure and non-tenure track appointment is based upon the percentage of designated effort for each of the four areas of teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service. Whereas tenure track appointments are typically evaluated on teaching and research/creative work, non-tenure track appointments are generally evaluated on teaching and outreach. The weight or rank of criteria within each category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP.

A. Professor

To achieve the rank of Professor and Clinical Professor, a faculty member must be evaluated with "Highest Distinction" in at least one area of primary activity, and at least "Excellence" in the other areas as defined by your workload assignment.

B. Associate Professor

To achieve the rank of Associate Professor and Associate Clinical Professor, a faculty member must be evaluated as at least having "Excellence" in two areas of primary activity, and at least "Acceptable" in the other areas as defined by your workload assignment.

C. Exceptions

It is recognized that occasionally someone may make an extraordinary contribution to the School of Pharmacy in a manner somewhat different from that defined in these guidelines. In such rare cases, exceptions are possible when the evidence and consensus overwhelmingly suggest appointment or promotion. Eligible voting faculty involved in the process including P & T committee members, Department Head and Dean will determine who meets criteria for cases of exception.

III. PROMOTION REVIEW PROCEDURES

The following section provides further explanation of how performance is to be evaluated and lists the specific procedures, areas to be evaluated, and criteria for evaluation for the main areas of teaching, research/creative works, outreach and service. This section is applicable for both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.

1. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Teaching evaluations are provided through multiple sources of data including: standardized student evaluations (mandated core questions plus course specific questions), formative peer faculty evaluations, outcome assessment data, HSOP course reviews, faculty portfolio submissions and the candidate's annual performance appraisal.

a. Peer Review System

The purpose of the peer review system is to provide a systematic evaluation of teaching so that a performance profile of each candidate is presented to the eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department for its consideration in the promotion/tenure process. The evaluation is made by 1 or more faculty members appointed by the Department Head. One of the peer review faculty members can be from outside the candidate's department.

b. Areas of Evaluation

Faculty members providing peer reviews will base their evaluation of the faculty member's preparation and delivery of lectures in the general lecture format, leading of small group discussions, clinical and laboratory teaching, and course management (where appropriate).

c. Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty members providing peer reviews will evaluate the candidate's performance, employing "Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching (See Appendix A). Faculty members providing peer reviews will then assign a ranking of "Acceptable," "Excellence" or "Highest Distinction." A ranking of "Acceptable" will be defined as meeting criteria 1-6. A ranking of "Excellence" or "Highest Distinction" will require meeting applicable criteria (i.e., Criteria 1-13) as outlined in Appendix A. The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department will use peer review letters, excerpts from the faculty formative portfolios, HSOP course reviews, student evaluations and the candidate's dossier during the final deliberations to provide an overall ranking of "Acceptable," "Excellence," or "Highest Distinction" in teaching.

2. Evaluation of Scholarship (i.e., Research/Creative Works)

a. Procedure

(i) Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in scholarly areas. The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department has developed a list of areas that will be given consideration under the scholarship requirements for tenure and/or promotion. These are listed under

"Areas of Evaluation" with a description of how accomplishments in each area will be weighted during deliberations.

(ii) Evaluation Mechanism

1. The candidate is to prepare a list of his/her scholarly activities as requested in the promotion dossier.
2. The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department will use the information within the dossier, letters from external reviewers and information provided by the candidate's Department Head, to rate the candidate as being acceptable, having excellence or highest distinction according to the developed criteria discussed further in this section.

b. Areas of Evaluation

(i) Peer-reviewed Publications

The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department recognize that publication in peer-reviewed refereed journals is a strong indication of scholarship.

