

Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Standards and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure¹

1. Introduction
2. Appointment
 - 2a. Categories
 - 2a(i) At-will appointments
 - 2a(ii) Tenured appointments
 - 2b. Types
 - 2b(i) Regular faculty
 - 2b(ii) Clinical teaching faculty
 - 2b(iii) Clinical faculty
 - 2b(iv) Research faculty
 - 2b(v) Adjoint faculty
 - 2b(vi) Adjunct faculty
 - 2b(vii) Lecturer
 - 2c. Standards
 - 2d. Process
3. Reappointment
 - 3a. Annual review
4. Interim review after appointment to assistant professor
5. Non-reappointment
6. Promotion
 - 6a. Standards
 - 6b. Process
 - 6b(i) Regular faculty
 - 6b(ii) Clinical teaching faculty
 - 6b(iii) Clinical faculty
 - 6b(iv) Research faculty
7. Tenure
 - 7a. Criteria
 - 7b. Process
8. Faculty performance reviews
 - 8a. Dossier
 - 8b. Internal and external reviewer evaluations
 - 8c. Annual reviews of regular and clinical teaching faculty
 - 8d. Reviews of clinical and research faculty
 - 8e. Optional post-promotion review of untenured regular track and clinical teaching track associate professors
 - 8e(i) Process

¹ This policy is subject to approval by the CU Anschutz Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs

- 8f. Post-tenure review of faculty
 - 8f(i) Process
- 9. Department ARPT committee
 - 9a. Process
- 10. Dean's Review committee
 - 10a. Process

Appendix A: Mission statements.

Table 1: Responsibilities and privileges of faculty members in various tracks/lines.

Appendix B: Appointment in faculty types and titles.

Appendix C: Processes involved in review of faculty members.

Appendix D: Reappointment considerations in faculty tracks.

Appendix E: Process for interim review of an assistant professor in the regular and clinical teaching tracks.

Appendix F: Examples of Meritorious and Excellent Performance in the Conduct of Faculty Responsibilities

Appendix G: Promotion process and standards in the regular faculty track.

Appendix H: Promotion process and standards in the clinical teaching track.

Appendix I: Promotion process and standards in the clinical faculty track.

Appendix J: Promotion process and standards in the research faculty track.

Appendix K: Timing of promotion and decision-making steps in faculty tracks.

Appendix L: Standards for the award of tenure.

Appendix M: Responsibilities of faculty member and chair

Appendix N: Dossier materials for interim review or promotion of regular track and clinical teaching faculty.

Appendix Na: Performance ratings template for promotion

Appendix Nb: Additional requirements for recommendation by the dean regarding promotion.

Appendix O: Dossier materials for review or promotion of clinical faculty.

Appendix P: Dossier materials for interim review or promotion of research faculty.

Appendix Q: Dossier materials for tenure of regular faculty.

Appendix Qa: Performance ratings template for tenure

Appendix Qb: Additional requirements for recommendation by the dean regarding the award of tenure, or appointment with tenure.

Appendix Ra: Dossier materials for post-promotion review.

Appendix Rb: Dossier materials for post-tenure review.

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 an assigned differential workload 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 their 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 University of Colorado APS 5060, 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 teaching, clinical, research and/or leadership and 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 university policy.

2a(i) **At-will** appointments are those where an employee does not have a contractual right, express or implied, to retain in the university's employ and

where either the university or employee may terminate the employment relationship without cause, and with or without notice, at any time for any reason (per University of Colorado APS 5060).

2a(ii) **Tenured** appointments are continuous until termination by retirement, resignation or revocation through applicable laws and policies of the Regents.

The privilege of membership in the SSPPS Faculty Senate is accorded to faculty members with appointments $\geq 50\%$ 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.* adjoint faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturer. More detailed descriptions can be found in Appendix B. Responsibilities and privileges accorded to each faculty track or line are summarized in Table 1.

2b(i) **Regular faculty** members contribute to the teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and where appropriate, clinical care missions of the SSPPS. They are the only faculty members eligible for tenure.

2b(ii) **Clinical teaching track faculty** members contribute to the teaching/education, leadership and service and, where appropriate, clinical care missions of the SSPPS. They participate in scholarly/creative work/research 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 clinical care and/or experiential education missions of the SSPPS.

2b(iv) **Research faculty** members are supported by non-general funds. They primarily contribute to the scholarly/creative work/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. They support the teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research activity, leadership and service and/or clinical 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. 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 teaching/education mission of the SSPPS.

2c. Requirements

The faculty of the SSPPS supports the teaching/education, research/scholarly activity, leadership and 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 their 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) and follow a search process as required by university and campus policy. All job positions will be posted in compliance with HR policy. For appointment to instructor, senior instructor, adjunct faculty, adjunct faculty or lecturer, the department chair (or designee) will make a recommendation on the appointment to be considered for approval by the dean and chancellor. For faculty appointments, a search committee will submit a recommendation to the department chair who will then develop a letter of appointment that will be considered for approval by the dean and chancellor. 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 must follow university and campus policy and requires approval of the dean and the chancellor.

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 should be reviewed annually and are not required to submit a SAR to their department chair. Instead, a record of their contributions to the clinical care and teaching/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 their activities in the previous evaluation period.

3a. Annual review

Evaluations of faculty performance are conducted annually. 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 their annual review rating has a right to appeal and those who have a grievance with their individual salaries may seek a review. (Appendix C).

4. Interim 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 their 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 an alternate timeline is specified in the appointment letter or in a written agreement between the faculty member and the 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 their 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 E. 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 all faculty members to continue to grow as scholars and be productive, collaborative members of its academic staff. Based on the assigned workload, where appropriate, performance in teaching/education,

scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and clinical care are taken into consideration when reviewing a faculty member for promotion. Indicators and criteria for consideration of performance in these areas are presented in Appendix F. Promotion decisions are based on summary evaluations of a faculty member's cumulative performance and annual performance evaluations may be one component of this process. However, promotion processes are separate and distinct from the annual review that begins at the department level.

Assistant professors hired into the regular track will have the option to continue under the promotion and tenure requirements of the approved policies and criteria (as presented in Appendix F) established when they were hired or under the most recent approved revised policies and criteria (as presented in Appendix F) for promotion to associate professor. This decision will be made by the assistant professor who may be advised by their department chair. The decision must be documented in the faculty member's promotion and/or tenure dossier. Promotion to professor will always occur under approved primary unit criteria in effect at the time of the promotion review.

6a. Standards

Each faculty member in the SSPPS is expected to strive for excellence in their areas of academic responsibility. Successful achievement of such standards are recognized and acknowledged by promotion. While the standards for tenure are constant and established by the Board of Regents, the criteria by which the standards for tenure and promotion 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 F. 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 G (regular track), Appendix H (clinical teaching track), Appendix I (clinical track) and Appendix J (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 their 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 recommendation about the candidate's performance.

