



College of Pharmacy

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE OF FACULTY

Introduction

Faculty members of The University of Arizona College of Pharmacy have responsibilities in several areas; primary among these are teaching, scholarship/research and professional/public service. While effort in each of these areas will vary from department to department and among individuals, every member of the faculty of the College of Pharmacy is expected to make contributions to each of these traditional areas.

Achievement of success in the essential areas of activity is recognized by the University through promotion in rank and with award of tenure. Promotion and tenure are achieved only through documented evidence of accomplishments. All faculty of The University of Arizona are reviewed for promotion and/or tenure using the guidelines of the *Board of Regents' Conditions of Faculty Service* (6201; Rev. 21/84) which are supplemental to the University policy outlined in Chapter III of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel*, including any published supplements or revisions.

The review process at The University of Arizona follows a three-tier structure. A review of the faculty member is initiated in the department. The latter occurs in response to a request for review by the candidate or on the basis of time of service. A formal Departmental Faculty Status Committee review is conducted in parallel with an independent review by the department head. The resulting reviews, along with the candidate's documents, are sent to the dean of the college, who requests that the College Faculty Status Committee meet to review the candidate. The results of that review are sent on to the dean, who provides his or her own independent review. Those independent reviews are then sent for a final review, which occurs at the University level. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee provides the final analysis and recommendation to the provost of the University.

College of Pharmacy Faculty Status Committee

The College of Pharmacy Faculty Status Committee is a standing committee of the college, and is appointed on a yearly basis by the dean of the college. Members are tenured, full-time faculty and represent each department within the college. This committee has responsibility for the review of all candidates being put forward by the college departments for promotion and/or tenure and those who undergo three-year reviews prior to the mandatory six-year reviews.

The committee acts in an oversight role and as a decanal advisory body. The college committee forms an independent evaluation about the merits of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. In addition, this committee is expected to review the recommendation made by the candidate's department, evaluate the basis for that decision and make certain that all departmental and University guidelines have been followed appropriately. This committee provides advice to the dean of the college about the candidate's accomplishments and offers a recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure. This committee acts in the overall best interests of the college.

The committee adheres to existing guidelines for evaluating the candidate and it does not exercise criteria in reaching its recommendation that are different from the University and department.

Promotion and Tenure for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

Appointment as Assistant Professor

A candidate is hired as an assistant professor on the basis of academic promise and accomplishments during doctoral and post-doctoral training periods. Such an individual is ordinarily required to have a doctoral degree (Ph.D. or Pharm.D.) from a recognized university and additional (research or clinical) training appropriate for the position. The quality of the degree-granting university and post-doctoral training are significant considerations as are letters of recommendation and accomplishments of the candidate (e.g., publications, research funding.) The individual is expected to show potential for creative scholarship, quality teaching and interest in professional and public service. The Faculty Status Committee is generally not asked to review candidates for appointment to assistant professor.

University policy indicates that tenure-eligible faculty must undergo a three-year review prior to the required promotion and tenure review in the sixth year. Each year, the department head will notify those faculty who will undergo the three-year review. The individual faculty member must prepare a dossier that includes all the elements required in the six-year review dossier, except for the outside letters. The three-year review becomes, in effect, a dress rehearsal for the six-year review.

The purpose of this review is to provide feedback to the individual faculty member as to progress in obtaining promotion and tenure. The faculty status committee will conduct the evaluation and provide a written report to the department head. The department head will then provide the faculty member with the written results of the evaluation, spelling out strengths and weaknesses in making progress toward promotion and tenure. The review and recommendation, along with the recommendation of the department head, are then forwarded to the College Faculty Status Committee for deliberation and then on to the dean. If the results of the three-year review warrant the need for an interim review prior to the mandatory review in the sixth year, the department head, dean or Faculty Status Committee may request an additional review in year four or five. If the results of the three-year or any subsequent pre-tenure review are negative, the file must proceed through the regular promotion and tenure process to the office of the provost, as described in the [University Handbook for Appointed Personnel](#), section 3.12.07

Promotion to Associate Professor

An assistant professor is promoted (or an associate professor is appointed) on the basis of having clearly established credentials as a scholar and teacher. An associate professor is expected to have established a sustained, independent and creative research program that

has been supported by funding from peer-reviewed granting agencies or other organizations. The scholarship is expected to be at the highest level and to have received national if not international recognition for its contributions to the candidate's scientific discipline. Mastery of the candidate's scientific discipline subject matter is expected, as is the proven ability to translate and communicate that information at a variety of levels including peers, post-graduate, graduate and undergraduate students, interns and residents and lay people. Teaching, therefore, should be of the highest quality and clearly documented.