- Priority is given to publication in the most prestigious journal(s) in each specialty. Each department maintains a list of acceptable journals in which faculty are encouraged to publish
- Publications in preparation will **not** be considered.
- For promotion and/or tenure, peer-reviewed or refereed work is valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed endeavors.
- In general, authorship on multi-author publications will be considered as 1st author = last author > 2nd author > 3rd author. Additional information provided by the candidate about his/her contribution and percent involvement to the research effort will be considered.
- Independence is a necessary criterion of scholarship. However, independence can be compatible with collaboration. Independence in collaboration means that the participant brings a unique contribution to the project without which the project would suffer. While independence is expected of faculty, it is understood that it may be represented in ways other than simply being sole or first author on published papers. The primary evidence of independence will be determined by the eligible voting faculty to include P & T committee members, Department Head and Dean.
- In general, original research publications will be more highly valued than critical reviews and book chapters. Examples of acceptable publications include, but are not limited to:
 - Original research in full length manuscript
 - Evaluative descriptions of practice and teaching innovations
 - Critical reviews in refereed journals

-
- Case reports
 - Book chapters (Evidence of peer review must be provided)

(ii) Non peer-reviewed Publications

These will be considered by eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department, although they will be weighted less heavily than those identified in (i). These may include, but are not limited to:

- Audio-visual programs
- Regular columns in journals
- Articles in non-refereed journals
- Letters to editor and book reviews
- Monographs and abstracts
- Editor and/or author of a book

(iii) Presentations at Scientific or Professional Meetings (including poster sessions)

- In general, papers or posters presented at professional meetings will be weighted as follows:
 - International > National > Regional > State-Local
 - Invited > Submitted
 - Original Work > Review Paper
- Abstracts are considered only as adjuncts to papers presented and not as publications and should **not** be listed under publications.
- Attendance at meetings is **not** considered evidence of scholarship.

(iv) Grants and Contracts / Creative Endeavors

- In general, grants and contracts will be weighted as follows:
 - Funded > Under review
 - Competitive peer-reviewed > research grant from government/foundations/commercial entities not employing rigorous methods to ensure peer review > non-competitive training/service contracts or sub-contracts to research grants
 - Principal Investigator > Co-Investigator > Collaborator
 - Full Grants > Starter Grants
 - Outside Extramural Agency Grants > Intramural Grants (within University)
 - Creative Grants > Service Grants
- Grants or contracts in preparation will **not** be considered.
- Consideration will be given to percentage of time devoted to project and responsibilities of the investigator.

-
- A consultant role is **not** considered as part of grants and contracts. Instead, it should be placed in the outreach category.
- (v) Copyrighted, patented, licensed, and other works
- In general, intellectual property will be weighted by as follows:
 - International > National > Regional > State-Local impact and significance
 - Individual > research group > collaborating group percent contribution
 - Submission for a copyright, for provisional or full patent, or of a licensed work will be considered during the evaluation period
 - Evidence for issuance of a full U.S. patent , commercial licensure, listing of a copyright and trademark will be weighted more than evidence of submission during the evaluation period

c. Criteria for Research/Creative Works

The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department has developed the following criteria for determining “Acceptable,” “Excellence” and “Highest Distinction.” These criteria vary depending upon whether the promotion is from Assistant to Associate or Associate to Full Professor, since the extent of activity would differ for candidates at these two different levels. See attachment Appendices B & C which provide these criteria in tabular form. Not all data is required in either appendix for promotion to Associate or Full Professor.

All candidates must meet the requirements in each rating category outlined below. Evidence of professional honors or awards that confers local recognition for research/creative efforts will be considered but is not required. When present, honors and awards will be considered in the determination of “Acceptable,” “Excellence” and “Highest Distinction” in addition to the areas listed below:

- publications in refereed journals,
- presentations,
- grants and contracts
- **intellectual property, copyrights, and patents**

The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department will assess the importance and quality of scholarly work by considering the target audience, the standing of the journal or book, the rigor of the review process, the type of publication, and the impact of the work. For example, consideration is given to the quality of books, chapters or articles and the audience reached. Specifically, as to chapters in books or textbooks the following should be considered: importance of the book; standards applied in selection of authors; review-type material or new data or new conceptual/theoretical formulations; standing of the publisher; professional reactions to the book including reviews; and, the level of use of the book (instructional, advance, scholarship, etc.).

Concerning articles or essays in refereed journals, the following need be addressed: the primary target audience; the standing of the journal in the discipline or profession; if reviewed, the rigor of the review process; the method for selecting articles, if not reviewed; the scope of the paper - review, scholarly, or a form of public service activity.

3. Evaluation of Outreach

a. Procedure

(i) Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality of the candidate's activity in outreach. The faculty has developed a universal list of outreach activities that will be given consideration under the outreach requirements for promotion and/or tenure.

