

# Department of Pathobiology

---

## Table of Contents

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION .....	38
1. Journal Article .....	38
2. Conference Proceedings .....	38
3. Book .....	38
4. Book Chapter .....	39
OTHER PUBLICATIONS.....	39
1. Diagnostic Reports .....	39
2. Abstracts .....	39
3. Web and Electronic Resources.....	40
4. Advisory Report.....	40
PATENTS .....	40
PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE .....	41
1. Teaching.....	41
2. Professional Service and Leadership Activities .....	41
3. Platform Presentations .....	41
4. Competitive Awards and Honors .....	42
5. Grant Reviewer .....	42
6. Invited Lectures.....	42
7. Journal Reviewer .....	43
8. Poster Presentations .....	43
9. Expert Testimony .....	43
10. Specialty Board Certification.....	43
FUNDED ACTIVITIES.....	44
1. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts .....	44
2. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts .....	44

## PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION

**1. Journal Article** - Authorship of peer-reviewed journal articles is a core indicator of scholarship. In some cases, significance can be determined statistically (journal impact factor or citation index) or by an assessment of appropriateness of the journal's target audience relative to article's subject matter. It is important to recognize that some publications are intended for focused readership; therefore, impact factors or citation indices might be poor indicators of actual impact on the intended audience. Such situations should be explained by the candidate and/or department head. Full research articles often represent the product of a sustained research effort, and may represent a more extensive scope than a brief report. Case reports and case-series reports are often the foundation of clinical or diagnostic scholarship. First authorship, senior authorship, and corresponding authorship carry equal significance. The significance of co-authorship should be defined in the dossier by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Co-authorship on a peer-reviewed publication of any type.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary, senior, or corresponding authorship on a brief report or single case study.</li> <li>Co-authorship on a full length manuscript or case series.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary or senior authorship on a full length manuscript or case series.</li> </ul>

**2. Conference Proceedings** - Authorship of contributions to conference proceedings can be voluntary or an invited activity that indicates a degree of professional recognition associated with distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance is validated by the inclusion of peer review (e.g. by a session chair or moderator), the scope of attendance at the conference (regional, national, or international), and the extent of circulation of the proceedings.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary authorship of a peer-reviewed contribution with regional distribution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary authorship on an invited peer-reviewed contribution with national or international distribution.</li> </ul>

**3. Book** - Authorship or editorship of a published book or textbook is generally recognized as an indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Shared authorship can carry equal significance if roles are evenly distributed. Significance can be gauged by the type of book (an authoritative professional resource vs. a review of the current state of knowledge), the scope of distribution or adoption (regional vs. national/international), the intended audience (public vs. professional), and the extent of professional acceptance (numbers of peer citations or published copies). For books in press, a contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the book, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A book serving as a review of other authoritative works.</li> <li>Intended for distribution to public readership, regional distribution and adoption.</li> <li>Narrow impact on a field.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An authoritative work and comprehensive review.</li> <li>Intended for professional or professional student audiences.</li> <li>National/international distribution and adoption.</li> <li>Many citations or adoptions.</li> <li>Broad impact on a field.</li> </ul>

**4. Book Chapter** - Authorship of a book chapter is usually an invited professional contribution which reflects national or international recognition; therefore, it is a good indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance can be gauged by the same criteria as those specified above for book authorship. For book chapters in press, a contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the chapter, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A chapter serving as a review of other authoritative works.</li> <li>• Intended for distribution to public readership.</li> <li>• Regional distribution and adoption.</li> <li>• Relatively few citations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An authoritative work and comprehensive review.</li> <li>• Intended for professional or professional student readership.</li> <li>• National/international distribution and adoption.</li> <li>• Extensive citations.</li> </ul>

