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1. Introduction

The University of Colorado Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS) is committed to the (i) development of outstanding scientists and pharmacists, (ii) creation of new knowledge and (iii) advancement of the practice of pharmacy. Faculty members are recruited that have the requisite attributes to fulfill these commitments and to serve the needs of the school and the department into which they are hired. The school promotes success of its faculty members through mentoring, establishing distributions of effort that balance the strengths of the faculty member with the needs of the school, the provision of infrastructural resources and annual appraisals of performance. The school expects faculty members to continue to grow as scholars and be productive, collegial members of its academic staff.

This document describes the expectations and standards that will be used by the SSPPS to evaluate candidates for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure. Committees of the faculty, at the department and school level, are charged with oversight of this process and with implementation of the procedures and standards for the faculty, as defined by the Regents of the University of Colorado and described herein. The mission statements of SSPPS and its departments (provided in Appendix A) serve as contexts under which faculty members perform their duties. These mission statements may change over time and will be revised as necessary.

2. Appointment

The SSPPS endeavors to meet its mission and promote the professional satisfaction of its faculty members by attempting to align the knowledge and skills of each faculty with his/her academic responsibilities. To accomplish these goals, a faculty member is appointed to one of seven faculty types (see 2b. below), consistent with those specified in the laws of the Regents, four faculty tracks exist within the SSPPS, viz. regular faculty, clinical teaching faculty, clinical faculty and research faculty. Candidates with appropriate academic credentials are appointed to positions on the faculty of the school based on their certifiable accomplishments and their ability to make contributions to the school's academic, clinical, research and/or service missions. The criteria for positions are summarized below.

2a. Terms

SSPPS has two types of faculty appointment: at-will and tenured. These are consistent with the laws of the Regents.
2a(i) **At-will** appointments are made for an indefinite period of time. The appointment can be terminated by the faculty member or the University at any time during the term of the contract (per section 24-19-104 of the Colorado Revised Statutes).

2a(ii) **Tenured** appointments are continuous until terminated by retirement, resignation or pursuant to laws and policies of the Regents.

The privilege of membership in the SSPPS Faculty Senate is accorded to faculty members with appointments ≥ 50% FTE. Only those faculty members in the regular and clinical teaching tracks have voting privileges.

2b. **Types**

For faculty appointments, the SSPPS has four main tracks, *viz.* regular faculty, clinical teaching faculty, clinical faculty and research faculty, and three more specialized lines, *viz.* adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturer. More detailed descriptions can be found in Regent policy 5L. Responsibilities and privileges accorded to each faculty track or line are summarized in Table 1.

2b(i) **Regular faculty** members contribute to the education, service, research and, where appropriate, patient care missions of the SSPPS. They are the only faculty members eligible for tenure.

2b(ii) **Clinical teaching track faculty** members contribute to the education, service and, where appropriate, patient care missions of the SSPPS. They participate in scholarly activities to a limited degree relative to regular track faculty.

2b(iii) **Clinical faculty** members are appointed on a part-time basis and are supported predominantly by non-general funds. They are health care professionals who primarily contribute to the patient care and/or experiential education missions of the SSPPS.

2b(iv) **Research faculty** members are supported predominantly by non-general funds. They primarily contribute to the research mission of the SSPPS through externally funded research and participate in education and service activities to a limited degree.

2b(v) **Adjoint faculty** members are appointed on a part-time basis and are supported predominantly by non-general funds. They support the education, research/scholarly activity, service and/or patient care missions of the SSPPS.

2b(vi) **Adjunct faculty** members are appointed on a part-time basis and primarily for a specific purpose to support one or several missions of the school,
e.g., on a course-by-course basis to support the education mission of the SSPPS. They are usually supported by non-general funds.

2b(vii) **Lecturers** are appointed on a part-time basis and are usually supported by non-general funds. They are hired to teach on a lecture-by-lecture basis to support the education mission of the SSPPS.

2c. Requirements

The faculty of the SSPPS supports the education, research/scholarly activity, service and/or patient care missions of the school. The extent to which an individual faculty member contributes to each mission is dependent upon the nature of his/her appointment. The scope of contributions for and privileges accorded to each faculty line/track are summarized in Appendix B. Specific requirements for appointment to each faculty title in each track are also provided in Appendix B.

2d. Process

Requests for appointment are initiated by a department chair (or designee). For appointment to instructor, senior instructor, adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty or lecturer, the department chair (or designee) will make the final decision on the appointment that will be approved by the dean. For all other appointments, a search committee will submit a recommendation to the department chair who will then develop a letter of appointment that will be approved and signed by the dean. The letter of offer will specify expectations for position responsibilities and the provision of salary support from the SSPPS and other sources, as applicable. Appointment of an existing faculty member to another faculty track requires approval of the dean and the provost.

3. Reappointment

Every SSPPS faculty member regularly undergoes review in accordance with University policies. Regular track, clinical teaching track and research track faculty members undergo annual review, a process that requires submission of a standardized annual report (SAR) (also known as the faculty report of professional activities, FRPA) to their department chair for evaluation (see Appendix C). This review serves as one of several considerations in the reappointment process. Clinical track faculty members are reviewed biennially and are not required to submit a SAR to their department chair. Instead, a record of their contributions to the clinical and education missions of the SSPPS are assembled by the faculty member’s department office in collaboration with the Office of Experiential Programs. The department chair (or designee) will
evaluate the clinical faculty member in the context of his/her activities in the previous evaluation period.

3a. Annual review

Evaluations of faculty performance are conducted regularly. The specific processes involved in review of faculty members in the four main tracks are summarized in Appendix C. A faculty member who does not agree with his/her annual review rating has a right to appeal (Appendix C)

4. Interim (or comprehensive) review after appointment to assistant professor

Each assistant professor in the regular, clinical teaching and research faculty tracks must demonstrate significant progress in all aspects of his/her academic responsibilities and also must show a commitment to work diligently to further the overall goals of the school. As such, in addition to annual reappointment reviews, an interim review for reappointment is conducted during the fourth year of the faculty member’s initial appointment as assistant professor (unless specified otherwise in the appointment letter or in a written agreement between the faculty member and his/her department chair and dean). The interim review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow a promising candidate to improve his/her record before undergoing evaluation for promotion to associate professor. The process for interim review of assistant professors in the regular, clinical teaching and research tracks is described in Appendix F. Clinical assistant professors do not undergo interim review.

5. Non-reappointment

All untenured faculty members are at-will. Non-reappointment applies to untenured faculty members and can occur as a result of changes in department program requirements or the failure of the faculty member to grow and develop as a productive member of SSPPS. It may also apply to assistant professors who receive (i) an unfavorable interim review or (ii) a recommendation against promotion to associate professor. Recommendations regarding reappointment are reviewed by the department chair and the dean.

6. Promotion

The school expects faculty members to continue to grow as scholars and be productive, collaborative members of its academic staff. Performance in
education, research/scholarly activity, service and, where appropriate, patient care are taken into consideration when reviewing a faculty member for promotion. Indicators and criteria for consideration of performance in these areas (as well as other factors that might have a material bearing on a promotion decision) are presented in Appendix G. Promotion decisions are based on summary evaluations of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and annual performance evaluations are one component of this process. However, promotion processes are separate and distinct from the annual review that begins at the department level.

6a. Standards

Each faculty member in the SSPPS is expected to strive for excellence in his/her areas of academic responsibility. Successful achievement of such standards are recognized and acknowledged by promotion. While the standards for promotion are constant and established by the Board of Regents, the criteria by which the standards are measured are dynamic in that they are subject to modification in response to the changing educational, research and patient care landscapes. Guidelines for these criteria are provided in Appendix G. It is important to recognize that requirements for the promotion of tenure-eligible faculty differ from those required for tenure. Specific standards for promotion to each faculty title in each track are provided in Appendix H (regular track), Appendix I (clinical teaching track), Appendix J (clinical track) and Appendix K (research track).

6b. Process

The processes associated with consideration for promotion vary according to the academic title (e.g., senior instructor or others) and the faculty track in which the candidate is engaged, e.g., regular faculty, clinical teaching faculty, clinical faculty or research faculty. For regular faculty members, consideration for promotion and an award of tenure are separate processes but they can occur together. Every candidate for promotion shall consult with and be advised by his/her department chair regarding the areas of performance that will be examined, the standards of performance that must be met, and the criteria that the department uses in reaching a decision about the candidate's performance.

Consideration for promotion is initiated by the candidate’s department chair and the review process is administered by the SSPPS personnel director in consultation with the candidate’s department chair. Independent of the academic title to which promotion is being considered, this process requires submission of a dossier by the candidate (see section 8a.). Information regarding timing and decision-making steps in the promotion process for each of the faculty tracks are provided in Appendix L. These processes have been developed to correspond with and follow policies established by the campus and the Regents.
6b(i) Regular faculty

For promotion to assistant professor, associate professor or professor, the initial review will be conducted by the department ARPT committee. This committee will convey its written review and recommendation to the department chair who will develop a letter of recommendation and submit it, together with the department ARPT review, to the dean. A secondary review will then be conducted by the Dean’s Review Committee (DRC) that will forward a recommendation to the dean. The dean will then write a letter of recommendation. Where differences of opinion between the department ARPT committee and the department chair, the DRC and/or the dean have occurred and have not been resolved, the dossier package will be referred back to the ARPT committee for re-review. The written recommendation of the ARPT re-review will then be processed as before. If differences of opinion continue to persist between the ARPT committee and the other levels of review, each party in the disagreement shall include a brief statement in the dossier outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in that context. All documents, viz. recommendations of the dean, the department ARPT committee, the department chair and the DRC and the candidate’s dossier, shall be forwarded first to the provost and then to the chancellor for review and approval. Promotion applications that receive dissenting votes during review within SSPPS shall be forwarded to the vice-chancellor’s advisory committee (VCAC) for a recommendation before being sent to the provost. Copies of all documents shall be maintained by SSPPS.