(ii) Evaluation Mechanism

1. The candidate is to prepare a list and a description of his/her past and current outreach activities.
2. The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department will use this information along with the information provided by the Department Head to rate the candidate's outreach performance as "Acceptable," "Excellence" and "Highest Distinction."

b. Areas of Evaluation

The following areas of evaluation have been selected to reflect the candidate's contribution to outreach in the form of professional achievement, innovative practices, and the dissemination of professional information to peers and other professionals.

(i) Community engagement:

1. Evidence of development and maintenance of new or innovative types of pharmacy services
2. Evidence that activity has had or continues to have demonstrable effect on health care outcomes
3. Evidence that activity has influenced the nature of other types of health care delivery (e.g., prescribing of physicians or medication administration by nurses) toward more optimal delivery of health care
4. Evidence that activity has led directly to the establishment of new standards of patient care

-
5. Evidence of application of collaborative and translational activities within his/her daily practices and/or area of expertise that specifically improves patient care outcomes.
 6. Evidence of participation in the development of health care policies or improvements in drug-use programs and processes (e.g., quality of service-related outcomes)
 7. Evidence of national recognition in his/her area of expertise
 8. Evidence of faculty engagement in solutions of community-based problems consistent with his/her expertise.

(ii) Presentations and Publications:

1. Presentations to health professionals, including HSOP-sponsored continuing education programs
2. Publications in appropriate journals as well as the less formalized print or electronic media (i.e., organizational or institutional newsletters)
3. Television, radio, or personal appearances and presentations relevant to pharmacy for the lay public, pharmaceutical sciences, or social and administrative sciences groups.

(iii) Other activities

1. Pharmacy-related community service projects
2. Non-school lectures or teaching or individual consultation to lay groups in areas relevant to areas of professional expertise
3. Volunteer outreach clinical activities
4. Education or Healthcare Planning Programs
5. Testifying at public hearings

c. Criteria for Evaluation

The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department has developed the following criteria for determining “Acceptable,” “Excellence” and “Highest Distinction.” These criteria vary depending upon whether the promotion is from Assistant to Associate or Associate to Full Professor, since the extent of activity would differ for candidates at these two different levels. See attachment Appendices D & E which provide these criteria in tabular form.

4. Evaluation of Service (i.e., Citizenship)

a. Procedure

(i) Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in service areas. The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department has developed a list of areas that will be given consideration under the service requirements for tenure and/or promotion. These areas, along with the criteria for evaluation, are discussed later in this section.

(ii) Evaluation Mechanism

1. The candidate is to prepare a list and a description of his/her past and current service activities.
2. The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department will use this information along with the information provided by the candidate's Department Head and/or the appropriate Chairpersons of committees on which the candidate has served to rate the candidate's service performance as being acceptable, having "Acceptable," "Excellence" and "Highest Distinction."

b. Areas of Evaluation

The following areas of evaluation have been selected to reflect the candidate's service to the Department, School, University, the candidate's profession, disciplines outside the candidate's own profession and the community. The following are presented as examples. Thus, evidence of service may include, but is not limited to the following:

(i) Service to the University, School, and/or Departments

1) Assignments

- Standing Committees and Subcommittees
- Ad Hoc Committees
- Committee/Task Force memberships
- Committee chairmanships
- Search Committees for recruitment of faculty, residents, and students
- Residency coordination
- Faculty senate membership
- Advisor of student organizations or students in academic difficulty
- Graduate Program Officer

2) Administrative Service

- Assistant or Associate Dean
- Department Head
- Department Programs Director (Administrative assignment)

(ii) Service to the Candidate's Profession

-
- Local, state, or national board activities (including preparation of board questions or evaluation of instruments)
 - Leadership positions held in professional societies or associations
 - Committee activities in professional societies or associations
 - Organization/coordination of local, state, or national programs or meetings
 - Membership on state, regional, or national review panels, study sections, councils, etc.
 - Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities
 - Leadership in the development of continuing professional education programs for personnel in the field
 - Membership on site visit teams
 - Consulting is considered service, provided the individual person is being called upon as an individual or a member of a group, i.e., Commission, Task Force, Advisory Committee, Study Section. Serving as a Chairperson of such a group is highly valued. Consultation can include advising governmental agencies, industry, professional groups, or testimony in court.

c. Criteria for Service

The eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department has developed the following criteria for determining acceptable, excellence and highest distinction. These criteria vary depending upon whether the promotion is from the Assistant to Associate Professor or from the Associate to Full Professor level since the extent of service activity would differ for candidates of these two different levels. See the Appendices F and G, which provide these criteria in tabular form.