## OTHER PUBLICATIONS

**1. Diagnostic Reports** - A diagnostic report is a confidential document that exerts a major impact on a clinician's management of a patient. Diagnostic reports are the final product of clinical diagnostic activities in anatomic pathology, clinical pathology, microbiology, molecular diagnostics, and other diagnostic disciplines. Final reports, although not peer-reviewed documents, are regularly distributed to clinical veterinarians as an informational and advisory document for the treatment of patients. The scholarly value of these reports in the management of a case can be confirmed by peer diagnosticians and clinical veterinarians who receive the reports. A faculty member may elect to submit a collection of redacted reports for external peer review to establish distinction in scholarship. Impact and responsiveness in diagnostic activities can be documented in a promotion dossier by inclusion of selected diagnostic reports with a statement by the candidate on the importance of the selected report and letters from clinical veterinarians validating the report's impact on case management. All faculty who participate in diagnostic outreach are expected to provide timely, accurate, and responsive reporting.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timely, accurate, and responsive diagnostic reporting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timely and accurate reporting with the highest standards of responsiveness and interpretation based on knowledge of the current literature.</li> <li>• Incorporation of state-of-the-art research technology into a diagnostic service.</li> <li>• Board certification by a national organization in a clinical or diagnostic discipline relevant to faculty activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorship of a peer-reviewed publication of case-based material that reflects the highest national/ international standards in diagnostics, interpretation, and advancement of the field.</li> <li>• Participation on a national/international panel tasked with establishing universal standards for test performance/assessment of diagnostic samples.</li> </ul>

**2. Abstracts** - Authorship of an abstract indicates a transition between discovery and peer-reviewed publication. Abstracts are an appropriate method to deliver new information to peers, but they are usually published in conference proceedings with limited peer review. Thus, abstracts alone are indicators of expected scholarship while abstracts that precede published articles are indicators of distinction in scholarship. Service as first or senior author carries the most significance. The significance of co-authorship needs to be defined in the dossier by the candidate. Authorship or co-authorship of abstracts is expected of all faculty regardless of rank.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorship or co-authorship on an abstract published the proceedings of a local or regional meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorship or co-authorship of an abstract published in the proceedings of a national or international meeting.</li> <li>Significance is increased when similar data are published in a refereed journal article.</li> </ul>	Not applicable

**3. Web and Electronic Resources** - Web and electronic resources can be developed into a form of outreach scholarship with a potential for rapid national and international impact. The scholarly significance should be determined through *post-hoc* peer review and by documenting the extent of resource integration into classes and training programs through user surveys and quantification of usage (number of website visits). Adherence to institutional policies related to Web usage (e.g. Blackboard posting of course materials) is expected. The range of significance can vary from expected scholarship to scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adherence to departmental, college, or university policies related to Web and other electronic resources (e.g., Blackboard posting of course materials).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A resource that has been implemented as a component of a course or outreach program, receiving favorable user-review, positive <i>post hoc</i> peer-review, or documented usage (e.g., UGA's reports from the <a href="#">Clinical Pathology Clerkship</a>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A resource that has been nationally or internationally recognized as a unique contribution based on <i>post hoc</i> peer-review or documentation of broad usage (e.g., UGA's <a href="#">Noah's Arkive</a>).</li> </ul>

**4. Advisory Report** - An advisory report is a summary of a body of work presented to an authoritative audience (e.g. a committee's recommendation to a governing body, a scientific advisory document written to brief a board of directors, etc.). The significance of authorship of published reports is usually indicated by the scope and nature of the intended audience (*i.e.*, regional, national, or international; the broader the audience the greater the impact). Some reports are intended for smaller audiences, but they exert a major impact on the advancement of a scientific discipline (e.g. published report of a corporate advisory panel). Published reports are indicative of expected scholarship, scholarship with distinction, or scholarship with highest distinction, subject to assessment and validation by an external reviewer of the dossier.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorship on a report with focused readership or narrow impact at a local, state, regional, or national level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Authorship of a report with disseminated readership or wide impact at national or international levels.</li> </ul>

## PATENTS

The scholarship of invention reflects distinction or highest distinction. Significance is assessed by the scope of the patent, likelihood for national or international impact, role as a team member (principal inventor and co-inventor can carry similar weight with justification by the candidate) and

the status of the application (along the spectrum from disclosure of intellectual property to issuance of a patent).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inventor or key co-inventor of a disclosed technology or issued patent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inventor or key co-inventor of a licensed patent or a patent that has led to an extramurally funded project or commercial product.</li> </ul>

## PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE

**1. Teaching** - Peer-review of teaching is the core method to assess scholarship in instruction. Student reviews of teaching are also considered in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Distinction is usually reserved for teaching that incorporates scholarly approaches while highest distinction denotes the development and implementation of novel approaches and the demonstration of their effectiveness through publication. Effective teaching is required of all faculty members regardless of rank.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An organized delivery of accurate information with responsive participation (e.g., timely submission of course notes, grades, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge.</li> <li>A scholarly approach to teaching that incorporates reported effective techniques.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge.</li> <li>Development, implementation, and publication of novel scholarly approaches.</li> </ul>

**2. Professional Service and Leadership Activities** - Selection to serve in professional leadership roles is usually an indication of a record of scholarship ranging from distinction to highest distinction. Criteria include the scope of the professional body (local, regional, national, or international), the nature of the leadership role (e.g. president vs. program chair) and selection method (volunteer vs. appointment vs. election). A high level of professional service and leadership is expected of all faculty regardless of rank.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributor to the leadership of the department and college by actively serving on committees, attending meetings, engaging in discussion, and voting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderator or officer of a local or regional meeting (as a volunteer approved or elected by a larger body).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderator of a session of a national or international meeting (by appointment or invitation).</li> <li>Professional service as an elected national officer in a national or international organization.</li> </ul>

**3. Platform Presentations** - Platform presentations are those that deliver new findings to an audience of peers, usually after abstract submission. These indicate scholarship with distinction or scholarship with highest distinction. Criteria include scope of the audience (i.e., regional, national, or international), nature of the presentation (invited vs. self-submission of abstract) and duration/extent of the presentation. Faculty members are expected to regularly present platform presentations at departmental or college venues appropriate to their assignments.

<b>Expected</b>	<b>Distinction</b>	<b>Highest Distinction</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A platform presentation at a departmental or college meeting (depending on assignment; e.g. dept. research seminar series, Phi Zeta Day, etc.).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A platform presentation at a meeting based on an abstract submission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A platform presentation of special significance at a national or international meeting based on an invitation.</li> </ul>

**4. Competitive Awards and Honors** - The scholarly significance of competitive awards and Honors is assessed through the prestige of the award (indicated by the stringency of the selection process, level of competition, etc.), extent of recognition (regional, national, international), and placement (first place, second place, honorable mention, etc.). They usually reflect distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

<b>Expected</b>	<b>Distinction</b>	<b>Highest Distinction</b>
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recipient of a prestigious college, university, or regional award.</li> <li>Finalist for a prestigious national or international award.</li> <li>Recurring nominee/finalist for a college award.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recipient of a prestigious national or international award.</li> </ul>

**5. Grant Reviewer** - Selection to serve on a grant review panel is evidence of professional recognition within the scope of the granting institution. Thus, national or international panels acknowledge scholarship with distinction or with highest distinction, while local or regional panels acknowledge scholarship at the level of distinction. Quality of participation can be documented by the panel coordinator. Impact can be assessed by the stature of the funding agency and the association between the reviewer's expertise and the agency's goals.

<b>Expected</b>	<b>Distinction</b>	<b>Highest Distinction</b>
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewer for funding opportunities coordinated within Auburn University or the State.</li> <li><i>Ad hoc</i> member of a review panel for national/international funding opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full member of a review panel (e.g. study section member or scientific panel) for funding opportunities at the national or international levels.</li> </ul>

**6. Invited Lectures** - The impact of invited lectures is largely determined by the venue (e.g., a peer institution, a technical school, etc.). Lectures that reflect unique expertise in a topic are generally valued over those that are based on general knowledge. The quality of lectures may be assessed through traditional measures (student evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.).