In making a promotion recommendation, the department ARPT committee and the DRC shall evaluate the candidate’s performance in the required areas, and shall also take into account other factors that have a material bearing on a promotion recommendation in that department.

6b(ii) Clinical teaching faculty

The process is identical to that described for regular faculty (see 6b(i) above) except that the dean’s decision is final and no further review is undertaken.

6b(iii) Clinical faculty

For promotion to clinical assistant professor, clinical associate professor or clinical professor, the initial review will be conducted by the department ARPT committee. This committee will convey its written recommendation to the department chair who will develop a letter of recommendation and submit it, together with the department ARPT review, to the dean. The dean (or designee) will then make a decision on the promotion. All documents, viz. recommendations of the dean (or designee), the department ARPT committee
and the department chair and the candidate’s dossier, shall be maintained by SSPPS.

In making a promotion recommendation, the department ARPT committee shall evaluate the candidate's performance in the required areas, and shall also take into account other factors that have a material bearing on a promotion recommendation in that department.

6b(iv) Research faculty

For promotion to research assistant professor, associate professor or professor, the initial review will be conducted by the department ARPT committee. This committee will convey its written recommendation to the department chair who will develop a letter of recommendation and submit it, together with the department ARPT review, to the dean. The dean (or designee) will then make a decision on the promotion. All documents, viz. recommendations of the dean (or designee), the department ARPT committee and the department chair and the candidate's dossier, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file in SSPPS and copies submitted to the provost for documentation purposes.

In making a promotion recommendation, the department ARPT committee shall evaluate the candidate's performance in the required areas, and shall also take into account other factors that have a material bearing on a promotion recommendation in that department.

7. Tenure

Faculty members in the regular track ranks of associate professor or professor are eligible for consideration for an award of tenure. Until the time of approval of this policy by the Regents, assistant professors hired into the tenure-track will have the option to continue under the tenure requirements of policies established when they were hired or under these revised policies. This decision will be made by the assistant professor who may be advised by his/her department chair. Faculty members in the clinical teaching, clinical or research tracks are not eligible for tenure. Consideration for promotion and an award of tenure are separate processes but tenure can be awarded at the same time as a candidate in the regular track is promoted to associate professor. The merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendations for award of tenure. No maximum time limit exists for an award of tenure; however, a faculty member who is turned down for tenure may not be reconsidered for a period of three years. Tenure decisions are based on an evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance.

7a. Criteria
The award of tenure will be reserved for those faculty members in the regular track who are among the best in their field of education and scholarly endeavor. The following three criteria must be met for a regular faculty member to be granted tenure:

i. An established record of excellence in research and scholarship that has led to a sustained history of publication and productivity arising from extramurally-funded original research/scholarly activity (Appendix G).

ii. An established record of excellence in, and dedication to, education that has resulted in a sustained history of innovation, publication or other achievements (Appendix G).

iii. A meritorious record of service.

Criteria used for these tenure considerations are provided in Appendix M.

In addition, the candidate should have demonstrated the capacity for providing sustained contributions to enhancing human knowledge and success in mentoring students, fellows, residents, graduate students and/or more junior faculty members. Professional/administrative service and/or clinical service will be weighed into any tenure decision. However, these activities are not an adequate basis for tenure in the absence of excellence in education and scholarship.

7b. Process

A candidate for tenure shall consult with and be advised by his/her department chair regarding the areas of performance that will be examined, the standards of performance that must be met, and the criteria that the department uses in reaching a decision about the candidate’s performance.

The process for a review for tenure is identical to the review for promotion of an assistant or associate professor in the regular faculty track except that all documents (viz. recommendations of the dean, the department ARPT committee, the department chair and the dean’s review committee (DRC) and the candidate’s comprehensive dossier) are reviewed by the vice-chancellor’s advisory committee (VCAC). Upon approval by the VCAC, all documents are reviewed by the provost, chancellor and president for approval and, as appropriate, presented to the Board of Regents.

In making tenure recommendations, the department ARPT committee and DRC shall evaluate the candidate’s performance in the required areas, and shall also take into account other factors that have a material bearing on the tenure recommendation in that department (Appendix G).
8. Faculty performance reviews

A variety of reviews are taken into account when a faculty member is being considered for promotion or tenure. The responsibilities of regular track and clinical teaching track faculty members and the chair are outlined in Appendix N.

8a. Dossier

A dossier is a means of documenting the professional achievements of a faculty member undergoing interim (comprehensive) review or a candidate applying for promotion or tenure. The candidate’s department chair will assist the candidate in developing his/her dossier. The dossier should be developed in accordance with current school procedures. Dossier materials required for (i) interim review or promotion review of regular and clinical teaching faculty (Appendix O), (ii) promotion review of clinical faculty (Appendix P), (iii) interim review or promotion review of research faculty (Appendix Q), (iv) tenure review of regular faculty (Appendix R) and (v) post-promotion or post-tenure review of regular and clinical teaching faculty (Appendix S) are provided in the respective appendices.

8b. Internal and external reviewer evaluations

Prior to department ARPT committee consideration, the department chair will solicit input from department faculty above the rank of the candidate. For a candidate seeking tenure, input will be solicited from tenured faculty members above the rank of the candidate or, for a professor seeking tenure, by professors with tenure. Faculty members will be invited to provide their letters directly to the chair of the department ARPT committee. These will be included in the dossier. It should be noted that these letters are not confidential and, as such, can be viewed by the candidate.

When a regular faculty candidate is undergoing interim review or applying for promotion or tenure, the department ARPT committee is required to obtain evaluations in writing from scholars external to the University who are qualified to judge the candidate. For a clinical teaching track or research track faculty candidate undergoing interim review or applying for promotion, the department ARPT committee will obtain written evaluations from professionals external to the SSPPS (but not necessarily external to the University) who are qualified to judge the candidate. Under all circumstances, external reviewers will be at or above the rank to which the candidate is being considered. Requests for evaluations involve the use of a solicitation letter from the chair of the department ARPT committee that follows the SSPPS-approved format. Selection of external evaluators shall be undertaken by the department ARPT committee. The candidate shall be given the opportunity to suggest possible evaluators and/or indicate specific scholars that the candidate feels should be excluded from consideration. Care will be taken to exclude any evaluator who may have a
conflict of interest, such as a dissertation director. A minimum of three external evaluation letters shall be required for interim review. A minimum of five external evaluation letters will be required for promotion and/or tenure reviews. The majority of reviewers must be other than those identified by the candidate. All letters received from external evaluators must be included in the candidate’s dossier. These letters must be treated as confidential and, as such, shall not be shared with the candidate. A department ARPT committee recommendation letter will include summaries of key comments by evaluators, with all identifiers removed to preserve confidentiality.

8c. Reviews of regular and clinical teaching faculty

Each regular and clinical teaching faculty member undergoes annual review by his/her department chair (or designee) in collaboration with the dean in the areas of his/her academic responsibility. The processes involved in annual review of faculty in the regular and clinical teaching tracks are outlined in Appendix C. Performance standards required for promotion in each track are specified in section 6a and appendices H and I. Performance standards required for tenure are provided in section 7a and appendix M.

8d. Reviews of clinical and research faculty

Each clinical and research teaching faculty member undergoes review by his/her department chair (or designee) in the areas of his/her academic responsibility. Reviews are on annual basis for research faculty and on at least a biennial basis for clinical faculty. The processes involved in annual review of faculty in these tracks are outlined in Appendix C. Performance standards required for promotion in each track are specified in section 6a and appendices J and K.

8e. Post-promotion review of clinical teaching and untenured regular faculty

The SSPPS expects its faculty members to continue to grow as scholars and be productive, collegial members of its academic staff. To promote continuing development, clinical teaching track and untenured regular track faculty members undergo post-promotion review (PPR).

8e(i) Process

After promotion to associate professor, every regular track and clinical teaching track faculty member will undergo PPR by the department ARPT committee every five years after his/her promotion. If there are concerns regarding a faculty member’s performance, a PPR may occur within the five year period at the discretion of the department chair and with concurrence of the dean. At the time of the PPR, the candidate’s dossier shall be forwarded to the department ARPT committee. A description of dossier materials is provided in Appendix S.
External evaluation letters are not required for PPR. The department ARPT committee will evaluate and determine the faculty member’s progress. The committee will write a brief report stating whether the candidate is meeting expectations or not. The report will summarize its findings regarding the faculty member’s:

i. adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present),
ii. meeting the department’s standards, and
iii. productivity and contributions to the University in education, research/creative work, service and, where appropriate, clinical practice.

The report is an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member’s contributions over the past five years to the department, the university, the community (where relevant) and the profession. The report will be forwarded to the candidate’s department chair who will develop and forward a recommendation to the dean together with the ARPT recommendation. The dean will then provide a summary report. A copy of the reports will be provided to the faculty member. Copies of both reports will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file in SSPPS.

Candidates for reappointment may receive specific advice about aspects of their performance that need improvement, although non-reappointment is also a possible result of the review.

8f. Post-tenure review of faculty

In accordance with University policy, a faculty member who has received tenure will undergo post-tenure review (PTR) by a PTR committee every five years after his/her receipt of tenure. If a regular faculty member has been awarded tenure, the first PTR will replace the PPR that may have been scheduled within five years of receiving tenure, i.e., the faculty member will not undergo PPR if tenure is awarded within the five year period required for PPR.