5. Evaluation of Collegiality

a. Procedure

(i) Purpose

In appraising a candidate's collegiality, department members should keep in mind that the successful candidate for tenure and/or promotion will assume what may be an appointment of 30 years or more in the department.

(ii) Definition

Collegiality can be defined as the ability for an individual to work productively with faculty, students, colleagues, staff members, and constituents in all University environments as it relates to teaching, scholarship, outreach, and service. Collegiality encompasses the basics of the professional ethics of the

academic world: respect for persons, integrity of intellectual inquiry, concern for the needs and rights of students and clientele, and awareness of workplace safety.

b. Evaluation

Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability, but rather as the professional criterion relating to the individual's performance of his or her duties within an academic unit that are compatible and consistent with the unit's mission and long-term goals. Collegiality is a basic expectation of all employees and is essential in maintaining or improving the academic quality of an institution. Each faculty member must interact with colleagues with civility and professional respect. All should exhibit an ability and willingness, when appropriate, to engage in shared academic and administrative tasks that a department group must often perform, and participate with some measure of reason and knowledge in discussions germane to department policies and programs. Demonstration of a record of non-cooperation and/or inconsistent participation in departmental tasks, policies, and programs is considered unacceptable.

Concerns respecting collegiality should be shared with the candidate as soon as they arise; they should certainly be addressed in the annual review and the third year review. Faculty members should recognize that their judgment of a candidate's collegiality will carry weight with the eligible voting faculty for P&T within the department.

APPENDIX A. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Items 1-6 represent minimum criteria for the rating of “Acceptable” in teaching. To achieve a rating of “Acceptable”, all applicable categories must be rated as “agree”. Item 5 is only applicable to members of the graduate faculty. Item 6 is only applicable to course and sequence coordinators. In addition to 1-6, items 7-13 represent criteria that will be considered toward a ranking of “Excellence” or “Highest Distinction” in teaching.

Criteria <i>The faculty member:</i>	Examples of Data Sources	Notes	Rating Agree/disagree
1. employs teaching methods and methods of presentation consistent with the educational philosophy of HSOP	teaching philosophy, standardized students evaluations (mandated core questions plus course specific questions), formative peer faculty evaluations, outcome assessment data, HSOP course reviews, formative (change in text above) portfolio submissions and the annual faculty performance appraisal.	individual students vs. small group vs. lecture vs. laboratory, etc.	
2. employs evaluations that: a. reflect the objectives of the course (or rotation, unit, activity) b. are appropriate to the objectives, content and skills being evaluated	copies of evaluations (i.e., test questions matched back to objectives, copies of test question format [multiple choice vs. short answer]) peer review evaluations, HSOP course reviews, IP Block debriefings, formative portfolio submissions		
3. speaks in a manner that is appropriate to the level of knowledge/ability of the students	observation by peer review committee; student evaluations		
4. provides up-to-date instructional materials and is knowledgeable in the area of instruction or proficient in clinical skills	copies of teaching materials; HSOP course review, Peer Review Committee, standardized students evaluations (mandated core questions plus course specific questions)		
5. when applicable, mentors and/or serves on Master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation committees as primary advisor or committee member	candidate’s dossier		
6. when applicable, faculty member coordinates the evaluation of teaching	candidate’s dossier	Faculty should receive credit for conducting assessment of teaching in a course/unit in	

activities and provides feedback to participants in those activities		such a manner that they can and do provide constructive feedback to other faculty participating in the course/unit	
--	--	--	--