Consideration for promotion is initiated by the candidate's department chair or the faculty member 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 K. These processes have been developed to correspond with and follow policies established by the campus and the Regents.

A candidate for promotion shall be entitled to appeal to the Faculty Grievance Committee if the candidate feels that the procedures described herein have not been appropriately followed at any stage of the recommendation or review process.

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 differing recommendations 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 differing recommendations 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. Under these circumstances, 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 Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) for a recommendation before being sent to the EVC-ASA and then to the Chancellor. 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.

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. In the

case of a negative decision on reappointment or promotion, a clinical teaching faculty member may request a review by the dean. This request must be completed within ten working days of receipt of written notice of the negative decision. A review will only be granted on the grounds that the process had procedural or factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the decision. The dean must issue a final determination within 30 days. If the dispute involves a dean's decision, the request for review will be referred to an appropriate faculty committee within the school who will provide a recommendation to the dean, but the dean retains authority to uphold the original decision.

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 will then make a decision on the promotion. In the case of a negative decision on reappointment or promotion, a clinical faculty member may request a review by the dean. This request must be completed within ten working days of receipt of written notice of the negative decision. A review will only be granted on the grounds that the process had procedural or factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they may have affected the decision. The dean must issue a final determination within 30 days. If the dispute involves a dean's decision, the request for review will be referred to an appropriate faculty committee within the school who will provide a recommendation to the dean, but the dean retains authority to uphold the original decision. All documents, *viz.* recommendations of the dean, 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.

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 will then make a decision on the promotion. In the case of a negative decision on reappointment or promotion, a research faculty member may request a review by the dean. This request must be completed within ten working days of receipt of written notice of the negative decision. A review will only be granted on the grounds that the process had procedural or factual errors of sufficient magnitude that they may

have affected the decision. The dean must issue a final determination within 30 days. If the dispute involves a dean's decision, the request for review will be referred to an appropriate faculty committee within the school who will provide a recommendation to the dean, but the dean retains authority to uphold the original decision. All documents, viz. recommendations of the dean, 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.

7. Tenure

Faculty members in the regular track ranks of associate professor or professor are eligible for consideration for an award of tenure. Assistant professors hired into the tenure track will have the option to continue under the promotion and tenure requirements of approved policies and criteria (as presented in Appendix F) established when they were hired or under the most recent approved revised policies and criteria (as presented in Appendix F) for promotion to associate professor. This decision will be made by the assistant professor who may be advised by their department chair. This decision must be documented in the faculty member's promotion and/or tenure dossier. Promotion to professor will always occur under approved primary unit criteria in effect at the time of the promotion review. 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. Standards

The award of tenure will be reserved for those faculty members in the regular track who meet the standards for excellent performance in the areas of teaching/education, and scholarly/creative work/research and meritorious performance in leadership and service and clinical care, where appropriate.

Standards used for tenure considerations are provided in Appendix L. Criteria used for these tenure considerations are provided in Appendix F.

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. Leadership and service and/or clinical care will be weighed into any tenure decision. However, these activities are not an adequate basis for tenure in the absence of excellence in teaching/education and scholarly/creative works/research.

7b. Process

A candidate for tenure shall consult with and be advised by their 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 a positive recommendation by the VCAC, all documents are reviewed by the EVC-ASA, chancellor and president. Positive recommendations are presented to the Board of Regents for approval.

In making tenure recommendations, the department ARPT committee and DRC shall evaluate the candidate's performance in the required areas (Appendix G).

A candidate for tenure shall be entitled to appeal to the Faculty Grievance Committee if the candidate feels that the procedures described herein have not been appropriately followed at any stage of the recommendation or review process.

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 faculty members and the chair are outlined in Appendix M.

8a. Dossier

A dossier is a means of documenting the professional achievements of a faculty member undergoing interim review or a candidate applying for promotion or tenure. The candidate's department chair will assist the candidate in developing their 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 N), (ii) promotion review

of clinical faculty (Appendix O), (iii) interim review or promotion review of research faculty (Appendix P), (iv) tenure review of regular faculty (Appendix Q) and (v) post-promotion or post-tenure review of regular and clinical teaching faculty (Appendix R) 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. These letters are confidential and, as such, cannot 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 campus-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. The ARPT committee may request up to two external evaluation letters for interim review. A minimum of three and up to 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 their department chair in collaboration with the dean. 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 G and H. Performance standards required for tenure are provided in section 7a and appendix L.

8d. Reviews of clinical and research faculty

Each clinical and research teaching faculty member undergoes review by their department chair. Reviews are on annual basis. 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 I and J.

8e. Optional post-promotion review of clinical teaching and untenured regular track associate professors.

Post-promotion review (PPR) is not required for untenured associate professors or professors in the regular track or clinical teaching track. Nevertheless, untenured associate professors in the regular track or clinical teach track may request to undergo post-promotion review (PPR) to obtain feedback regarding their performance as they consider applying for promotion to professor.

8e(i) Process

The untenured regular track or clinical teaching track faculty candidate will meet with the department chair and request to undergo PPR by the department ARPT committee. The candidate's dossier shall be forwarded to the department ARPT committee. A description of dossier materials is provided in Appendix R_a. 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 teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and, where appropriate, clinical care.

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 a review of the candidate's performance. A copy of the ARPT and department chair's reports will be provided to the faculty member.

8f. Post-tenure review of faculty

In accordance with University policy (APS 1022 and Campus Administrative Policy 1050), a faculty member who has received tenure will undergo post-tenure review (PTR) by a PTR committee every five years after 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.

8f(i) Process

At the time of PTR², the candidate's dossier shall be forwarded to the department PTR committee. A description of dossier materials is provided in Appendix Sb. 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 brief report and at its conclusion provide a rating for each area of assigned differential workload and an overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance using the standardized university rating system. 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, scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and, where appropriate, clinical care.

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 EVC-ASA, consistent with the requirements of Campus Administrative Policy 1050. Under circumstances in which the faculty member receives a rating from the PTR committee that is less than "satisfactory" in any evaluative area, the faculty member must meet with the department chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and develop a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA, see Campus Administrative Policy 1050 and APS 5008). 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

² 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.

member who does not agree with the less than “satisfactory” rating by the PTR committee may request a peer review of their 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 school committee which will make a recommendation 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.

A tenured or tenure-track faculty must also develop a PIA if they receive a “below expectations” or “fails to meet expectations” University rating in an annual performance evaluation (see APS 5008). This involves the faculty member meeting with their department chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and developing and implementing a plan to address deficiencies. If the goals of the PIA are not met or the faculty member receives a second annual performance rating of less than “satisfactory” within a five year period, they will be required to undergo an Extensive Review process (as specified in APS 5008).