The scholarly contributions of the candidate will depend upon the training and responsibilities of the candidate and will vary from department to department. In general, faculty members of the College are expected to become expert in a scientific research discipline or in a more applied clinical discipline. In either setting, however, the candidate must be recognized for his or her scholarship and contributions to the discipline, as well as for teaching proficiency.

All faculty candidates are expected to become involved with and provide service to the University community as well as to scientific and professional communities. Clearly, the time and effort that an individual devotes to these activities will vary, depending upon a variety of factors, but should never occur at the expense of quality of scholarship and teaching. All candidates should provide support to their department and the college through committee work assignments. Contributions to University committees, while not expected at this level, should be considered by the candidate. Involvement with scientific associations and professional organizations are other aspects of service and the time and interest determines the extent of the contribution. The candidate needs to balance these several conflicting time-demands.

A special aspect of the promotion to associate professor is that typically that consideration is made in conjunction with a decision about tenure. The determination to tenure an individual represents a long-time commitment by the University and, as a consequence, care needs to be exercised when granting tenure. It is necessary to make some determination that the individual being considered for tenure has excellent prospects for continued success and the evidence is clear, to the extent possible, supporting that decision.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to rank of professor represents the ultimate level on the academic professorial ladder, with the exceptions of special titles such as Regent's Professor or Distinguished Professor. The title of professor indicates that the candidate has achieved a nationally and internationally recognized reputation as an authority in the chosen discipline. To achieve this status, an individual must have a sustained period of scholarly activity since promotion to associate professor that is apparent through publications, other forms of communication, invited presentations and a funded research program. The research program is generally expected to have provided training for postdoctoral and doctoral students who, at this time, have become independent scientists or clinicians in their own right. Teaching quality shall have continued and the candidate should have made contributions to the academic community through committee assignments (often as chair) at the department, college and

University levels. Furthermore, the candidate is expected to have made service contributions to his or her scientific community and/or professional organizations.

Promotion and Retention of Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty

In addition to the tenure-eligible professorial track, there are least two other professional appointments at the college: clinical track and research track. Each department in the College of Pharmacy uses one of those tracks, which is made available for specific teaching, clinical or research needs. Each department has created guidelines for promotion and retention in those tracks. The College Faculty Status Committee uses those guidelines in conjunction with existing University rules to make its decisions on promotion of individuals in these tracks.

Annual Reviews

All faculty members of the college are reviewed every year to assess performance in the areas of scholarship/research, teaching and service. This review occurs at the department level and involves independent reviews by the department head and a committee appointed by the department head or voted upon by department members. The department head summarizes his or her evaluation along with that of the committee and those results are presented to the dean. The College Faculty Status Committee reviews those results primarily for discrepancies between the department head and department committee, and for any instances of poor performance by a faculty member. The College Faculty Status Committee then submits a report to the dean of the college summarizing the findings, which forms the basis of the dean's yearly audit (for post-tenure review only).

The yearly review of faculty members during their pre-tenure status is especially important since it should allow the individual to have a clear picture as to his or her performance in general and with respect to progress towards the formal three-year review and the promotion and tenure decision in year six. It is important that the department head thoroughly review with the candidate his or her performance in the areas of scholarship/research, teaching and service. It is also important to indicate to the candidate that these yearly reviews have a more narrow focus than the wider review exercised during the promotion and tenure review. Therefore, it is important to impress upon the candidate the following view expressed by the University: "Annual performance reviews shall be taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion and tenure issues. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure."

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE OF TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY

Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science
College of Pharmacy
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Introduction

The primary functions of University faculty are: the creation of new knowledge through scholarly and research activities; provide quality instruction to students in professional and graduate programs; provide service to the institution (department, college and university) and to professional and scientific organizations and public service. Faculty employed by the University must meet all of these functions, but not necessarily in equal measure. Meeting societal demands to provide these functions in a creative and effective manner leads to the rewards offered to a faculty member by this University (*i.e.*, promotion, tenure). Promotion and tenure decisions, therefore, should be based upon evidence and documentation of outstanding performance in these areas.