7. assumes responsibility for improving instructional and/or training programs through: a. designing/redesigning courses or units within courses based upon need b. developing new programs such as residencies and fellowships	in teaching section of dossier, formative portfolio submissions, note innovations undertaken		
8. participates in and facilitates coursework offered by other Schools in which you have provided instruction at Auburn University or other academic institutions [elective collaborative teaching efforts beyond assigned teaching responsibilities]	teaching section of dossier, statements from peer reviewers, associate Dean, Department Head or Associate Department Head, or PEC Steering	Faculty should receive credit for participating in career development and planning course/activities	
9. provides leadership in the development of teaching skills among faculty	candidate's dossier	Faculty receive credit for undertaking self development in the areas of teaching <u>and</u> sharing what they have learned with other faculty, in order to aid the overall development of teaching within the faculty	
10. develops innovative techniques or methods for instruction and evaluation/assessment	presentation of materials in teaching package provided to peer review committee; authorship of educationally focused lectures, presentations, publications; in teaching section of dossier, note innovations undertaken		
11. advises and assists student organizations or students on academic probation	statement from Associate Dean; teaching section of dossier		
12. receives awards or honors for teaching or educational accomplishments	dossier		
13. students/residents/fellows present research conducted under the supervision of a faculty member at local/national professional or scientific meetings	papers read at scientific or professional meetings section of dossier		

Overall Impact Select one of the following: "Acceptable" "Excellence" "Highest Distinction"			
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX B. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP - PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR*

	ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
Publications	Evidence of peer-reviewed publications	Evidence of peer-reviewed publications in recognized prestigious journals in the field*	As in excellence, but with evidence of impact in research in the field
Presentations	Evidence of activity beyond state or local levels	Original work or area of expertise which is delivered as an invited presentation at the national level; invited seminars at a University	As in excellence but, in addition, invited original work or area of expertise at the international level
Grants and Contracts	Evidence of submission of extramural grant applications or securing intramural funding, of which the individual is principal investigator or co-investigator	Evidence of activity with at least one grant or contract funded by an extramural agency with a rigorous review process, of which the individual is principal investigator	As in excellence and with at least one full grant (i.e., NSF, or equivalent of other federal agencies) of a creative nature funded by an extramural agency with rigorous review process, of which individual is principal investigator
Honors and Awards	Has received a professional honor or award that confers local recognition for research/creative (i.e., scholarly) efforts	Has received a professional honor or award that confers statewide or regional recognition for research/creative (i.e., scholarly) efforts	Has received a professional honor or award which confers national or international recognition for research/creative (i.e., scholarly) efforts or has received multiple honors and/or awards at any level
Sustainability of focused research	Evidence of development of expertise and recognition in a defined area of scholarly program	Evidence consistent with his/her sustained scholarly program	Evidence of a sustainable* career path recognized as a result of his/her scholarly program
Copyrighted, Patented, Licensed, or Other Works	Evidence of submission for a copyright, submission of provisional or full patent application or	Evidence of copyright or licensed work with potential for regional significance; evidence of a major percent contribution to the development of intellectual property;	Evidence of copyright, patent, or licensed work with potential for national or international significance; evidence of a major percent contribution to the development of intellectual property; evidence for issuance of a full U.S.

	submission of a licensed work or trademark	evidence for issuance of a full U.S. patent; evidence of commercial licensure of a full U.S. patent; listing of a copyright and trademark by the candidate	patent; evidence of commercial licensure of a full U.S. patent; listing of a copyright and trademark by the candidate
--	--	--	---

*The weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP. For example, evidence of copyrights, patents, or other licensed works may carry more weight toward promotion in one department versus another. Sustainability is defined as evidence of extramural funding to sustain independent research program and demonstrate a significant impact on science of discipline at a national/international level. Each department maintains a list of acceptable journals in which faculty are encouraged to publish.

APPENDIX C. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP – PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR*

	ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
Publications	Evidence of continued activity in peer-reviewed publications	Evidence of peer-reviewed publications in recognized prestigious journals in the field*	As in excellence, but with evidence of impact in research in the field
Presentations	Evidence of continued activity beyond state or local levels	Original work or area of expertise which is delivered as an invited presentation at the national level; invited seminars at a University	As in excellence but, in addition, invited original work or area of expertise at the international level
Grants and Contracts	Evidence of submission of extramural grant applications or securing intramural and/or extramural funding, of which individual is principal investigator or co-investigator	A record of continuing extramural research support. At least one grant or contract approved by an extramural agency with a rigorous review process, of which individual is principal investigator	As in excellence and with at least one active full grant (i.e., NSF, or equivalent of other federal agencies) of a creative nature funded by an extramural agency with rigorous review process, of which individual is principal investigator
Honors and Awards	Has received a professional honor or award that confers local recognition for scholarship efforts	Has received a professional honor or award that confers statewide or regional recognition for scholarship efforts	Has received a professional honor or award which confers national or international recognition for scholarship efforts or has received multiple honors and/or awards at any level
Sustainability of focused research	Evidence of development of expertise and recognition in a defined area of scholarly program.	Evidence consistent with his/her sustained scholarly program	Evidence of a sustainable career path recognized as a result of his/her scholarly program
Copyrighted, Patented, Licensed, or Other Works	Evidence of submission for a copyright, submission of provisional or full patent application or submission of a	Evidence of copyright or licensed work with potential for regional significance; evidence of a major percent contribution to the development of intellectual property; evidence for issuance of a full U.S.	Evidence of copyright, patent, or licensed work with potential for national or international significance; evidence of a major percent contribution to the development of intellectual property; evidence for issuance of a full U.S. patent; evidence of commercial licensure of a

	licensed work or trademark	patent; evidence of commercial licensure of a full U.S. patent; listing of a copyright and trademark by the candidate	full U.S. patent; listing of a copyright and trademark by the candidate
--	----------------------------	---	---

*Not all criteria are applicable to all departments within HSOP; hence evidence in each category is not required for promotion. In addition, the weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP. For example, evidence of copyrights, patents, or other licensed works may carry more weight toward promotion in one department versus another. Sustainability is defined as evidence of extramural funding to sustain independent research program and demonstrate a significant impact on science of discipline at a national/international level. Each department maintains a list of acceptable journals in which faculty are encouraged to publish.

APPENDIX D. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING OUTREACH – PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

<p>OUTREACH AREAS</p>	<p>The following represents examples of outreach activities and is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Thus, activities may include, but are not limited to:</p>
<p>Community engagement, Presentations, Publications, and Other Activities</p> <p>“Acceptable” Evidence of activity in <u>any</u> listed area</p> <p>“Excellence” Evidence of activity in > 1 of the listed areas</p> <p>“Highest Distinction” As in Excellence, but requires a consistent record of meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts on a national/international level.</p>	<p>Evidence of development and maintenance of new or innovative types of pharmacy services</p> <p>Evidence that activity has had or continues to have a demonstrable effect on health care outcomes</p> <p>Evidence that activity has influenced the nature of other types of health care delivery (e.g., prescribing of physicians or medication administration by nurses) toward optimal delivery of health care</p> <p>Evidence that activity has led directly to the establishment of new standards of patient care</p> <p>Evidence of application of collaborative and translational activities within his/her daily practices and/or area of expertise that specifically improves patient care outcomes</p> <p>Evidence of participation in the development of health care policies or improvements in drug-use programs and processes (e.g., quality of service-related outcomes)</p> <p>Evidence of receiving recognition (i.e., local, regional, national, or international) in his/her area for outreach efforts</p> <p>Evidence of faculty engagement in solutions of community-based problems consistent with his/her expertise</p> <p>Reports, oral presentations, or posters to health professionals, including HSOP-sponsored CE programs, at regional, national, or international venues</p> <p>Outreach-related publications in peer-reviewed journals leading to impact on a regional, national, or international level</p> <p>Less formalized print or electronic media publications (i.e., newsletters, videos) for the lay public or healthcare professionals</p> <p>TV, radio, personal appearances and/or presentations relevant to pharmacy for the lay public, pharmaceutical sciences, or social and administrative sciences groups</p> <p>Participation in pharmacy-related community service projects</p> <p>Provision of non-HSOP lectures, teaching, or individual consultation to lay groups in areas relevant to areas of professional expertise</p> <p>Volunteer outreach clinical activities</p> <p>Participation in education or healthcare planning programs</p> <p>Serving as an expert witness or testifying at public hearings in areas relevant to professional expertise</p>

APPENDIX E. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING OUTREACH – PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO FULL PROFESSOR