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 scholarly/creative work/research, teaching, clinical care and leadership 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 will vote on the candidate's performance in each area of responsibility (education/teaching, research/scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and, as appropriate, clinical care) and provide a recommendation on the promotion or tenure application. The voting results and letter of recommendation will be forwarded to the department chair. A summary of interim and PPR (as necessary) 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 can consist of faculty members from outside the SSPPS as necessary. 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 the candidate's performance in each area of responsibility and provide a recommendation on the promotion or tenure application. The voting results and letter of recommendation will be forwarded 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 EVC-ASA. 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 EVC-ASA, 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 their 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 EVC-ASA.

Appendix A: *Mission statements*

School of Pharmacy Mission Statement

The University of Colorado SSPPS is committed to excellence and innovation in professional, graduate and post-graduate education; scholarship and research; patient-centered care; public health advocacy; and societal leadership and engagement.

Department of Clinical Pharmacy Mission Statement

To advance patient care through clinical pharmacy education/teaching, scholarly/creative work/research, and clinical practice.

Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences Mission Statement

To perform outstanding education/teaching and scholarly/creative work/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.

<i>Appointment type</i> ^a	<i>SSPPS mission responsibilities</i>				<i>SSPPS faculty senate</i>		<i>tenure-eligible</i>	<i>sabbatical-eligible</i>	<i>unrestricted funds</i>
	<i>teaching/education</i>	<i>scholarly/creative works/research</i>	<i>clinical care</i>	<i>Leadership and service</i>	<i>member</i>	<i>voting</i>			
<i>regular track</i>	✓	✓	(✓)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>clinical teaching track</i>	✓	(✓)	(✓)	✓	✓	✓	×	x ^b	✓
<i>clinical track</i>	✓	(✓)	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	×
<i>research track</i>	(✓)	✓	(✓)	(✓)	✓	×	×	×	×
<i>adjoint</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	×
<i>adjunct</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	(✓)
<i>lecturer</i>	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	(✓)

^a More detailed descriptions can be found in APS 5060.

^b Clinical teaching track faculty may be eligible for a revised workload assignment to accommodate professional development.

(✓) 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 teaching/education mission of the SSPPS. A regular faculty member is also expected to participate in scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and, where appropriate, clinical care. A faculty member in the regular track is a voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate. Regular faculty members with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor 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, scholarly/creative work/research and, where appropriate, innovative clinical care. The candidate must also have the ability to collaborate with colleagues in teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research and, when appropriate, clinical care 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/education, original scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and/or, where appropriate, innovative clinical care. 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: (a) a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to professional and graduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (c) a record since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, and leadership and service and/or, when appropriate, innovative clinical care. Additionally, the candidate has achieved recognition as a national and/or international authority in their chosen field of study.

Clinical teaching faculty

An individual appointed to this track is primarily involved in the teaching/education, leadership and service and/or clinical care missions of the SSPPS. They may also participate in additional scholarly/creative work/research as defined by their department chair. However, this activity will represent only a minor part of their assigned differential workload and evaluation. The faculty member is a voting member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate. Clinical teaching track faculty members are not eligible for tenure or sabbatical, but are eligible for a revised workload assignment to accommodate professional development.

Instructor, Clinical teaching: Appointment at this rank requires that the candidate must possess a terminal degree³. Appointment to this rank requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has experience in, or the potential for, independent teaching and/or contemporary clinical care.

Senior instructor, Clinical teaching: Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate meets the criteria for instructor, Clinical teaching track, and has a record of independent teaching and/or contemporary clinical care.

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, leadership and service and/or innovative clinical care. The candidate should have the ability to substantially contribute to the mission area(s) of the SSPPS pertaining to teaching/education, leadership and service, scholarly/creative work/research (where appropriate) and/or clinical care.

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/education and established leadership and service skills and/or innovative clinical care. The candidate should also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents, and/or graduate students and may have contributed to the scholarly/creative work/research mission of the SSPPS. The candidate will typically 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.

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/education, leadership and service and/or innovative clinical care. There should also be clear and demonstrable evidence of significant, sustained contributions to the SSPPS in teaching/education, leadership and service, and/or clinical care. The candidate should have contributed to the scholarly/creative work/research mission of the SSPPS. The candidate should be an outstanding professional role model and will typically have a minimum of five years of service as an associate professor, Clinical teaching track.

Clinical faculty

An individual appointed to this track is primarily involved in the clinical and experiential teaching missions of the SSPPS. They may also participate in additional scholarly/creative work/research, teaching or leadership and service as defined by the department chair. However, these activities will represent only minor parts of their assigned differential workload and evaluation. A clinical faculty member will be predominantly supported by monies other than general funds, e.g., employed by a non-SSPPS entity. The faculty member 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 degree⁴. Appointment to this rank requires demonstrable evidence that the candidate has substantial experience in, or the potential for, contemporary clinical care.

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 care and possess the ability to substantially contribute to the

⁴ 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.

mission of the SSPPS pertaining to teaching/education, leadership and service, and/or scholarly/creative work/research.

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 or team-based scholarly activity and has also made significant and consistent contributions to the SSPPS in teaching/education, leadership and service, and/or scholarly/creative work/research. The candidate will typically have a minimum of five years of service as an assistant professor.

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/education, leadership and service, clinical care and/or scholarly/creative work/research. Clinical professors should be outstanding practitioners and professional role models. Candidates typically 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. They may also participate in teaching, clinical care or leadership and service as defined by the department chair. However, these activities will represent only minor parts of their assigned differential workload and evaluation. A research faculty member will be predominantly supported by extramurally-funded grants in accordance with their assigned differential workload. The faculty member 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 scholarly/creative work/research 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 scholarly/creative work/research 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 scholarly/creative work/research. 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 scholarly/creative work/research. 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 their chosen field of study through the maintenance of an ongoing program of extramurally-funded scholarly/creative work/research. 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 teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, leadership and service and/or clinical care missions of the SSPPS. The title is granted to an individual who is an employee of a major research institute closely affiliated with the University of Colorado, or with another agency or institution and who offers courses or supervises academic programs without compensation above their regular salary. An adjunct faculty member will be supported by non-general funds, e.g., employed by a non-SSPPS entity. The individual is a part-time member of the faculty who is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment nor are they 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. They have 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 are they 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. A lecturer is a part-time member of the faculty who is not eligible for tenure or sabbatical assignment and is not a member of the SSPPS Faculty Senate.

Appointment to this rank requires that the candidate be qualified to teach the particular content for which they have been hired. They may have graduate degrees and/or advanced experience in their profession or field of expertise.

Appendix C: Processes involved in the annual 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 assigned differential workload (ADW) established at the time of appointment (for a new faculty member) or at the end of the previous evaluation period. The ADW reflects the percent time a faculty member is expected to devote to teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, clinical care, and leadership and service in the coming year. For each activity category of the ADW, 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. The annual review rating process may be subject to change. Any changes will be subject to approval by the SSPPS faculty and the EVC-ASA 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 their department chair. The annual performance evaluation provides the faculty member with specific information regarding their 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 their 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.