8f(i) Process

At the time of PTR¹, the candidate’s dossier shall be forwarded to the department PTR committee. A description of dossier materials is provided in Appendix S. External evaluation letters are not required for PTR. The PTR committee will evaluate and determine a faculty member’s progress. The committee will write a

---

¹ The PTR committee will be a sub-committee of the candidate’s department ARPT committee and comprise three tenured faculty members at or above the rank of the candidate. The committee members will be selected by the ARPT committee chair. Under circumstances in which the requisite number of qualified tenured faculty members are not available on the ARPT committee, the ARPT committee chair will appoint ad hoc members in consultation with the dean.
brief report and at its conclusion provide an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance using the standardized university rating system (Appendix D). The report will summarize its findings regarding the faculty member's:

i. adherence to the previous Professional Plan(s) (taking into account the differentiated workload, where present),

ii. meeting the department's standards, and

iii. productivity and contributions to the University in teaching, research/creative work, service and, where appropriate, clinical practice.

The report is an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member's contributions over the past five years to the department, the university, the community (where relevant) and the profession. The report will be forwarded to the candidate's department chair who will provide a letter of concurrence or non-concurrence to the dean, together with the PTR committee recommendation. A copy of the PTR reports will be provided to the faculty member. Copies of all reports will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file in SSPPS and submitted to the provost for documentation purposes. Under circumstances in which the faculty member receives a rating from the PTR committee that is less than “satisfactory”, the faculty member must meet with his/her department chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA, see APS5008). The PIA will include specific goals, time-lines and benchmarks that will be used to determine the progress of the faculty member in resolving identified deficiencies. A faculty member who does not agree with the less than “satisfactory” rating by the PTR committee may request a peer review of his/her performance record. This will be conducted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean. This involves submission of a written request to the dean within two weeks of receiving the PTR rating. The dean will refer the appeal to the VCAC which will make a determination to uphold the original rating or not. No action will be taken to begin a PIA until the appeal process, if invoked, is completed. This appeal process should be completed within six weeks of the date that it is initiated by the faculty member.

Under circumstances in which a tenured faculty member receives a “below expectations” or “fails to meet expectations” University rating in an annual performance evaluation, a triggered review will be initiated (see APS1003). This involves the faculty member meeting with his/her department chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and developing and implementing a PIA (as above). If the goals of the PIA are not met or the faculty member receives a second University rating of less than “satisfactory” within a five year period, he/she will be required to undergo an Extensive Review process (as specified in APS5008).

9. Department ARPT Committee
The Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) committee shall be appointed as described in the policies and procedures manual of the SSPPS. The membership of the ARPT committees of each department shall be forwarded to the SSPPS Director of Personnel each year in a timely manner to allow any tenure reviews to be completed in time for Regent consideration.

9a. Process

After receipt of the necessary documentation from the SSPPS personnel director, the ARPT committee will review the candidate and provide a recommendation that will include:

i. a description and evaluation of the candidate’s research/scholarly activity, teaching, clinical practice and service (as required by the department criteria),

ii. a statement describing the procedures followed and actions taken by the department in making the recommendation, including reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation (this statement must include the results of any vote taken for each area of responsibility in accordance with university policies and procedures in effect at the time),

iii. salient points of any external reviewers’ analyses (with care taken to maintain confidentiality),

iv. the findings of the interim or post-promotion review (PPR) (as necessary)

The ARPT committee vote and its recommendation on each promotion or tenure application will be forwarded to the department chair. A summary of interim and PPR findings will be forwarded to the department chair who will develop and forward a recommendation to the dean together with the ARPT recommendation.

10. Dean’s Review Committee

The Dean’s Review committee (DRC) evaluates promotion and tenure applications (as appropriate) of regular track and clinical teaching track faculty members and aids in the evaluation of recommendations forwarded by the department ARPT committees and chairs. The DRC shall consist of faculty members both from within and from outside the SSPPS. They shall be at or above the rank of the candidate under consideration and for evaluation of an application for tenure, they shall be tenured. The dean shall appoint members of the DRC and name its chair.

10a. Process

The DRC will review and vote on each promotion or tenure application and forward a recommendation to the dean. The recommendations of the dean, the
department chair, the department ARPT committee and the DRC, and the comprehensive dossier on the candidate shall be forwarded to the provost. For a regular track faculty member applying for tenure, the recommendations of the dean, the department chair, the department ARPT committee and the DRC and the comprehensive dossier will be forwarded to the vice-chancellor’s advisory committee (VCAC) for a recommendation to the provost, chancellor and president and Board of Regents. Should the dean or the DRC disagree with the recommendation of the department ARPT committee or chair, the dean will communicate the nature of the disagreement to the chair of the ARPT committee. The ARPT committee will then revisit its original judgment and convey its reconsidered judgment to the dean for his/her consideration and that of the DRC. Where differences of opinion between the department ARPT committee, the department chair, the dean and/or the DRC have occurred and have not been resolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in that context. These will be included in the dossier that is forwarded to the provost.
Appendix A:  Mission statements

School of Pharmacy Mission Statement

The University of Colorado SSPPS is a comprehensive institution of higher education committed to excellence in teaching, research and public/professional service in areas unique to the practice of pharmacy and to the pharmaceutical sciences. The school's professional educational programs have as their principal purpose the training of pharmacy practitioners who are compassionate, ethical and caring; scientifically knowledgeable and technically competent; skilled at communication and teamwork; motivated to pursue lifelong learning; and dedicated to fulfilling the public trust by assuring the safe, effective and efficient use of prescription and non-prescription drug products.

Department of Clinical Pharmacy Mission Statement

To advance the science, teaching, and practice of human pharmacology and therapeutics; to promote safe, effective, and economical pharmacotherapy in patients; and to advocate public health and disease prevention.

Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences Mission Statement

To perform outstanding teaching and research in the basic, translational and clinical sciences; to provide exemplary institutional and professional service; and to promote faculty growth and development.
Table 1: Responsibilities and privileges of faculty members in various tracks/lines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointment type&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SSPPS mission responsibilities</th>
<th>SSPPS faculty senate</th>
<th>tenure-eligible</th>
<th>sabbatical-eligible</th>
<th>unrestricted funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education/teaching</td>
<td>research/scholarly activity</td>
<td>patient care</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regular track</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(✓)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinical teaching track</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinical track</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research track</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunct</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjunct</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lecturer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> More detailed descriptions can be found in Regent policy 5L.

(✓) Optional responsibilities or source of funds (depending on the candidate).
Appendix B:  Appointment in faculty types and titles

Regular faculty

An individual appointed to this track has a significant role in fulfilling the education mission of the SSPPS. A regular faculty member is also expected to participate in research/scholarly activity, service and, where appropriate, patient care. He/she is a voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate. Only regular faculty members are eligible for tenure and for sabbatical assignment.

Assistant professor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate have a terminal degree and, with rare exceptions, advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. Appointment as an assistant professor requires that the candidate has demonstrated the potential for independent teaching, research and scholarly activity and, where appropriate, innovative clinical practice. The candidate must also have the ability to collaborate with colleagues in education, research and scholarly activities (when appropriate) and to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents, and/or graduate students.

Associate professor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for assistant professor and there is clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching, original research/scholarly activity, teaching, service and/or, where appropriate, innovative clinical practice. The candidate should also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents, and/or graduate students.

Professor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for associate professor and has demonstrated advanced academic maturity and achieved recognition as a national and/or international authority in his/her chosen field of study through the maintenance of an ongoing program of research/scholarly activity, teaching, service and/or innovative clinical practice.

Clinical teaching faculty

An individual appointed to this track is primarily involved in the teaching, service and/or patient care missions of the SSPPS. He/she may also participate in additional research/scholarly activity as defined by his/her department chair. However, this activity will represent only a minor part of his/her distribution of effort and evaluation. He/she is a voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate. Clinical teaching track faculty members are eligible for sabbatical assignment but are not eligible for tenure.
**Instructor, Clinical teaching:** A candidate must possess a terminal degree\(^2\). Appointment to this rank requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has experience in, or the potential for, independent teaching and/or contemporary clinical practice.

**Senior instructor, Clinical teaching:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for instructor, Clinical teaching track, and has demonstrated the ability to conduct independent teaching and/or contemporary clinical practice.

**Assistant professor, Clinical teaching:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for senior instructor Clinical teaching track, and, with rare exceptions, has advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. Appointment as an assistant professor, Clinical teaching track, requires that the candidate has developed a program of independent teaching, service and/or innovative clinical practice. The candidate should have the ability to substantially contribute to the mission area(s) of the SSPPS pertaining to teaching, service and/or clinical practice.

**Associate professor, Clinical teaching:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for assistant professor, Clinical teaching track, and there is clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching and established service skills and/or innovative clinical practice. The candidate should have a minimum of five years of service as an assistant professor. The candidate should also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents, and/or graduate students.

**Professor, Clinical teaching:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for associate professor, Clinical teaching track, and there is demonstrable evidence of advanced academic maturity and recognition for teaching, service and/or innovative clinical practice. There should also be clear and demonstrable evidence of significant, sustained contributions to the SSPPS in teaching, service, and/or patient care. The candidate should be an outstanding professional role model and have a minimum of five years of service as an associate professor, Clinical teaching track.

---

\(^2\) The term “terminal degree” will be qualified to the time at which the health care professional graduated. For example, pharmacists who graduated with a BS prior to the introduction of the entry-level Pharm.D. at their institution would be considered to have a terminal degree. Exceptions can be made at the discretion of the dean for health care professionals with extensive clinical experience.
Clinical faculty

An individual appointed to this track is primarily involved in the clinical and experiential teaching missions of the SSPPS. He/she may also participate in additional research/scholarly activity, teaching or service as defined by his/her department chair. However, these activities will represent only minor parts of his/her distribution of effort and evaluation. A clinical faculty member will be predominantly supported by monies other than general funds, e.g., employed by a non-SSPPS entity. He/she is a non-voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate and is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment.