Pharmacy Practice and Science faculty are promoted and/or tenured under the guidelines of the Arizona Board of Regents' Conditions of Faculty Service which are supplemental to the University policy outlined in the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP)*, including any published supplements or revisions thereof. It is strongly suggested that faculty thoroughly read each of these University documents. The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for promotion and tenure for Pharmacy Practice and Science faculty. The Department Head should be notified of any real or perceived contradictions between university and departmental promotion and tenure policies.

Generally, all recommendations for promotion and/or tenure are submitted to the Dean's office by October 15 of each academic year and to the Provost's office by January 15. Decisions are reached some time in April following submission of the dossier. To initiate the process, a written memorandum from the candidate indicating the desire to be considered for promotion and/or tenure should be provided to the Department Head at the beginning of the academic year. It is important that the candidate create a dossier consistent with the exact requirements set out by the Provost's office. Not providing the information requested and not adhering to the guidelines will only delay the review process.

Committee on Faculty Status

The Department's Committee on Faculty Status is responsible for evaluating faculty for promotion and/or tenure. The Department Head appoints the Committee at the beginning of each academic year. This Committee consists of at least three tenured faculty members representing the academic ranks of associate professor and professor. The chairperson of the Committee shall be appointed annually by the Head of the Department. In cases where a candidate is being considered for promotion to full professor, the Committee will consist of only tenured full professors. The Committee will generally provide its review of the candidate during August to September. That review, along with the Department Head's letter of review, is transmitted to the Dean by October 15.

Previous version: March 2014

Revised and approved June 1, 2015

Formal Assessment on Progress Toward Promotion and Tenure and Continuing Status for Tenure-Track Faculty

Annual performance reviews of all tenure-track faculty (with or without tenure) will be conducted by the Department Head and a department peer-review committee of faculty members selected by department vote and will include a component discussing the candidate's progress toward Promotion and Tenure. For candidates whose progress in any area is not satisfactory, a written plan must be developed by the candidate in consultation with the Department Head within 120 days of the annual performance review with guidelines for improvement and for integration into subsequent annual reviews until the plan is completed. This plan must be submitted with the results of the progress toward Promotion and Tenure.

All tenure-track faculty who have not achieved tenure will undergo a third-year review on progress toward tenure which includes the "Progress to Tenure Dossier." The third-year review is conducted by the appointed Departmental Faculty Status Committee (this is different from the annual peer review committee which conducts the annual performance review based on the annual performance review documents) and the Department Head. The third-year review is a formal process that requires both Departmental and College Faculty Status Committee assessment. This review represents a "dress-rehearsal" for the mandatory six-year review and should provide a good indication of the candidate's progress in meeting the requirements for promotion and/or tenure. The Faculty Status Committee will use the Department's Promotion and Tenure guidelines to describe and assess the candidate's progress in a report to the Department Head. Participation in the annual Promotion and Tenure component is limited to those faculty holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate.

Promotion and Tenure Review Procedure

A tenure-eligible assistant professor may be recommended for promotion, for nonrenewal, or for other changes in status after annual performance reviews in any year up to the sixth year of tenure-eligible service, or a subsequent year if a time clock delay has been granted. If individuals are initially appointed as tenure-eligible associate professors at the University, and they have not served at another educational institution in the rank of assistant or associate professor, they will be governed by the same time schedule for notification of renewal, promotion, or tenure decisions as assistant professors. The Provost has the sole authority to grant requests to extend the promotion clock for tenure-eligible faculty based upon good cause shown for either personal or professional reasons.

An associate professor with tenure may go up for promotion to the rank of professor at any time. Promotion is not required as a condition of continued employment. If the faculty member's immediate administrative head does not recommend the faculty member for promotion to tenured full professor before the end of the fifth year of service in the rank of tenured associate professor at the University, his or her immediate administrative head should notify the faculty member in writing of the right to be reviewed during the sixth year for promotion to tenured full professor.