A faculty member who does not agree with their annual review rating “marginal” or “unsatisfactory” may request a peer review of their 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.

Faculty who have a grievance with their individual salary may seek a review. In cases where the faculty member’s concern is the annual merit evaluation, the faculty will follow the above process for reconsideration of the evaluation. In cases where the faculty member’s concern is primarily a market and/or equity issue, the faculty member should first inquire with their department chair. The faculty member should state the specific nature of the concern, provide relevant

background information and if applicable, request a specific remedy. The department chair should respond to the faculty member within 30 days. If the concern cannot be resolved at this level, the faculty member should prepare and submit a written letter with the same information and include an explanation of why the concern was not satisfactorily resolved to the dean. The dean will conduct their review and respond in writing within 30 days. The decision of the dean is final.

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 scholarly/creative work/research/research, teaching/education, leadership and service, and clinical care, as appropriate to their track (see Appendix D) and specified in their most recent ADW 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 up to the point of the mid-term review 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 scholarly/creative work/research, teaching/education, leadership and service and, where appropriate, clinical care. 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 Performance Improvement Agreement will be developed (see APS 5008). This involves the faculty member meeting with their department chair to identify the causes of the unsatisfactory evaluation and developing a plan to address deficiencies. 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 annual performance rating of less than “satisfactory” within a five-year period, they will be required to undergo an Extensive Review process (as specified in APS 5008).

Appendix D: 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 scholarly/creative work/research, teaching/education, leadership and service and, where appropriate, clinical care.

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 teaching/education, clinical care and leadership and service.

Clinical faculty

All clinical faculty members are at-will and subject to reappointment on at least an annual basis. Clinical faculty members are evaluated in the areas of teaching/education, clinical care and leadership 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 scholarly/creative work/research.

Appendix E: *Process for interim review of an assistant professor in the regular, clinical teaching and research tracks.*

The faculty member will submit a 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 may 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 F:

Examples of Meritorious and Excellent Performance **in the Conduct of Faculty Responsibilities**

November 30, 2022

The promotion process is meant to describe and reward continued professional growth and achievement. The matrix below is intended to present examples of various levels of accomplishment in the areas of teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, leadership/service and clinical care. It is intended to assist faculty, department chairs, and promotion committees in evaluating candidates' accomplishments. Due to the inherent complexity of faculty activities using the matrix as a prescribed checklist is highly discouraged. The matrix supplements the more general instructions provided by the School with respect to the contents of a dossier for promotion and/or tenure.

Importantly, faculty members are not expected to have accomplishments in all areas shown within the matrix. Rather, the matrix highlights a broad range of activities that may be recognized as “meritorious” or “excellent,” reflecting the varied activities and accomplishments of our diverse faculty and which are valued by our school. Additional examples not listed here may be included in a candidate's dossier and should be considered in the promotion and/or tenure process if they serve to illustrate the quality of an individual's work. Although examples of faculty accomplishments are presented as distinct entities here, it is recognized that accomplishments frequently overlap in category.

It is expected that faculty pursuing promotion to Associate Professor would likely have fewer examples of accomplishments in the “excellent” list than those pursuing promotion to Professor. Professors will need to achieve excellence by demonstrating examples of multiple high-level achievements relevant to their academic dossier. The general expectation is that performance at each successively higher level will reflect continuous productivity and activities of increasingly greater impact within the individual's area(s) of expertise.

In summary, rather than providing an “absolute standard,” these examples serve to demonstrate the diversity of ways in which faculty may meet the standards for meritorious or excellent performance in each of the four areas of faculty responsibility. The faculty is expected to provide evidence of how they meet the standards for “meritorious” or “excellent” performance in the areas of faculty responsibility.

Teaching/Education	
Meritorious	Excellent
<p>Ability to use examinations and grades to appropriately and equitably evaluate student performance, as determined by peers.</p> <p>Active participation on education-related committees within the school.</p> <p>Active participation in the teaching/education activities of the departments and school directed towards students (graduate or professional), residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, or other trainees/health professionals (i.e. presenting a series of lectures covering one or more topics; acting as a primary instructor in a course, journal clubs or laboratory exercises, organizing or facilitating a seminar series, participating in CE courses).</p> <p>Demonstrates expertise in curricular content in the area of teaching responsibility.</p> <p>Develops new or appropriately revises educational materials on a consistent basis.</p> <p>Participation in mentoring programs for students (graduate or professional), residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, or other trainees.</p> <p>Participation in workshops or training on unconscious bias, diversity and inclusion, or other topics intended to improve classroom culture, teaching or mentorship.</p> <p>Quality of instructional materials or media used in the classroom, as determined by students and peers.</p> <p>Self-improvement activities (for example, participation in workshops or courses that are designed to improve teaching or mentoring effectiveness).</p>	<p>Active engagement in curriculum development or revision.</p> <p>Chairing a Doctoral Dissertation or Master's committee and/or thesis committee (not primary advisor).</p> <p>Collaborates with colleagues in development of new education strategies and course offerings.</p> <p>Completion of advanced faculty development programs that result in a certificate or degree in education, with evidence that the faculty member has applied these new skills or new knowledge to improve their teaching or pedagogy.</p> <p>Consistent participation in national educational activities (i.e., residency review committees, programs sponsored by professional organizations, re-certification courses or workshops).</p> <p>Consistent record of advocacy for diversity, inclusion and equity in the education of health professionals. Examples might include leadership of recruitment, pipeline or diversity programs or significant mentorship of learners or colleagues who are under-represented in the health professions.</p> <p>Consistent record of supporting student research projects as a mentor (i.e., mentor for honors projects, co-authoring peer reviewed publications with a student as the first author).</p> <p>Consistently receives excellent/outstanding teaching evaluations.</p> <p>Demonstration of educational leadership (for example, by serving as a course, fellowship or training program director, curriculum committee chair, leading education taskforce, director of an experimental educational program).</p>

<p>Teaching effectiveness, as judged by student, peer, and self-assessments, or accompanied by an evaluation from the department chair.</p> <p>Utilization of assessments to improve education programs.</p>	<p>Development of a new course, clinical rotation, or major revision of an existing course.</p> <p>Development of education policies that serve to enhance the quality of educational programs.</p> <p>Development of innovative courses, innovative delivery of course content including problem-based learning cases, laboratory exercises, online or remote teaching resources or other instructional materials, or innovative teaching methods, such as educational websites, simulations, videotapes, packaged courses or workshops.</p> <p>Development of mentoring or coaching programs that focus on career development, academic advancement or wellness and resiliency of students (graduate or professional), residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, or other trainees/health professionals, or faculty.</p> <p>Development of teaching resources for faculty on diversity and inclusion, and health equity.</p> <p>Development or implementation of new technologies that aid the learning process, as determined by peers and students.</p> <p>Effective teaching in unusually challenging circumstances (for example, during a disaster or public health emergency, in remote or resource constrained communities or countries, or teaching English language learners or special needs learners).</p> <p>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.</p>
--	---