Clinical instructor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate have a terminal degree\(^3\). Appointment to this rank requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has substantial experience in, or the potential for, contemporary clinical practice.

Clinical senior instructor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for clinical instructor and there is demonstrable evidence that the candidate has significant experience in the practice of contemporary clinical pharmacy and a record of substantial contributions to education programs of the SSPPS.

Clinical assistant professor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for clinical senior instructor and, with rare exceptions, has advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated the potential for innovative clinical practice and possess the ability to substantially contribute to the mission of the SSPPS pertaining to teaching, service, and/or research/scholarly activity.

Clinical associate professor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for clinical assistant professor and there is clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed an innovative clinical practice, engaged in independent scholarly activity and has also made significant and consistent contributions to the SSPPS in teaching, service, and/or research/scholarly activity. The candidate should have a minimum of five years of service as an assistant professor.

\(^3\) The term “terminal degree” will be qualified to the time at which the health care professional graduated. For example, pharmacists who graduated with a BS prior to the introduction of the entry-level Pharm.D. at their institution would be considered to have a terminal degree. Exceptions can be made at the discretion of the dean for health care professionals with extensive clinical experience.
**Clinical professor:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for clinical associate professor and there is clear and demonstrable evidence of significant, sustained contributions to the SSPPS in teaching, service, clinical service and/or research/scholarly activity. Clinical professors should be outstanding practitioners and professional role models. Candidates should have a minimum of five years of service as an associate professor.

**Research faculty**

An individual appointed to this track is primarily involved in the research mission of the SSPPS. He/she may also participate in teaching, patient care or service as defined by his/her department chair. However, these activities will represent only minor parts of his/her distribution of effort and evaluation. A research faculty member will be predominantly supported by extramurally-funded grants in accordance with his/her distribution of effort. He/she is a non-voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate and is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment.

**Research instructor:** A candidate must have a terminal degree and, with rare exceptions, advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate has developed the initial stages of a program of research/scholarly activity that has the potential for extramural funding.

**Research senior instructor:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate have a terminal degree and at least two years of advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. In addition, the candidate must have actively participated in and played a significant role in the design of a program of research/scholarly activity that has been extramurally-funded.

**Research assistant professor:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for research senior instructor and there is clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has the potential for extramurally-funded independent and collaborative research/scholarly activity. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. A candidate at this rank should demonstrate clear potential for progress to higher research track faculty positions.

**Research associate professor:** Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for research assistant professor and there is clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed an extramurally-funded program of original research/scholarly activity.
The candidate must also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students.

Research professor: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for research associate professor, has demonstrated advanced academic maturity and achieved recognition as a national and/or international authority in his/her chosen field of study through the maintenance of an ongoing program of extramurally-funded research/scholarly activity. The candidate must also have provided significant mentoring of post-doctoral professionals and/or graduate students.

Adjoint faculty

An individual appointed to this line is expected to support the education, research/scholarly activity, service and/or patient care missions of the SSPPS. He/she should be an employee of a major research institute closely affiliated with the University of Colorado, or with other agencies or institutions that offer courses or supervise academic programs without compensation above their regular salary. An adjoint faculty member will be supported by non-general funds, e.g., employed by a non-SSPPS entity. He/she is a part-time member of the faculty who is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment nor is he/she a member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate.

Eligible titles include assistant professor adjoint, associate professor adjoint and professor adjoint. The academic qualifications required for these titles are similar to those required of regular faculty (see 2c(i) above).

Adjunct faculty

An individual appointed to this line is hired for a specific purpose, e.g., on a course-by-course basis to support the education mission of the SSPPS. He/she has previously held the rank of assistant professor, associate professor or professor at a comparable accredited higher education institution. An adjunct faculty member is a part-time member of the faculty who is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment nor is he/she a voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate.

Eligible titles include assistant professor adjunct, associate professor adjunct and professor adjunct. The academic rank accorded an adjunct member of faculty will be equivalent to the last rank held by the candidate in a comparable institution. If a department chair believes a candidate’s qualifications and experience warrant an adjunct appointment (even though the candidate has not
previously held an academic title), the title of assistant professor adjunct normally would be applied.

**Lecturer**

An individual appointed to this line is hired to teach on a lecture-by-lecture, part-time basis. He/she is a part-time member of the faculty who is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment nor is he/she a member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate.

Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate be qualified to teach the particular content for which he/she has been hired. He/she may have graduate degrees and/or advanced experience in his/her profession or field of expertise.
Appendix C: Processes involved in review of faculty members.

An annual performance evaluation of a regular track, clinical teaching track or research track faculty member is conducted by the department chair (or designee, such as the department vice-chair) in collaboration with the dean. The evaluation process involves documentation of contributions to the missions of the school and the department through submission of a standardized annual report (SAR) to the department chair. The chair (or designee) will evaluate the faculty member in the context of the distribution of effort (DOE) established at the time of appointment (for a new faculty member) or at the end of the previous evaluation period. The DOE reflects the percent time a faculty member is expected to devote to education, research/scholarly activities, clinical practice and service in the coming year. For each activity category of the DOE, performance of the faculty member is evaluated and assigned a rating and an associated score. A composite performance score is then calculated and an overall SSPPS annual performance rating (APR) assigned. Performance rating categories, scores and calculations are described in Appendix D. The annual review rating process (as described in Appendix D) may be subject to change. Any changes will be subject to approval by the SSPPS faculty and the provost prior to incorporation into this policy.

Evaluations are based on performance standards developed by the departments and the administration and in accordance with written expectations agreed to between the faculty member and his/her department chair. The annual review takes into account the annual performance evaluation and provides the faculty member with specific information regarding his/her progress toward promotion and, as appropriate, tenure. Strong annual evaluations, however, are not the measure used to determine the award of tenure or a promotion in rank. A faculty member in the regular track is advised to also seek advice from mentors and other senior faculty members about his/her progress toward tenure. The overall APR of the faculty member contributes to decisions related to reappointment and merit salary adjustments. Further, the overall APR of an individual faculty member is subject to disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act. For this purpose, the performance ratings used in the SSPPS will be converted to the university standards as provided in Appendix D. Future changes in the SSPPS overall annual review rating process will be incorporated automatically into this policy.

A faculty member who does not agree with his/her annual review rating of “marginal” or “unsatisfactory” may request a peer review of his/her performance record by the department appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure (ARPT) committee. This involves submission of a written request to the dean within two weeks of receiving the rating. The dean will refer the appeal to the appropriate ARPT committee which will make a determination to uphold the “marginal” or “unsatisfactory” rating or not.
Untenured faculty

All untenured faculty members are at-will employees and subject to annual reappointment. For reappointment, a faculty member is evaluated in the areas of research/scholarly activity, education, service and clinical practice, as appropriate to his/her track (see Appendix E) and specified in his/her most recent DOE agreement. An overall performance review of at least “satisfactory” is expected to be achieved by the faculty member. A decision for reappointment will be based on the overall performance review and clear indications that the faculty member will continue to grow and develop as a productive and contributing member of the faculty. Program requirements of the department shall also be considered at the time of reappointment and these may influence reappointment decisions independent of the performance review of the untenured faculty member. A decision on reappointment is normally made by the faculty member’s department chair and with the approval of the dean. Recommendations for non-reappointment (see section 5) will be reviewed and authorized by the department chair and the dean.

Tenured faculty

Tenured faculty members are subject to annual performance evaluations in the areas of research/scholarly activity, education, service and, where appropriate, clinical practice. An overall performance of at least “satisfactory” is expected to be achieved by a faculty member. Under circumstances in which a tenured faculty member receives an annual performance rating of less than “satisfactory” (i.e., “marginal” or “unsatisfactory”), a triggered review will be initiated (see APS1003). This involves the faculty member meeting with his/her department chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and developing and implementing a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA, see APS5008). If the goals of the PIA are not met (as evidenced in the next annual performance evaluation after the term of the PIA) or the faculty member receives a second rating of less than “satisfactory” within a five year period, he/she will be required to undergo an Extensive Review process (as specified in APS5008).
Appendix D: Performance ratings and scores used for faculty annual reviews and university ratings

For each activity category of a faculty member's distribution of effort (DOE), his/her performance is evaluated and given a rating ("unsatisfactory", "marginal", "satisfactory", "meritorious", "excellent" or "outstanding") and assigned a rating score using the following rubric (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rating</th>
<th>score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outstanding</td>
<td>4.7 - 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>4.0 – 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>3.5 – 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>3.0 – 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>2.0 – 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0.0 - 1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the proportion each category contributes to the faculty member's DOE and the rating score achieved by the faculty member in each category, a composite performance score is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{composite performance score} = (\text{education % of DOE} \times \text{education score}) + (\text{research/scholarly activity % of DOE} \times \text{research/scholarly activity score}) + (\text{clinical practice % of DOE} \times \text{clinical practice score}) + (\text{service % of DOE} \times \text{service score}) + (\text{professional development % of DOE} \times \text{professional development score})
\]

The faculty member's composite performance score is then categorized as being "unsatisfactory", "marginal", "satisfactory", "meritorious", "excellent" or "outstanding" by using the following rubric (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>composite performance score</th>
<th>SSPPS APR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7 - 5.0</td>
<td>outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 – 4.6</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 – 3.9</td>
<td>meritorious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 – 3.4</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 – 2.9</td>
<td>marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0 - 1.9</td>
<td>unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rating then represents the overall SSPPS annual performance rating (APR) of the faculty member. This is converted to the standardized university rating as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSPPS APR</th>
<th>University rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outstanding</td>
<td>outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>exceeding expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meritorious</td>
<td>meeting expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>meeting expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsatisfactory</td>
<td>fails to meet expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university rating of each individual faculty member is subject to disclosure under the Colorado Open Records Act.
Appendix E:  Reappointment considerations in faculty tracks

Untenured regular faculty

All untenured regular faculty members are at-will employees and subject to annual reappointment. For reappointment, a faculty member is evaluated in the areas of research/scholarly activity, education, service and, where appropriate, clinical practice.