OUTREACH AREAS	The following represents examples of outreach activities and is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Thus, activities may include, but are not limited to:
<p>Community engagement, Presentations, Publications, and Other Activities</p> <p>“Acceptable” Evidence of activity in <u>any</u> listed area</p> <p>“Excellence” Evidence of activity in > 1 of the listed areas</p> <p>“Highest Distinction” As in Excellence, but requires a consistent record of meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts on a national/international level.</p>	<p>Evidence of development and maintenance of new or innovative types of pharmacy services</p> <p>Evidence that activity has had or continues to have a demonstrable effect on health care outcomes</p> <p>Evidence that activity has influenced the nature of other types of health care delivery (e.g., prescribing of physicians or medication administration by nurses) toward optimal delivery of health care</p> <p>Evidence that activity has led directly to the establishment of new standards of patient care</p> <p>Evidence of application of collaborative and translational activities within his/her daily practices and/or area of expertise that specifically improves patient care outcomes</p> <p>Evidence of participation in the development of health care policies or improvements in drug-use programs and processes (e.g., quality of service-related outcomes)</p> <p>Evidence of receiving recognition (i.e., local, regional, national, or international) in his/her area for outreach efforts</p> <p>Evidence of faculty engagement in solutions of community-based problems consistent with his/her expertise</p> <p>Reports, oral presentations, or posters to health professionals, including HSOP-sponsored CE programs, at regional, national, or international venues</p> <p>Outreach-related publications in peer-reviewed journals leading to impact on a regional, national, or international level</p> <p>Less formalized print or electronic media publications (i.e., newsletters, videos) for the lay public or healthcare professionals</p> <p>TV, radio, personal appearances and/or presentations relevant to pharmacy for the lay public, pharmaceutical sciences, or social and administrative sciences groups</p> <p>Participation in pharmacy-related community service projects</p> <p>Provision of non-HSOP lectures, teaching, or individual consultation to lay groups in areas relevant to areas of professional expertise</p> <p>Volunteer outreach clinical activities</p> <p>Participation in education or healthcare planning programs</p> <p>Serving as an expert witness or testifying at public hearings in areas relevant to professional expertise</p>

APPENDIX F. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE – PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The following represents **examples** of service activities and is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Thus, activities may include, but are not limited to:

ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
<p>Record of active service on standing Department, School or University Committees or Task Forces</p> <p>Record of membership in local, state or national professional associations; attendance at professional association meetings and documentation of volunteer service on committees</p>	<p>Active participation as a member of a major Department, School or University committee or as an advisor for student governance or student professional organization</p> <p>Active service on committees in local, state or national professional organizations</p> <p>Evidence of activity as a consultant with state, regional, or national professional societies, industry, governmental or regulatory agencies or groups. Examples of this may include NIH Study Sections, grant review committees, USP Committees, etc.</p>	<p>Active service as a Chairperson or provision of distinguished leadership as a member on a School/University Committee or Task Force</p> <p>Active service as an officer or Committee Chairperson in local, state, national, or international professional organizations</p> <p>Evidence of significant activity as a consultant with national professional societies, industry, governmental, regulatory or international agencies or groups. Examples of this may include NIH Study Sections, grant review committees, USP Committees, etc.</p>

APPENDIX G. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE – PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR

The following represents **examples** of service activities and is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Thus, activities may include, but are not limited to:

ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
<p>Continuing record of providing input to Department, School or University Committees or Task Forces</p> <p>Continuing record of membership and service in local, state, national, or international professional organizations</p> <p>Evidence of service activity as consultant to professional colleagues outside of the University relevant to areas of expertise</p> <p>Receives awards or honors for service to the University or professional organizations</p>	<p>Evidence of continuing active participation as a member of a major Department, School or University committee or as an advisor student governance or student professional organization</p> <p>Evidence of continuing service on committees in local, state, national, or international professional organizations</p> <p>Evidence of continuing activity as a consultant with state, regional, national, or international professional societies, industry, governmental or regulatory agencies or groups. Examples of this may include NIH Study Sections, grant review committees, USP Committees, etc.</p>	<p>Evidence of continuing service as a Chairperson or provision of distinguished leadership on a School/University Committee or Task Force</p> <p>Evidence of continuing service as an officer or Committee Chairperson in local, state, national, or international professional organizations</p> <p>Evidence of significant activity as a consultant with national professional societies, industry, governmental, regulatory or international agencies or groups. Examples of this may include NIH Study Sections, grant review committees, USP Committees, etc.</p>