	<p>Evidence of teaching scholarship, such as publication or presentations related to teaching methodologies or innovations, publication of course materials, software programs and textbooks and the degree to which results are accepted by peers.</p> <p>Invitations to and/or present courses outside of primary department, educate peers via directing or teaching in workshops and conferences or serve as visiting professor at other institutions.</p> <p>Invitations to present seminars at local, state, national, or international meetings with a focus on education and/or teaching.</p> <p>Leadership of, or significant contributions to, the development of certifying, credentialing or qualifying examinations for students (graduate or professional), residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, or other trainees/health professionals.</p> <p>Nominations for or receipt of teaching awards as well as other regional, national and international recognition accorded teaching accomplishments.</p> <p>Obtains internal and/or external funding for program of teaching scholarship.</p> <p>Obtaining new or additional resources to support existing or new educational programs.</p> <p>Record of successful mentorship of students (graduate or professional), residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, other trainees/health professionals or faculty, as measured by: letters of support from mentees; publications, presentations, grants, awards or other evidence of mentees' academic success; evidence that mentees have obtained related job positions and pursued outstanding careers.</p> <p>Successful leadership of local, regional or national continuing education courses.</p>
--	---

Scholarly/Creative Work/Research	
Meritorious	Excellent
<p>Authorship of publications including research articles, review articles, book chapters, case reports, letters to editor, etc. First- or senior-authored publications are present but may include co-authored published work.</p> <p>Development of patent applications for discoveries.</p> <p>Facilitates school, campus or hospital research programs by serving as a regular member of relevant research related committees.</p> <p>Obtaining grants or other financial support for research-related scholarly activity.</p> <p>Participates in the design, conduct and publication of research (basic science, clinical, educational, epidemiological, translational)</p> <p>Presentations at local and regional meetings; and/or invited research seminars.</p> <p>Service as an ad hoc member on study sections.</p> <p>Service as an ad-hoc reviewer for a medical or scientific journal.</p> <p>Serving as a collaborator in a basic science, clinical, educational, epidemiological, translational or other research program.</p>	<p>An ongoing record of first- or senior-author publications in peer-reviewed journals that: a) represent significant contributions to the published literature; b) demonstrate the ability to generate or test hypotheses; and/or c) demonstrate originality and independence as an investigator or represent significant independent intellectual contributions to successful research programs. Team scientists should have an ongoing, peer-reviewed publication record that includes first-, middle- or senior-author publications, with documentation that the faculty member has made substantial and unique contributions to the conception or design of the publications, acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the data, and/or writing of the manuscript.</p> <p>As a primary consideration for research, establishment of an independent or team-based sustainable extramurally-funded (i.e. NIH, DOD, NSF, industry funding, foundation funding, education support grants) 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 greater 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.)</p> <p>Awarded patents for discoveries.</p> <p>Development and/or dissemination/implementation of new techniques, therapies, clinical guidelines, patient care pathways, health care delivery systems that have improved the health of patients or populations or creation and generation of intellectual property.</p> <p>Evidence of scholarship (for example, research, grants, publications or national</p>

	<p>presentations) that promote educational innovation, health care quality and patient safety or that advance the science and practice of health care quality improvement; or influence policy or a field of research in diversity and inclusion, and health equity.</p> <p>Leadership in the design, conduct, and publication of basic science, clinical, educational, epidemiological, translational research.</p> <p>Principal investigator status on competitive peer-reviewed research grants (for example: K08, K23 or similar mentored awards from NIH or private foundations for associate professors; R01, R21, P01, P30, P50 or similar independent awards for professors). These examples should be considered as guides, as funding expectations vary across disciplines and departments. In general, greatest weight is given to funding that is sustained, that has led to impactful research and that indicates a high likelihood of future competitive funding.</p> <p>Progression to or established national and international recognition accorded research accomplishments as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. receipt of research honors and awards; b. election to membership and/or to officer positions in scientific organizations; c. invitations to serve on advisory boards, editorial boards of journals, government and scientific society groups, and grant review panels; d. invitations to organize a scientific symposium e. invitations to serve as an editor, section editor or editorial board member for a medical or scientific journal f. invitations to serve as a regular member on a scientific study section <p>Receipt of grants or contracts for clinical trials, outcomes research, scientific research and other creative endeavors that results in scholarly activity.</p> <p>Regularly assumes greater than average</p>
--	---

	<p>share of administrative, leadership or service responsibilities related to research. Examples might include leading or making exceptional contributions school, campus or other University or hospital research committees, institutes, organizations or cores.</p> <p>Success as a team scientist. Success may include: significant independent intellectual contributions to successful research programs; contributing distinct expertise (for example, in one or more biological sciences, epidemiology, statistics, computational biology, qualitative or mixed-methods research, pedogeological, community participatory research, clinical pharmacy, clinical trials or other areas) to a research team or collaboration that results in important discoveries and publications; contributing critical skills, expertise and effort as a co-investigator that result in sustained competitive research funding; or contributions to research teams that result in new insights, break boundaries, promote technology development or lead to new discoveries.</p>
--	--

Leadership/Service	
Meritorious	Excellent
<p>Contributing to department, school, campus, university or hospital programs that focus on diversity, equity, inclusion, anti-racism, through service on committees, coordinating events or outreach activities.</p> <p>Mentoring and encouraging the professional growth of students (graduate or professional), residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, other trainees or faculty.</p> <p>Participation in department functions and initiatives.</p> <p>Participation in school functions, student-sponsored programs and local professional activities, and the conscientious execution of department responsibilities.</p> <p>Service as an article reviewer for clinical, educational or scientific journals.</p> <p>Service on committees or task forces within the program, division, department, school, campus or university.</p> <p>Service to local, state, national or international organizations through committee membership.</p>	<p>Appointment to a national or international committee.</p> <p>Consultative services to other health professionals, hospitals, institutions of higher education, and governmental agencies.</p> <p>Development of a faculty-mentoring program.</p> <p>Election to responsible positions dealing with health care issues at the local, state, regional, national or international levels. Invited lectures or presentations (i.e. scientific, continuing education) at state, national or international meetings.</p> <p>Leadership and service as an officer, committee or task force chair in professional or scientific organizations.</p> <p>Leadership and/or service awards from an area of the University or from a local, national, or international organization (civic, scientific and/or professional).</p> <p>Leadership on a state, national or international committee related to diversity and inclusion, and health equity.</p> <p>Service as an editor or editorial board member of a professional or scientific journal.</p> <p>Service as a member of a scientific study section, grant reviewer or external program evaluation.</p>