Clinical teaching faculty

All clinical teaching track faculty members are at-will and subject to annual reappointment. Clinical teaching faculty members are evaluated primarily in the areas of education, clinical practice and service.

Clinical faculty

All clinical faculty members are at-will and subject to reappointment on at least a biennial basis. Clinical faculty members are evaluated in the areas of education, clinical practice and service. The Office of Experiential Programs may also provide input regarding a clinical faculty member's performance.

Research faculty

All research faculty members are at-will and subject to annual reappointment. Research faculty members are evaluated primarily in the area of research/scholarly activity.
Appendix F:  *Process for interim (comprehensive) review of an assistant professor in the regular, clinical teaching and research tracks.*

The faculty member will submit his/her dossier (see section 8a) to the SSPPS personnel director for initiation of the process. The department ARPT committee will evaluate the dossier and determine the faculty member’s progress toward promotion (and potentially tenure for an assistant professor in the regular track) and report its assessment and a recommendation regarding re-appointment to the department chair. The department chair may be invited to meet with the ARPT committee and provide further details of the candidate’s performance during the interim review process. The review will include evaluation by external reviewers. Candidates for reappointment may receive specific advice about aspects of their performance that need improvement. Non-reappointment is also a possible result of the interim review. Recommendations for non-reappointment (see section 5) will be reviewed and authorized by the department chair and the dean.
Appendix G:  *Guidelines for faculty evaluation.*

**Education/teaching**

- Teaching effectiveness, as judged by student, peer, and self-assessments, and accompanied by an evaluation from the department chair.
- Quality of instructional materials or media used in the classroom, as determined by students and peers.
- Receipt of teaching awards as well as other regional, national and international recognition accorded teaching accomplishments.
- Evidence of teaching scholarship, such as publication of course materials, software programs and textbooks and the degree to which results are accepted by peers.
- Development of a new course, clinical rotation, or revision of an existing course.
- Ability to use examinations and grades to appropriately and equitably evaluate student performance, as determined by peers.
- Evidence of innovation that results in improvement in teaching effectiveness or determines that the innovation should not be pursued, as determined by students and peers.
- Receipt of an educational development grant or direction of an experimental educational program.
- Participation in the education of advanced degree professionals (e.g., Distance Degrees & Programs students, residents, fellows) and/or graduate students, including active engagement on graduate committees.
- Ability to recruit high quality graduate, postgraduate and post-professional students and to successfully guide them through their studies and place them in prestigious positions.
- Effectiveness in advising students, as determined by students and peers.
- Contributions to course operation, as determined by course director(s).
- Effectiveness in providing leadership in development and operation of courses, curriculum and/or educational programs.

---

\(^{4}\) This refers to (i) teaching in the traditional sense (e.g., in person, on-line, lecture, facilitating small group work, etc.) and (ii) education in the broader sense in relation to the enhancement of the quality of educational program offerings (e.g., education program development, renewal, assessment, policy making, etc.). Students include those involved in the Doctor of Pharmacy and graduate programs, as well as residents and post-doctoral fellows.
• Effectiveness in advancing the education mission of the school or university through, for example, development of new education programs or enhancements to existing education programs or development of new delivery methods for education programs.

• Obtaining new or additional resources to support existing or new educational programs.

• Renewing an education program by re-conceptualizing an existing degree or non-degree program.

• Utilization of assessments to improve education programs.

• Development of education policies that serve to enhance the quality of educational programs.

• Publications focusing on the scholarship of teaching and extramural grant funding for such scholarship.

• Active engagement in curriculum development or revision.

• Development or implementation of new technologies that aid the learning process, as determined by peers and students.

Research and scholarly activity

• Quality and number of publications including research articles, review articles, book chapters, case reports, letters to editor, etc. Emphasis will be placed on publication of original work conducted by the faculty member that is directly related to his/her work as a member of the faculty of the school.

• Establishment of an independent and sustainable extramurally-funded research program that generates high quality, peer-reviewed publications at regular intervals. (When considered for promotion and tenure, publications based on independent and original research projects initiated by the candidate are given more weight than publications based on research projects initiated in collaboration with a previous mentor. Independent and original components of collaborative research efforts, however, are encouraged.)

• Frequency with which published articles are cited by peers.

• Receipt of grants and contracts for clinical trials, scientific research and other creative endeavors, including patent application activity.

• Opinions of peer academicians from other institutions and other academic

---

5 Quality relates to the accepted quality of the journal in which the paper is published.
units of the University of Colorado.

- National and international recognition accorded research accomplishments as evidenced by:
  a. receipt of research honors and awards;
  b. election to membership and to officership positions in scientific organizations;
  c. invitations to serve on editorial boards of journals, government and scientific society groups, and grant review panels;
  d. invitations to organize and/or participate in scientific symposia
  e. invitations to present research seminars.

**Service (administrative, institutional, professional, scientific and public).**

- Participation in department functions and initiatives.
- Participation in school functions, student-sponsored programs and local professional activities, and the conscientious execution of department responsibilities.
- Willingness to accept leadership roles and to effectively perform special assignments.
- Extent and quality of department, school and institutional committee service.
- Extent and quality of participation in professional continuing education programs.
- Extent and quality of service to professional and scientific journals and organizations.
- Extent and quality of service on evaluative panels or teams, such as grant or protocol review panels, site visit teams, educational panels and academic program evaluation teams.
- Invited lectures or presentations.
- Consultation and public service.
- Evidence of leadership and effectiveness as an administrator.
- Professionalism/teamwork characteristics.

**Clinical practice/patient care**

- Attainment of board or other forms of specialty certification.
• Ability to provide high quality patient-specific pharmaceutical care, as evaluated by peers and supervisors, which promotes safe, effective and economical pharmacotherapy in patients and leads to better patient care and outcomes.

• Evidence of maintenance and enhancement of professional competency, e.g., through continuing education, conferences, and/or seminars.

• Evidence of service that increases the quality of experiential education.

• Service on committees or as a consultant in areas of recognized clinical expertise.

• Establishment of new and innovative types of pharmacy practices.

• Provision of education on pharmacotherapy related topics to pharmacists and other health care providers.

• Publication of case reports, clinical trials or other evidence of scholarship associated with clinical practice.

• Development of clinical practice initiatives or quality improvement programs.

• Attainment of extramural funding in support of clinical programs or initiatives.

• Establishment of new clinical contracts or programs for the school.

• Assessment and improvements in clinical programs.

• Enhancement of clinical programs through development of program policies or procedures.

Other factors

• Instances of formal disciplinary action, the reason for which may affect the candidate’s teaching, research/scholarly activity, clinical practice or service.
Appendix H:  *Promotion process and standards in the regular faculty track.*

In general, a candidate being considered for promotion is expected to achieve and maintain at least an excellent level of performance in his/her major DOE area of academic responsibility (education, patient care and/or research/scholarly activities) and at least a meritorious level of performance in his/her secondary area of academic responsibility during the period prior to his/her review for promotion. Promotion in the regular track is awarded only if there are clear indications that the candidate will continue to grow and develop as a productive academic scholar and provide sustained contributions to the missions of the SSPPS.

**Assistant professor:** Employment as an assistant professor in the regular track occurs by appointment and not by promotion. Accordingly, there are no standards for promotion to this rank.

**Associate professor:** Promotion to the rank of associate professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching and original research or scholarly activity, and where appropriate, innovative clinical practice. Distinction in service may supplement a record of teaching, research/scholarly activity and, where appropriate, innovative clinical practice. A rating of at least excellent by the department ARPT committee must be obtained in the candidate’s primary area of academic responsibility (as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate). It is recognized that the expectations for promotion decisions are not as rigorous as they are for tenure. Further, the candidate should be progressing towards a national presence in his/her area of expertise. While annual performance ratings are used to assess a faculty member’s general progress toward promotion, promotion is not based on achieving any particular rating. Annual performance ratings are not used as a primary evaluative tool for promotion considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary area of academic responsibility AND</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education/teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research/scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND progressing towards national presence in his/her area of expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standards of excellence will be established in the context of the following criteria:
If education is the primary criterion for promotion to associate professor, the candidate must have a record of ongoing highly effective teaching, involvement in educational program development and/or innovative activities marked by accomplishments in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix G).

If research/scholarly activity is the primary criterion for promotion to associate professor, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of scholastic productivity that indicates he/she is on the requisite path to becoming a recognized researcher/scholar. Such indicators may include publication in peer-reviewed journals (where the candidate is a contributing author, ideally the sole, primary or senior author), development of a national presence in a specific area of research, invitations to present research findings and the ability to obtain extramural research funding (where the candidate is the principal or co-principal investigator) (Appendix G). The expectations for funding are not as rigorous as those made for tenure considerations in that it may be more sporadic and/or derived from less competitive sources, e.g., local grants or non-Federal sources. Generally, the candidate’s research program should reflect a focus centered on a particular patient group, medical condition, therapeutic category, scientific concept or education innovation.

If clinical practice is the primary criterion for promotion to associate professor, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services. These activities should be documented by accomplishments in the scholarship of application that includes publication of peer-reviewed articles in journals (Appendix G). In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical practice performance.