<b>Expected</b>	<b>Distinction</b>	<b>Highest Distinction</b>
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An invited lecture delivered to another department or peer institution based on unique expertise in a field; should receive favorable student and peer review.</li> <li>An invited outreach lecture to the public or sector group on a general or special interest topic at the state or regional level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An invited lecture delivered at a peer institution as a part of a special lecture series or conference focusing on the presenter's area of expertise.</li> <li>An invited outreach lecture to the public or sector group on a general or special interest topic at the national or international level.</li> </ul>

**7. Journal Reviewer** - Selection to serve on an editorial board of a journal or to serve as an *ad hoc* reviewer is evidence of professional recognition. The scope of such recognition is generally reflected by the breadth and extent of the journal's circulation or its impact factor. Such recognition is indicative of scholarship at the levels of expected, distinction, or highest distinction. Determinants of impact would include number of reviews, extent of journal circulation (national or international) and the stature of the journal relative to the candidate's professional interests.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Ad hoc</i> reviewer of manuscripts in a professional journal with national/international circulation.</li> <li>Member of an editorial board for a national/ international professional journal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Service as primary editor for a national/international professional journal.</li> </ul>

**8. Poster Presentations** - Poster presentations at professional meetings are usually an indicator of expected scholarship, or in well documented cases, scholarship with distinction or highest distinction. When abstracts are voluntarily submitted for presentation at a professional meeting, peer selection for a poster presentation generally carries lower impact than a platform presentation; some exceptions are listed below. Criteria include scope of the meeting attendance (*i.e.*, local, regional, national, or international), the degree of stringency for selection of poster presentations (usually indicated by the session chair in the notice of poster assignment). All faculty are expected to contribute to presentations (poster or platform) at venues appropriate to their assignments.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribution to a poster (or platform) presentation at a local, regional, national or international meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A poster presentation at a national or international meeting. The presenter is in attendance to discuss the contents of the poster.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An invited poster presentation at a prestigious national or international meeting (<i>e.g.</i>, Gordon Conference, NIH workshop, USDA special session, etc.).</li> </ul>

**9. Expert Testimony** - This is evidence of esteemed professional reputation and indicates scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invited expert testimony.</li> </ul>

**10. Specialty Board Certification** - Certification by a nationally or internationally recognized professional college is indicative of attainment of a national standard, thus scholarship with distinction and national/international peer recognition of expertise.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board certification by a nationally or internationally recognized clinical or diagnostic specialty organization.</li> </ul>	Not applicable

## FUNDED ACTIVITIES

**1. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts** - Intramural support is defined as a source of funding that is awarded from within Auburn University (this includes Animal Health and Disease Research, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott-Ritchey Research Center, Interdisciplinary Grants Program, Breeden Awards, etc.). Roles on projects are the same as those described above under Extramural Grants and Contracts. Intramural funding is often used as a source of support for experiments that generate preliminary data in justification of a later extramural proposal. Thus, intramural funding for a project that precedes an extramurally funded project is evidence of scholarship with highest distinction. Intramural projects that lead to peer-reviewed publications are indicators of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an intramural project or departmental research.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PI or Co-PI on an intramural project.</li><li>Distinction is further demonstrated by peer-reviewed publication of results from the project.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PI or Co-PI on an intramural project that leads to extramural funding.</li></ul>

**2. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts** - Service as a principal investigator (PI), co-principal investigator (Co-PI), co-investigator (Co-I), collaborator, or consultant indicate scholarly contributions to a project (generally listed in decreasing order of distinction). The roles of PI or Co-PI carry the greatest scholarly impact. A major factor in determining scholarly impact is the scope of the funding entity (federal department, nationally recognized foundation, global corporation, state agency, etc.). Funding agencies with a broad scope reflect a more significant the scholarly contribution. However, certain disciplines rely on state or local funding sources to target the appropriate audiences in their outreach efforts. Some projects are appropriately targeted to large funding sources (NIH, NSF, USDA, corporations, etc.). Other projects are appropriately targeted to smaller funding sources (Morris Animal Foundation, Grayson Jockey Club, Winn Feline Foundation, etc.). While large grants and contracts are usually indicators of highest distinction in scholarship, smaller grants may carry equivalent distinction when targeted to the appropriate funding source. In such cases, justification for the selection of a funding source should be provided by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>General contributions to extramurally funded projects when relevant to assignment and area of expertise.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an extramurally funded project.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>PI or Co-PI on an extramurally funded project.</li></ul>

*Submitted by the Department of Pathobiology on April 1, 2010. Revised April 26, 2011.*