Clinical Care	
Meritorious	Excellent
<p>Achieving and/or maintaining pharmacy board certification (i.e. BPS) in an area or areas applicable to primary clinical practice/patient care responsibilities.</p> <p>Active and effective participation in clinical activities that promote health care quality and patient safety.</p> <p>Active participation in clinical programs that address the needs of under-served or marginalized patients or populations</p> <p>Assessment and improvements in clinical programs.</p> <p>Evidence of maintenance and enhancement of professional competency, e.g., through continuing education, conferences, and/or seminars.</p> <p>Evidence of service that increases the quality of experiential education. (i.e. implement entrustable professional activities (EPAs)).</p> <p>Invitations to speak on clinical topics on campus.</p> <p>Participation in workshops or training programs that address challenges in diversity and equity in clinical settings, including workshops focusing on implicit bias, microaggressions, confronting racism, allyship and upstander training.</p> <p>Participation on committees or task forces that support the patient care programs of the department, hospital, school or university.</p> <p>Provision of education on pharmacotherapy related topics to pharmacists and other health care providers.</p> <p>Serves as a professional role model in area of clinical expertise.</p>	<p>Ability to provide high quality patient-specific pharmaceutical care, as evaluated by students, residents, fellows, other trainees, professional colleagues, peers and/or supervisors, which promotes safe, effective and economical pharmacotherapy in patients and leads to documented better patient care and outcomes.</p> <p>Appointment to community boards or other leadership positions in organizations that promote healthier communities and address the social, environmental and economic determinants of health.</p> <p>Attainment of extramural funding in support of clinical programs or initiatives.</p> <p>Creative, active participation in the evaluation of the effectiveness of care (quality, outcomes, patient safety, utilization, access, cost).</p> <p>Development of new techniques, therapies, clinical guidelines, clinical information systems, patient care practices or pathways or health care delivery systems that have improved the health of patients or populations</p> <p>Enhancement of clinical programs through development of program policies or procedures.</p> <p>Establishment of new and innovative types of pharmacy practices.</p> <p>Evidence to support being an outstanding practitioner and professional role model.</p> <p>Leadership roles (i.e. national, international, or professional organization), journal editor or as a consultant in areas of recognized clinical expertise.</p> <p>Nomination for, or receipt of, honors or awards for clinical excellence or professionalism.</p>

	<p>Progression towards or established national and/or international recognition in the area of expertise.</p> <p>Providing direct patient care in challenging or hazardous circumstances, such as during pandemics or public health emergencies or during deployments to resource-limited or hazardous locations overseas.</p> <p>Publication of review articles, case reports, clinical trials or other evidence of scholarship associated with clinical practice.</p> <p>Regularly assumes greater than average share of administrative, leadership or service responsibilities in support of the patient care programs of the department, hospital, school or university.</p> <p>Service on committees or leadership roles (i.e. national, international, or professional organization) or as a consultant in areas of recognized clinical expertise.</p> <p>Significant involvement in health care advocacy, community service, community-based participatory research programs, or other activities that shape public policy on health care, address racism and inequities in the healthcare system or that address community health and healthcare needs.</p>
--	---

Appendix G: Promotion process and standards in the regular faculty track.

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/education and original scholarly/creative work/research, and/or where appropriate, innovative clinical care. Distinction in leadership and service may supplement a record of teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research and, where appropriate, innovative clinical care. A rating of excellent by the department ARPT committee must be obtained in one of the following: teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research or clinical care (where appropriate). 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 their area of expertise. Annual performance ratings are not used as a primary evaluative tool for promotion considerations.

<i>Excellence in at least one of the following:</i>	AND	<i>At least Meritorious in three of the following (including the one indicated in the excellent category):</i>
Teaching/education		Teaching/education
Scholarly/creative work/research		Scholarly/creative work/research
Clinical care (where applicable)		Clinical care (where applicable) Leadership and service

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

To receive a rating of excellent in teaching/education, the candidate must have a record of on-going highly effective teaching, involvement in educational program development and/or innovative activities marked by accomplishments in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix F).

To receive a rating of excellent in scholarly/creative work/research for promotion to associate professor, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of scholastic productivity that indicates they are 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 F). 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.

To receive a rating of excellent in clinical care 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 F). In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical care performance.

Consideration for promotion to associate professor will normally be initiated once the candidate is in their seventh year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. This may occur earlier or 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, dean, and EVC-ASA. 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 make a recommendation to the dean. The dean will issue a recommendation to the EVC-ASA, who will make a final decision. 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 their seventh year of full-time service as an assistant professor (or later, up to their tenth year if a maximum three-year extension is granted) will not be reappointed (see section 5).

If the criteria for promotion have been revised before a candidate has been evaluated for promotion to associate professor, the candidate will have the option to continue under the promotion and tenure requirements of the approved policies and criteria (as presented in Appendix F) established when they were hired or under the most recent approved revised policies and criteria (as

presented in Appendix F) for promotion to associate professor. This decision will be made by the assistant professor who may be advised by their department chair. The decision must be documented in the faculty member’s promotion dossier.

Professor: Promotion to the rank of professor requires that the candidate meets the criteria for associate professor and: (a) a record that, taken as a whole, may be judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to professional, and graduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; (c) a record since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching/education, scholarly/creative work/research, and leadership and service and/or, when appropriate, innovative clinical care and (d) achieved recognition as a national and/or international authority in their field of study.

A record taken as a whole to be excellent is determined by:

<i>Excellence in at least two of the following with evidence of scholarship in at least one of the two:</i>	AND	<i>At least Meritorious in three of the following (including the two indicated in the excellent category):</i>
Teaching/education Scholarly/creative work/research Clinical care (where applicable)		Teaching/education
		Scholarly/creative work/research
		Clinical care (where applicable)
		Leadership and service

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

To achieve a rating of excellent in teaching/education for promotion to professor, the candidate must have a sustained record of excellence in teaching/education as defined in Appendix F. 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. Additionally, the candidate may have a record of sustained, on-going, innovative activities marked by excellence in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix F).

To achieve a rating of excellent in scholarly/creative work/research 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 F). There should be evidence that the candidate's research productivity with respect to funding and publications has continued to grow since their 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.

To achieve a rating of excellent in clinical care is for promotion to professor, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services that have achieved national recognition for their contribution to clinical 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 care performance (Appendix F).

Promotion to professor will always occur under approved primary unit criteria in effect at time of the promotion review.

Appendix H: *Promotion process and standards in the clinical teaching track.*

In general, a candidate being considered for promotion is expected to achieve and maintain an excellent level of performance in each of their major areas of academic responsibility (teaching/education and/or clinical care) during the period prior to the 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 care.

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/education, leadership and service and/or innovative clinical care. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students and may have contributed to the scholarly/creative work/research mission of the SSPPS.

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/education, and/or innovative clinical care. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students and may have contributed to the scholarly/creative work/research mission of the SSPPS. The candidate will typically have a minimum of five years of service as an assistant professor. A rating of excellent must be obtained in the candidate's primary area of academic responsibility. While annual performance ratings are used to assess a faculty member's general progress toward promotion, promotion is not based on achieving any particular annual review rating. Annual performance ratings are not used as a primary evaluative tool for promotion considerations.