Consideration for promotion to associate professor will normally be initiated once the candidate is in his/her seventh year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. This may be extended up to a maximum of ten years under unusual or unexpected circumstances and with the written approval of the candidate’s department chair and dean. In order to obtain an extension, the candidate should submit a letter to the dean (or designee) requesting an extension prior to the scheduled promotion review. The request will be referred to the department ARPT committee for a recommendation that will be considered by the department chair who will then render a decision. If the extension is denied by the department chair, the candidate may appeal to the dean. A shorter review period may be accepted only when the record of accomplishment is clearly worthy of promotion or as specified in a faculty member’s letter of appointment. Evaluation for early promotion should be a joint decision of the candidate, the department chair and the dean. Additional criteria or higher standards are not applied to candidates for early promotion. Further, an unsuccessful candidate for early promotion may reapply within the existing
promotion timeline. A faculty member who is not promoted to associate professor by the end of his/her seventh year of full-time service as an assistant professor (or later, up to his/her tenth year if a maximum three year extension is granted) will not be reappointed (see section 5).

Professor: Promotion to the rank of professor implies advanced academic maturity and evidence that the candidate has achieved national and/or international recognition in his/her area of expertise by maintaining an ongoing program of research or scholarly activity, teaching and/or innovative clinical practice. Annual performance ratings are only one of several evaluative tools in the promotion process. A rating of at least excellent from the department ARPT committee must be obtained in the candidate’s primary and secondary areas of academic responsibility (as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary areas of academic responsibility</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>education/teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>research/scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND national and/or international recognition in his/her area of expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standards of excellence will be established in the context of the following criteria:

If education is the primary criterion for promotion to professor, the candidate must have a substantial record of sustained, on-going, innovative activities marked by an extraordinary level of excellence in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix G). As a secondary criterion for promotion to professor, the candidate must have a substantial record of excellence in teaching as defined in Appendix G. The candidate’s teaching record must reflect continued growth and achievement since promotion to associate professor. There should be evidence that the candidate has provided meaningful mentoring of junior faculty. Ideally, the candidate will have demonstrated the ability to train advanced degree professionals and/or graduate students as evidenced by participation in an ongoing post-doctoral residency or fellowship training program and/or the advising and education of graduate students.

If research/scholarly activity is the primary or secondary criterion for promotion to professor, the candidate must demonstrate an advanced level of scholastic productivity with regards to original peer-reviewed scientific publications (where
the candidate is the sole, primary or senior author) and the ability to obtain ongoing extramural research funding (where the candidate is the principal or co-principal investigator) (Appendix G). There should be evidence that the candidate’s research productivity with respect to funding and publications has continued to grow since his/her promotion to associate professor. Generally, the candidate’s research program should reflect a focus centered on a particular patient group, medical condition, therapeutic category, scientific concept or education innovation.

If clinical practice is the primary or secondary criterion for promotion to professor, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services that have achieved national recognition for his/her contribution to patient care. These accomplishments should be documented by excellence in the scholarship of application that includes publication of peer-reviewed articles in journals widely recognized as among the top journals in their respective fields and acquisition of extramural funding to support development or maintenance of these innovative practices. In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical practice performance (Appendix G).
Appendix I:  

**Promotion process and standards in the clinical teaching track.**

In general, a candidate being considered for promotion is expected to achieve and maintain at least an excellent level of performance in each of his/her major DOE areas of academic responsibility (education and/or patient care) during the period prior to his/her review for promotion. Promotion is awarded only if there are clear indications that the candidate will continue to grow and develop as a productive scholar and provide sustained contributions to the missions of the SSPPS.

**Senior instructor, Clinical teaching track:** Promotion to the rank of senior instructor in this track requires the candidate has demonstrated the ability to conduct independent teaching and/or contemporary clinical practice.

**Assistant professor, Clinical teaching track:** To be considered for promotion to assistant professor in this track, a candidate must have a terminal degree and, with rare exceptions, advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. Promotion to the rank of assistant professor, Clinical teaching track, requires that the candidate has developed a program of independent teaching and, where appropriate, innovative clinical practice. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students.

**Associate professor, Clinical teaching track:** Promotion to the rank of associate professor in this track requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching, and/or innovative clinical practice. The candidate should have a minimum of five years of service as an assistant professor. A rating of at least excellent must be obtained in the candidate’s primary area of academic responsibility (as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate). For a candidate with an administrative title, the primary area of academic responsibility (non-administrative service-related) will be agreed upon by the candidate and the person to whom he/she reports. Should the candidate with the administrative title report to someone other than his/her department chair, the primary area of academic responsibility will be reported annually to the candidate’s department chair in the annual distribution of effort agreement. While annual performance ratings are used to assess a faculty member’s general progress toward promotion, promotion is not based on achieving any particular rating. Annual performance ratings are not used as a primary evaluative tool for promotion considerations.
The standards of excellence will be established in the context of the following criteria:

If education is the primary criterion for promotion to associate professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have a substantial record of on-going, innovative activities marked by a level of excellence in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix G).

If clinical practice is the primary criterion for promotion to associate professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services. In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical practice performance (Appendix G).

Consideration for promotion to associate professor in this track will normally be initiated once the candidate is in his/her seventh year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. This may be extended up to a maximum of ten years under exceptional circumstances and with the written approval of the candidate’s department chair and dean. In order to obtain an extension, the candidate should submit a letter to the dean (or designee) requesting an extension. The request will be referred to the department ARPT committee for a recommendation that will be considered by the department chair who will then render a decision. If the extension is denied by the department chair, the candidate may appeal to the dean. A shorter review period may be accepted only when the record of accomplishment is clearly worthy of promotion or as specified in a faculty member’s letter of appointment. Evaluation for early promotion must be a joint decision of the candidate, the department chair and the dean. Additional criteria or higher standards are not applied to candidates for early promotion. Further, an unsuccessful candidate for early promotion may reapply within the existing promotion timeline. A faculty member who is not promoted to associate professor, Clinical teaching track, by the end of his/her seventh year of full-time service as an assistant professor, Clinical teaching track, (or later, up to his/her tenth year if a maximum three year extension is granted) will not be reappointed (see section 5).

**Professor, Clinical teaching track:** Promotion to the rank of professor, Clinical teaching track, implies advanced academic maturity and demonstrable evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary area of academic responsibility</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>education/teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research/scholarship (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the candidate has achieved national and/or international recognition in his/her chosen field of study by maintaining an ongoing program of education and/or innovative clinical practice. The candidate should have completed at least five years of service at the rank of associate professor.

A rating of at least excellent from the department ARPT committee must be obtained in the candidate’s primary and secondary areas of academic responsibility (as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate). For a candidate with an administrative title, the primary area of academic responsibility (non-administrative service-related) will be agreed upon by the candidate and the person to whom he/she reports. Should the candidate with the administrative title report to someone other than his/her department chair, the primary area of academic responsibility will be reported annually to the candidate’s department chair in the annual distribution of effort agreement. While annual performance ratings are used to assess a faculty member’s general progress toward promotion, promotion is not based on achieving any particular rating. Annual performance ratings are not used as a primary evaluative tool for promotion considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and secondary areas of academic responsibility</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>research/scholarship (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>national and/or international recognition in his/her area of expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standards of excellence will be established in the context of the following criteria.

If education is the primary or secondary criterion for promotion to professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have a substantial record of sustained, on-going, innovative activities marked by an extraordinary level of excellence in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix G). The candidate’s teaching record must reflect continued growth and achievement since promotion to associate professor. There should be evidence that the candidate has provided meaningful mentoring of junior faculty. Ideally, the candidate will have demonstrated the ability to train advanced degree professionals and/or graduate students as evidenced by participation in an ongoing post-doctoral residency or fellowship training program and/or the advising and education of graduate students.
If clinical practice is the primary or secondary criterion for promotion to professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services that have achieved national recognition for his/her contribution to patient care. These accomplishments should be documented by excellence in the scholarship of application that includes publication of peer-reviewed articles in journals widely recognized as among the top journals in their respective fields and acquisition of extramural funding to support development or maintenance of these innovative practices. In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical practice performance (Appendix G).
Appendix J:  *Promotion process and standards in the clinical faculty track.*

In general, a candidate being considered for promotion is expected to achieve and maintain at least an excellent level of performance in support of the patient care, service and/or experiential missions of the SSPPS.

**Clinical senior instructor:**  Promotion to the rank of clinical senior instructor requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has significant experience in the practice of contemporary clinical pharmacy and a record of substantial contributions to education programs of the SSPPS.

**Clinical assistant professor:**  Promotion to the rank of clinical assistant professor requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has the potential for innovative clinical practice and the ability to substantially contribute to the mission of the SSPPS pertaining to teaching, service, and/or research/scholarly activity. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. The candidate should have completed at least three years of service as a clinical senior instructor.

**Clinical associate professor:**  Promotion to clinical associate professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of innovative clinical service and also made significant and consistent contributions to the SSPPS in teaching, service, and/or research/scholarly activity. The candidate must also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. The candidate should have completed at least five years of service as a clinical assistant professor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>AND</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clinical practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>education/teaching (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>research/scholarship (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
<td>evidence as meritorious professional role model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clinical professor:**  Promotion to the rank of clinical professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate is an outstanding practitioner and professional role model. There should also be evidence of significant, sustained contributions to the SSPPS in teaching, service, and/or research/scholarly activity, as appropriate. The candidate should have completed at least five years service as a clinical associate professor.
≥ excellence in: AND ≥ meritorious in:
clinical practice education/teaching (where applicable)
research/scholarship (where applicable)
service (where applicable)

AND evidence as outstanding practitioner & professional role model
Appendix K:  

Promotion process and standards in the research faculty track

In general, a candidate being considered for promotion is expected to achieve and maintain at least an excellent level of performance in support of the research mission of the SSPPS.