<i>Excellence in at least one of the following:</i>	AND	<i>At least Meritorious in two of the following (including the one indicated in the excellent category):</i>
Teaching/education Clinical care (where applicable)		Teaching/education
		Clinical care (where applicable)
		Scholarly/creative work/research (where applicable)
		Leadership and service

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

To achieve a rating of excellent in teaching/education for promotion to associate professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have a sustained record of on-going, effective teaching and/or innovative activities marked by accomplishments in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix F).

To achieve a rating of excellent in clinical care for promotion to associate professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services and/or documented accomplishments in scholarly/creative work/research that includes publications. In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical care performance (Appendix F).

Consideration for promotion to associate professor in this track will normally be initiated once the candidate is in their seventh year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. This may occur earlier or 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 make a recommendation to the dean who shall issue a decision. 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 their seventh year of full-time service as an assistant professor, Clinical teaching track, (or later, up to their

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 requires that the candidate meets the criteria for associate professor and outstanding accomplishments in teaching, and/or provide clinical care, a record of leadership in the school, and a meritorious leadership and service record. Promotion implies advanced academic maturity, an advanced level of scholastic productivity and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has achieved national and/or international recognition in their chosen field of study by maintaining an ongoing program of teaching/education and/or innovative clinical care. The candidate will typically 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 either teaching/education or clinical care (where applicable). The candidate must have excellent accomplishments in teaching, and/or clinical care, a record of leadership in the school, and a meritorious leadership and service record. 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.

<i>Excellence with evidence of scholarship in at least one following:</i>	AND	<i>At least Meritorious in three of the following (including the one indicated in the excellent category):</i>
Teaching/education Clinical care (where applicable)		Teaching/education
		Clinical care (where applicable)
		Scholarly/creative work/research (where applicable)
		Leadership and service

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

To achieve a rating of excellent in education/teaching for promotion to professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have a sustained record on-going, innovative activities marked by excellence in the scholarship of teaching (Appendix F). 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.

To achieve a rating of excellent in clinical care for promotion to professor, Clinical teaching track, the candidate must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services that have achieved national recognition for their contribution to clinical 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 excellent clinical care performance (Appendix F).

Appendix I: 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 clinical care, leadership and service and/or experiential missions of the SSPPS.

Clinical senior instructor: Promotion to the rank of clinical senior instructor requires demonstrable evidence that that the candidate has significant experience in the practice of contemporary clinical pharmacy and a record of substantial contributions to teaching/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 care and the ability to substantially contribute to the mission of the SSPPS pertaining to teaching/education, leadership and service, and/or scholarly/creative work/research. The candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. The candidate will typically 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/education, leadership and service, and/or scholarly/creative work/research as appropriate. The candidate must also have participated in the training of post-doctoral professionals, fellows, residents and/or graduate students. The candidate will typically have completed at least five years of service as a clinical assistant professor.

<i>Excellence in:</i>		<i>At least Meritorious in one of the following:</i>
Clinical care	AND	Teaching/education (where applicable)
		Scholarly/creative work/research (where applicable)
		Leadership and service (where applicable)

Clinical professor: Promotion to the rank of clinical professor requires a terminal degree or equivalent and a record, when viewed holistically, is judged to be excellent and indicates substantial, significant and continued growth and development and accomplishment in clinical care, teaching/education, leadership and service and/or scholarly/creative work/research, as appropriate. The

candidate will typically have completed at least five years service as a clinical associate professor.

<i>Excellence in:</i>		<i>At least Meritorious in two of the following:</i>
Clinical care	<i>AND</i>	Teaching/education (where applicable)
		Scholarly/creative work/research (where applicable)
		Leadership and service (where applicable)

Appendix J: 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 that the candidate has actively participated in a program of scholarly/creative work/research 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 scholarly/creative work/research. 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 scholarly/creative work/research. The candidate will typically have completed at least five years of service as a research assistant professor. They 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 scholarly/creative work/research.

<i>Excellence in:</i>	AND	<i>At least Meritorious in one of the following:</i>
Scholarly/creative work/research		Teaching/education (where applicable)
		Clinical care (where applicable)
		Leadership and service (where applicable)

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 their chosen field of study through the maintenance of an ongoing extramurally-funded program of scholarly/creative work/research. The candidate will typically have completed at least five years of service as an associate professor. They 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.

<i>Excellence in:</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>At least Meritorious in two of the following:</i>
Scholarly/creative work/research		Teaching/education (where applicable)
		Clinical care (where applicable)
		Leadership and service (where applicable)

Appendix K: *Timing of promotion and decision-making steps in faculty tracks*

Regular faculty

Associate professor: Review for promotion to associate professor must occur once the candidate is in their seventh to tenth year⁵ of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. Recommendations 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 will typically 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. Recommendations 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: Recommendations 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 their seventh to tenth year⁷ of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor, Clinical teaching track. Recommendations 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 will typically have completed at least five years' service at the rank of associate professor, Clinical teaching track. Recommendations on promotion will be made by the department ARPT

⁵ Consideration for promotion to associate professor will normally be initiated once the candidate is in their seventh year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor. This may occur earlier or 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, dean and EVC-ASA.

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: Recommendations 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 will typically have completed at least five years of service as a clinical assistant professor. Recommendations 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 will typically have completed at least five years of service as a clinical associate professor. Recommendations 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: Recommendations 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 will typically have completed at least five years of service as a research assistant professor. Recommendations 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 will typically have completed at least five years of service at the rank of research associate professor. Recommendations on promotion will be made by the department ARPT committee and department chair in consultation with the dean.

Appendix L: 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. The award of tenure may also coincide with a decision to promote an assistant professor 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. As stated in Regent Policy 5.D.2, a candidate for tenure in the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences must demonstrate excellence in scholarship and excellence in, and dedication to, teaching. Further, Regent Policy requires a candidate to show evidence of impact beyond the institution in either teaching or scholarly/creative work/research. SPPSS expects a candidate for tenure will have established a national and/or international reputation in their areas of expertise and demonstrated the capacity for providing sustained contributions to enhancing human knowledge.

<i>Excellence in:</i>	<i>AND</i>	<i>At least Meritorious in:</i>
Teaching/education		Clinical care (where applicable)
Scholarly/creative work/research		Leadership and service

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

For teaching/education, the candidate must have an established record of excellence in, and dedication to, teaching/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 F). 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 scholarly/creative work/research, 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 sources, (ii) a leading role in their 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 F). There should be evidence that the candidate's research productivity with respect to funding and publications has been consistently maintained.