Research senior instructor: Promotion to the rank of research senior instructor requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has actively participated in a program of research and scholarly activity that has been extramurally-funded.

Research assistant professor: To be considered for promotion to assistant professor in this track, a candidate must have a terminal degree and, with rare exceptions, advanced postgraduate training, such as postdoctoral research, residency or fellowship. Promotion to the rank of research assistant professor requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has a potential for extramurally-funded, independent and collaborative research/scholarly activity. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students.

Research associate professor: Promotion to the rank of research associate professor requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed an extramurally-funded program of original research or scholarly activity. The candidate should have completed at least five years of service as a research assistant professor. He/she must also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. A rating of at least excellent must be obtained in the candidate’s area of research and scholarly activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research/scholarship</td>
<td>education/teaching (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND participation in training graduate student, fellow, resident and/or post-doctoral professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research professor: Promotion to the rank of research professor requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national and/or international authority in his/her chosen field of study through the maintenance of an ongoing extramurally-funded program of research or scholarly activity. The candidate should have completed at least five years of service as an associate professor. He/she must also have provided significant mentoring of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. A rating
of at least excellent must be obtained in the candidate’s area of research and scholarly activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>AND</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>research/scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td>education/teaching (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>service (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>significant mentoring of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>national and/or international authority in his/her chosen field of study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L: Timing of promotion and decision-making steps in faculty tracks

Regular faculty

Associate professor: Promotion to associate professor must occur once the candidate is in his/her seventh to tenth year\(^6\) of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. Decisions on promotion to associate professor will be made by the department ARPT committee, the department chair and the Dean’s Review Committee in consultation with the dean.

Professor: To be considered for promotion to professor, the candidate should have completed at least five years of service at the rank of associate professor. The decision to submit a dossier for review for promotion to professor will be made by the candidate's department chair in consultation with the candidate. Decisions on promotion to professor will be made by the department ARPT committee, the department chair and the Dean’s Review Committee in consultation with the dean.

Clinical teaching faculty

Senior instructor, Clinical teaching: Decisions on promotion to this rank will be made by the department chair (or designee) in consultation with the dean.

Assistant professor, Clinical teaching: Decisions on promotion to assistant professor, Clinical teaching track, will be made by the department ARPT committee, the department chair and the Dean’s Review Committee in consultation with the dean.

Associate professor, Clinical teaching: Promotion to associate professor, Clinical teaching track, must occur once the candidate is in his/her seventh to tenth year\(^7\) of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor, Clinical teaching track. Decisions on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee, the department chair and the Dean’s Review Committee in consultation with the dean.

Professor, Clinical teaching: To be considered for promotion to professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate should have completed at least five years

---

\(^6\) Consideration for promotion to associate professor will normally be initiated once the candidate is in his/her seventh year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. This may be extended up to a maximum of ten years under unusual or unexpected circumstances and with the written approval of the candidate’s department chair and dean.
service at the rank of associate professor, Clinical teaching track. Decisions on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee, department chair and the Dean’s Review Committee in consultation with the dean.

**Clinical faculty**

*Clinical senior instructor:* Decisions on promotion to clinical senior instructor will be made by the department chair (or designee) in consultation with the dean.

*Clinical assistant professor:* Decisions on promotion to clinical assistant professor will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean (or designee).

*Clinical associate professor:* To be considered for promotion to clinical associate professor, the candidate should have completed at least five years of service as a clinical assistant professor. Decisions on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean (or designee).

*Clinical professor:* To be considered for promotion to clinical professor, the candidate should have completed at least five years of service as a clinical associate professor. Decisions on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean (or designee).

**Research faculty**

*Research senior instructor:* Decisions on promotion to senior instructor will be made by the department chair (or designee) in consultation with the dean.

*Research assistant professor:* Decisions on promotion to research assistant professor will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean.

*Research associate professor:* To be considered for promotion to research associate professor, the candidate should have completed at least five years of service as a research assistant professor. Decisions on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean.

*Research professor:* To be considered for promotion to research professor, the candidate should have completed at least five years of service at the rank of
research associate professor. Decisions on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean.
Appendix M:  **Standards for the award of tenure.**

Tenure may be awarded only to a faculty member in the regular track who is at the rank of associate professor or professor. It may also be awarded to a suitably-qualified assistant professor at the same time he/she is promoted to associate professor. Tenure is reserved for candidates who are amongst the best in their field of scholarly endeavor. The standards of excellence necessary for tenure are higher than those normally required for promotion to associate professor or professor. Using the criteria below, a rating of at least excellent from the department ARPT and dean's review committees must be obtained in the candidate's areas of education and research/scholarly activity. Further, the candidate will have established a national and/or international reputation in his/her areas of expertise and demonstrated the capacity for providing sustained contributions to enhancing human knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>≥ excellence in:</th>
<th>≥ meritorious in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>education/teaching</td>
<td>clinical practice (where applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research/scholarship</td>
<td>service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND national and/or international recognition in his/her area of expertise</td>
<td>AND sustained funding from extramural, competitive sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standards of excellence will be established in the context of the following criteria:

For education, the candidate must have an established record of excellence in, and dedication to, education that has resulted in a sustained history of effective teaching, active engagement in and development of education programs (e.g., redevelopment of a course or program), a record of innovation, publication and/or other achievements (Appendix G). Active involvement in national and international pharmacy education associations, committees or programs (e.g., AACP, ACPE, FIPSE) would serve to supplement the candidate's contributions to education.

For research/scholarly activity, the candidate must demonstrate at least the levels of excellent performance required for promotion to associate professor. In addition, the candidate must also have (i) a sustained history of funding as a principal investigator from extramural, competitive sources, (ii) a leading role in his/her and collaborative research endeavors, and (iii) an established history of publication in peer-reviewed scientific publications where the candidate is the sole, primary or senior author (Appendix G). There should be evidence that the candidate's research productivity with respect to funding and publications has been consistently maintained.
## Appendix N: Responsibilities of a regular track or clinical teaching track faculty member and chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Regular track or clinical teaching track faculty member</th>
<th>Department chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Annual review**                  | 1. Submit updated curriculum vitae (CV), standardized annual report report (SAR), professional plan and other requested materials  
2. Meet regularly with faculty mentor | 1. Ensure faculty member includes all information relevant to reappointment.  
2. Review faculty member’s CV, standardized annual report (SAR), distribution of effort (DOE), and professional plan. Document faculty member’s achievement of professional plan and department expectations.  
3. In collaboration with dean, establish faculty annual performance rating (APR).  
4. Develop DOE agreement with faculty member for following year. |
| **Interim (comprehensive) review of assistant professor** | 1. Submit interim review dossier (see Appendix O) to SSPPS personnel director. | 1. Meet with faculty member to discuss interim review process and mentor the faculty member through the process.  
2. Receive review from department ARPT committee.  
3. Submit summary recommendation letter and ARPT |
| Promotion | 1. Submit dossier (see Appendix O) to SSPPS personnel director.  
2. Provide names of scholars who could and/or should not be considered as possible external reviewers. | 1. Meet with faculty member to review promotion process and mentor the faculty member through the process.  
2. Request and receive letters of evaluation from department faculty members.  
3. Receive report from department ARPT committee.  
4. Submit summary recommendation letter and ARPT report to dean. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenure (applies to regular faculty member only) | 1. Submit dossier (see Appendix R) to SSPPS personnel director.  
2. Provide names of scholars who could and/or should not be considered as possible external reviewers. | 1. Meet with faculty member to review tenure process and mentor the faculty member through the process.  
2. Request and receive letters of evaluation from department faculty members.  
3. Receive report from department ARPT committee.  
4. Submit summary recommendation letter and ARPT report to dean. |
Appendix O: **Dossier materials for interim review (IR) or promotion (P) of regular track and clinical teaching track faculty.**

The dossier submitted by the candidate must include the following materials:

- **Current curriculum vitae (IR, P).**
- **Annual reviews (IR, P)** since appointment (for interim review) or since the last promotion (for promotion review).
- **Professional plans (P)** since the last promotion (for promotion review).
- **Evidence supporting the teaching ability of the candidate (IR, P)**, including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit an organized teacher's portfolio that highlights her/his accomplishments in teaching, e.g., development of new instructional materials or methods, educational scholarship, receipt of teaching awards or other evidence of success as a teacher, course syllabi and Faculty Course Questionnaires (these student evaluations are required). This section should include the candidate's most recent peer assessment and may also include evaluations by the candidate's students, colleagues or other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate's teaching in classroom, laboratory, clinical or other settings. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.

- **Documents supporting the candidate's research/scholarly activity, clinical activity and professional practice (IR, P).** This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications, unsolicited letters and other evidence of success, e.g., reprints of candidate's publications. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.

- **Documents supporting the candidate's service to the school, university, profession and community (IR, P).** A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.

- **Any other information (IR, P)** the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation during his/her interim review or promotion review.

Documents to be added by the department ARPT committee following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:

- A copy of the specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of candidates in the department;
- **Previous reappointment and/or promotion letters** (if required by the campus, primary unit or school/college).
- **Letters of evaluation by external reviewers (IR, P).** The candidate can submit a list of three or four names of individuals who could serve as outside evaluators, as well as a list of individuals he/she would exclude as evaluators. A minimum of three external letters of evaluation are required.
for interim review and a minimum of five external letters of evaluation are required for promotion review.

- **SSPPS faculty letters of evaluation (P).** Letters of evaluation are requested from each faculty member in the candidate’s department at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion.
- **ARPT committee recommendation letter (IR, P).**
- **Performance rating template (P).** The template (Appendix Oa) summarizes how the committee membership voted for each of the performance criteria.

**Other documents to be added to the department ARPT recommendation report include (in sequence):**

- **Department chair recommendation letter (IR, P)**
- **Dean’s Review Committee recommendation letter (P)**
- **Dean’s recommendation letter (IR, P)** (see Appendix Ob for additional details required in this letter for P)
- **Performance rating template (P)** (see Appendix Oa). This should be completed by the department chair, dean’s review committee and the dean.
- **Vice-Chancellor’s Advisory committee recommendation letter (P, if disagreement in recommendations in SSPPS)**
Appendix Oa: **Performance ratings template for promotion**

A performance rating template (see below) must be included with the dossier that includes votes at all levels on all aspects of the candidate’s performance.

**Recommendation for:** Promotion

**Candidate name:**

**School/College, Department:**

**Performance Ratings Template**

For each performance criteria, indicate the *actual number of votes* for each performance rating, where E = excellent, M = meritorious, NM = not meritorious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># voting members</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work</th>
<th>Clinical Practice/ Patient Care</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** If additional votes were taken at any level, add rows to the above template as needed.
Appendix Oₐ: Additional requirements for recommendation by the dean regarding promotion.

The dean’s letter of recommendation must address explicitly the candidate’s qualifications for promotion, e.g., excellent research/creative activities, excellent teaching, excellent leadership and service.

If multiple votes are conducted at any level of review or the recommendation is not consistent across levels of review, an explanation must be provided.

A performance rating template (Appendix Oₐ) must be included with the dossier that includes votes at all levels on all aspects of the candidate’s performance.
Appendix P: **Dossier materials for review (R) or promotion (P) of clinical faculty.**

The dossier submitted by the candidate must include the following materials:

- Current curriculum vitae (R, P).
- Evidence supporting the mentoring ability of the candidate (R, P), including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit a summary that highlights her/his accomplishments in teaching students in her/his practice/research environment. This would include receipt of teaching awards or other evidence of success as a mentor/teacher, the number of students supervised since the last review (including her/his role as preceptor or mentor) and any student evaluations that have been obtained, e.g., through school-wide systems (such as CoursEval®) or the Experiential office. In the absence of formal student evaluations, this section may include evaluations by the candidate’s students, colleagues or other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate’s teaching in the laboratory, clinical or other settings. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- Documents supporting the candidate’s research, scholarly or creative activity (R, P). This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications, unsolicited letters and other evidence of success, e.g., reprints of candidate’s publications. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- Documents supporting the candidate’s service to the school, university, profession and community (R, P). A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- Any other information (R, P) the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation during his/her review.

Documents to be added by the department ARPT committee following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:

- A copy of the specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of candidates in the department;
- Previous reappointment or promotion letters (if required by the campus, primary unit or school/college).
- ARPT committee recommendation letter (R, P).

Other documents to be added to the department ARPT recommendation report include:

- Department chair recommendation letter (R, P)
Appendix Q:  *Dossier materials for interim review (IR) or promotion (P) of research faculty.*

The dossier submitted by the **candidate** must include the following materials:

- **Current curriculum vitae (IR, P).**
- **Annual reviews (IR, P)** since appointment (for interim review) or since the last promotion (for promotion review).
- **Evidence supporting the mentoring ability of the candidate (IR, P),** including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit a summary that highlights her/his accomplishments in teaching students in her/his practice/research environment. This would include receipt of teaching awards or other evidence of success as a mentor/teacher, the number of students supervised since the last review (including her/his role as preceptor or mentor) and any student evaluations that have been obtained, e.g., through school-wide systems (such as CoursEval®) or the Experiential office. In the absence of formal student evaluations, this section may include evaluations by the candidate's students, colleagues or other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate's teaching in the laboratory, clinical or other settings. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- **Documents supporting the candidate’s research, scholarly or creative activity (IR, P).** This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications, unsolicited letters and other evidence of success, e.g., reprints of candidate's publications. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- **Documents supporting the candidate’s service to the school, university, profession and community (IR, P).** A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- **Any other information (IR, P)** the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation during his/her review.

**Documents to be added by the department ARPT committee following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:**

- A copy of the specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of candidates in the department;
- **Previous reappointment or promotion letters** (if required by the campus, primary unit or school/college).
- **Letters of evaluation by external reviewers (IR, P).** The candidate can submit a list of three or four names of individuals who could serve as outside evaluators, as well as a list of individuals he/she would exclude as evaluators. A minimum of three external letters of evaluation are required for promotion review.
• **SSPPS faculty letters of evaluation (P).** Letters of evaluation are requested from faculty members in the candidate’s department at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion.

• **ARPT committee recommendation letter (IR, P).**

**Other documents to be added to the department ARPT recommendation report include:**

• **Department chair recommendation letter (IR, P)**
Appendix R: Dossier materials for tenure (T) of regular faculty.

The dossier submitted by the candidate must include the following materials:

- Current curriculum vitae.
- Annual reviews since appointment (for interim review) or since the last promotion (for promotion or tenure review).
- Professional plans since the last promotion (for promotion or tenure review).
- Evidence supporting the teaching ability of the candidate, including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit an organized teacher’s portfolio that highlights her/his accomplishments in teaching, e.g., development of new instructional materials or methods, educational scholarship, receipt of teaching awards or other evidence of success as a teacher, course syllabi and Faculty Course Questionnaires (these student evaluations are required). This section should include the candidate’s most recent peer assessment and may also include evaluations by the candidate’s students, colleagues or other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate’s teaching in classroom, laboratory, clinical or other settings. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- Documents supporting the candidate’s research/scholarly activity, clinical activity and professional practice. This section may include articles, book reviews, research data and grants, receipt of awards, electronic communications, unsolicited letters and other evidence of success, e.g., reprints of candidate’s publications. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- Documents supporting the candidate’s service to the school, university, profession and community. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- Any other information the candidate believes will assure adequate consideration and evaluation during his/her interim review, promotion review or tenure review.

Documents to be added by the department ARPT committee following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:

- A copy of the specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of candidates in the department;
- Previous reappointment, promotion and/or tenure letters (if required by the campus, primary unit or school/college).
- Letters of evaluation by external reviewers. The candidate can submit a list of three or four names of individuals who could serve as outside evaluators, as well as a list of individuals he/she would exclude as
evaluators. A minimum of five external letters of evaluation are required for tenure review.

- **SSPPS faculty letters of evaluation.** Letters of evaluation are requested from all tenured faculty members of SSPPS.
- **ARPT committee recommendation letter**
- **Performance rating template (Appendix R_a)** that summarizes how the committee membership voted for each of the performance criteria.

**Other documents to be added to the dossier materials include (in sequence):**

- **Department chair recommendation letter**
- **Dean’s Review Committee recommendation letter**
- **Dean’s recommendation letter** (see Appendix R_b for details required in this letter)
- **Performance rating template** (see Appendix R_a). This should be completed by the department chair, dean’s review committee and the dean.
- **Vice-Chancellor’s Academic Affairs Advisory committee recommendation letter**
Appendix R_a:  Performance ratings template for tenure

A performance rating template (see below) must be included with the dossier that includes votes at all levels on all aspects of the candidate’s performance.

**Recommendation for:** Award of Tenure

**Candidate name:**

**School/College, Department:**

*Performance Ratings Template*

For each performance criteria, indicate the *actual number of votes* for each performance rating, where **E** = excellent, **M** = meritorious, **NM** = not meritorious.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># voting members</th>
<th>Teaching E</th>
<th>Teaching M</th>
<th>Teaching NM</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work E</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work M</th>
<th>Scholarly/Creative Work NM</th>
<th>Clinical Practice/ Patient Care E</th>
<th>Clinical Practice/ Patient Care M</th>
<th>Clinical Practice/ Patient Care NM</th>
<th>Service E</th>
<th>Service M</th>
<th>Service NM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** If additional votes were taken at any level, add rows to the above template as needed.
Appendix Rb:  Additional requirements for recommendation by the dean regarding the award of tenure, or appointment with tenure.

The dean’s letter of recommendation must address explicitly the candidate’s qualifications for tenure, e.g., excellent research/creative activities, excellent teaching, excellent leadership and service.

If multiple votes are conducted at any level of review or the recommendation is not consistent across levels of review, an explanation must be provided.

A performance rating template (Appendix Ra) must be included with the dossier that includes votes at all levels on all aspects of the candidate’s performance.
Appendix S:  **Dossier materials for post-promotion or post-tenure review.**

Dossier materials to be submitted for post-promotion review of a regular track or clinical teaching track faculty member are identical to those to be submitted for post-tenure review by a tenured regular track faculty member. The dossier must include the following materials:

- *Current curriculum vitae*
- *Annual performance evaluations* [most recent 5 years], including the Faculty Course Questionnaires, peer review of teaching, and, if desired, other types of teaching evaluation
- *Letter summarizing contributions* [most recent 5 years] in teaching, scholarship and service (suggested length 2-3 pages)
- *Professional Plans* [upcoming five years and most recent 5 years]
- *Performance Improvement Agreements* that may have been established in last 5 years (post-tenure review only).
- *Additional materials* requested by the committee

Documents to be added by the department ARPT committee following receipt of the dossier from the candidate include:

- A *copy of the specific written criteria and procedures for measuring the performance of candidates in the department*;
- *Previous reappointment, tenure and/or promotion letters* [most recent 5 years]

Documents to be added to the department ARPT recommendation report include (in sequence):

- *Department chair recommendation letter*
- *Dean’s recommendation letter*