Appendix M: Responsibilities of a faculty member and chair

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Clinical or research faculty</i>	<i>Regular track or clinical teaching faculty member</i>	<i>Department chair</i>
<i>Annual review</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit updated curriculum vitae (CV) and record of contributions to the clinical and education missions of the school 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit updated curriculum vitae (CV), standardized annual report (SAR), professional plan and other requested materials 2. Meet regularly with faculty mentor 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure faculty member includes all information relevant to reappointment. 2. Review faculty member's CV, standardized annual report (SAR), assigned differential workload 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 assigned differential workload agreement with faculty member for following year.
<i>Interim review of assistant professor</i>	<p>Clinical - N/A</p> <p>Research –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit interim review dossier (see Appendix P) to SSPPS personnel director. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit interim review dossier (see Appendix N) to SSPPS personnel director. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet with faculty member to discuss interim review process and mentor the faculty member through the process. 2. Receive review

			<p>from department ARPT committee.</p> <p>3. Submit summary recommendation letter and ARPT report to dean.</p>
<i>Promotion</i>	<p>1. Submit dossier (see Appendix O,P) to SSPPS personnel director.</p>	<p>1. Submit dossier (see Appendix N) to SSPPS personnel director.</p> <p>2. Provide names of individuals who could and/or should not be considered as possible external reviewers.</p>	<p>1. Meet with faculty member to review promotion process and mentor the faculty member through the process.</p> <p>2. Request and receive optional letters of evaluation from department faculty members.</p> <p>3. Receive report from department ARPT committee.</p> <p>4. Submit summary recommendation letter and ARPT report to dean.</p>
<i>Tenure (applies to regular faculty member only)</i>	N/A	<p>1. Submit dossier (see Appendix Q) to SSPPS personnel director.</p> <p>2. Provide names of individuals who could and/or should not be considered as possible external reviewers.</p>	<p>1. Meet with faculty member to review tenure process and mentor the faculty member through the process.</p> <p>2. Request and receive letters of evaluation from department faculty members.</p> <p>3. Receive report from department ARPT committee.</p> <p>4. Submit summary recommendation letter and ARPT report to dean.</p>

Appendix N: 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/education ability of the candidate (IR, P), including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit an organized teacher's portfolio that highlights their 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. If relevant, the candidate should provide a statement about how their teaching has had impact beyond the institution.*
- *Documents supporting the candidate's clinical care (IR, P). This section may include documentation new and innovative types of pharmacy practice, clinical care initiatives or quality improvement programs, clinical contracts, development of program policies and procedures and publications associated with clinical care. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.*
- *Documents supporting the candidate's scholarly/creative work/research (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 leadership and 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 their 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.*
- *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 they would exclude as evaluators. Up to two external evaluation letters may be requested for interim reviews and a minimum of three and up to five external evaluation letters will be required for promotion reviews
- *Optional SSPPS faculty letters of evaluation (P).* Letters of evaluation may be 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).*
- *Performance rating template (P).* The template (**Appendix Na**) 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 Nb** for additional details required in this letter for **P**)
- *Performance rating template (P)* (see **Appendix Na**). 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 Na: 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.

	# voting members	Teaching/ Education			Scholarly/creative work/research			Clinical Care			Leadership and Service		
		E	M	NM	E	M	NM	E	M	NM	E	M	NM
Department													
Department chair													
Dean’s Review Committee													
Dean													

NOTE: If additional votes were taken at any level, add rows to the above template as needed.

Appendix Nb: *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 scholarly/creative work/research, excellent teaching/education, excellent leadership and service, excellent clinical care.

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 Na**) must be included with the dossier that includes votes at all levels on all aspects of the candidate's performance.

Appendix O: 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 teaching/education and mentoring ability of the candidate (R, P),* including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit a summary that highlights their accomplishments in teaching students in their 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 their role as preceptor or mentor) and any student evaluations that have been obtained, e.g., through school-wide systems 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 clinical care (R, P).* This section may include documentation new and innovative types of pharmacy practice, clinical care initiatives or quality improvement programs, clinical contracts, development of program policies and procedures and publications associated with clinical care. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- *Documents supporting the candidate's scholarly/creative work/research (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 leadership and 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 their 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.*
- *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 P: 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 teaching/education and mentoring ability of the candidate (IR, P), including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit a summary that highlights their accomplishments in teaching students in their 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 their role as preceptor or mentor) and any student evaluations that have been obtained, e.g., through school-wide systems 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 scholarly/creative work/research (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 clinical care (IR, P). This section may include documentation new and innovative types of pharmacy practice, clinical care initiatives or quality improvement programs, clinical contracts, development of program policies and procedures and publications associated with clinical care. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.*
- *Documents supporting the candidate's leadership and 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 their 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.*

- *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 they would exclude as evaluators. A minimum of three external letters of evaluation are required for promotion review.
- *Optional SSPPS faculty letters of evaluation (P).* Letters of evaluation may be 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 Q: 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/education and mentoring ability of the candidate*, including results of learner evaluations. Each candidate should submit an organized teacher's portfolio that highlights their 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 scholarly/creative work/research.* 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 clinical care.* This section may include documentation new and innovative types of pharmacy practice, clinical care initiatives or quality improvement programs, clinical contracts, development of program policies and procedures and publications associated with clinical care. A self-evaluative statement or narrative summary should be provided.
- *Documents supporting the candidate's leadership and 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 their 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.*

- *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 they would exclude as evaluators. A minimum of three and up to five external evaluation letters will be required for tenure reviews
- *Optional SSPPS faculty letters of evaluation.* Letters of evaluation may be requested from all tenured faculty members of SSPPSARPT *committee recommendation letter*
- *Performance rating template (Appendix Q_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 Q_b** for details required in this letter)
- *Performance rating template* (see **Appendix Q_a**). This should be completed by the department chair, dean’s review committee and the dean.
- *Vice-Chancellor’s Advisory Committee recommendation letter*

Appendix Q_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, or Appointment with 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.

	# voting members	Teaching/Education			Scholarly/creative work/research			Clinical Care			Leadership and Service		
		E	M	NM	E	M	NM	E	M	NM	E	M	NM
Department													
Department chair													
Dean’s Review Committee													
Dean													

NOTE: If additional votes were taken at any level, add rows to the above template as needed.

Appendix Q_b: *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 scholarly/creative work/research, excellent teaching, excellent leadership and service, excellent clinical care.

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 Q_a**) must be included with the dossier that includes votes at all levels on all aspects of the candidate's performance.

Appendix Ra: Dossier materials for post-promotion review.

Clinical teaching track and untenured regular track associate professors may request to undergo post-promotion review (PPR) to obtain feedback regarding their performance as they consider applying for promotion to professor. As such, PPR is not required for untenured associate or professors in the regular track or clinical teaching track. 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.
- *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*

Appendix R_b: Dossier materials for post-tenure review.

Dossier materials to be submitted for post-tenure review of a tenured regular track faculty member must include:

- *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.
- *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*

Document author: Cindy L. O'Bryant, Associate Dean Academic and Faculty Affairs

SSPPS Faculty Senate Approval: November 30, 2022

Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs Approval: December 2, 2022