At the beginning of each academic year, the Department Head shall provide the Department's Faculty Status Committee chairperson with a list of names of faculty who are to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. An individual faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion during the following academic year should notify the Department Head of such a request in writing by April 1. In turn, each faculty member to be reviewed shall be notified by the Department Head, in writing, of his/her scheduled review. Each faculty member shall be reminded of the University and College of Pharmacy policy and guidelines for promotion and/or tenure. She/he shall be given a deadline for submitting to the Department Head documentation (the candidate's dossier) supporting creative and effective performance in teaching, service, and research. The candidate is encouraged to attend the Provost's office Annual Workshop (Instructions on the Process and Preparation of Dossiers for Promotion and Tenure and Continuing Status and Promotion), which is held each year in mid-April.

The faculty member should submit a list of at least three prominent individuals outside of the University who would be able to provide a competent and fair review of the individual being considered for promotion. The Department Head will also choose at least three prominent individuals outside the University who would be able to provide a competent and fair review of the individual being considered for promotion. No more than half of the total number of outside evaluators may be from the candidate's list. The Department Head will distribute the candidate's dossier to the outside evaluators with a request for review. Upon completion of their evaluation, the outside evaluators will send a letter of their evaluation of the candidate's dossier to the Department Head. The Department Head will add the outside evaluators' letters to the candidate's dossier and then submit the candidate's dossier to the Department Faculty Status Committee. Generally, it is inappropriate to have external reviewers who have collaborated with the candidate in order to obtain an unbiased, independent review. The faculty member should

refer to documents made available from the Provost's office (e.g., "Guide to the Promotion Process").

In promotion or tenure matters the committees shall be so constituted that recommendations shall be made only by faculty members holding rank superior to the rank of the candidate being considered, except in the case of full professors where the committee members shall each be a full professor. Normally standing committees shall meet without the administrator whom they advise.

Once the candidate's dossier is received, the Department Committee members will review the dossier and then meet in one or more closed sessions. A written ballot will be taken and the results will accompany the written report of the deliberations and the decision of the Committee with regard to promotion and/or tenure. This evaluation will then be submitted to the Department Head. A minority viewpoint will accompany the Committee report if the decision is not unanimous. The Department Head will review the reports and forward a memorandum containing his/her own recommendation to the Dean of the College of Pharmacy. The candidate's dossier and the Departmental Faculty Status Committee's report will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will then forward the candidate's dossier to the College Faculty Status Committee who will review the dossier. The College Faculty Status Committee will return the candidate's dossier along with their report to the Dean. The Dean provides his/her assessment and the candidate's dossier to the Provost who will forward the dossier to the University Committee for their review. The University Committee will submit their review and the dossier back to the Provost for his/her decision. The Board of Regents then approves/denies all promotion and tenure decisions.

Review for Retention of Tenure Eligible Faculty – Third Year Review

University policy requires that tenure-eligible assistant and associate professors must undergo a three-year review prior to the required promotion and tenure review in the sixth year. Each year, the Department Head will notify those faculty who will undergo the three-year review according to University guidelines. The dossier must include all the elements of the six-year review with the possible exception of outside letters. Departments may seek additional assessments from outside the department and/or University regarding a candidate's professional accomplishments, stature as viewed by peers, and scholarly potential. The three-year review becomes, in effect, a "dress rehearsal" for the six-year review. The purpose of this review is to provide feedback to the individual faculty member as to progress being made in obtaining promotion and tenure. The third-year review is conducted by the appointed Department Faculty Status Committee and the Department Head, and the Department Faculty Status Committee will provide a written report to the Department Head. The Department Head will then provide the faculty member with the written results of the evaluation, spelling out strengths and weaknesses in making progress toward promotion and tenure. The review and recommendation are then forwarded to the College Faculty Status Committee for deliberation and then on to the Dean. If the results of the three-year review warrant the need for an interim review prior to the mandatory year,

the Department Head or Dean or College Faculty Status Committee may request an additional four or five year review. If the results of the three-year or any subsequent probationary review are negative, the file must proceed through the regular Promotion and Tenure process to the Provost's office as described in UHAP policy.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

The quality of scholarship/research, teaching and service are the traditional areas in which an academic is evaluated for consideration for promotion and tenure. Faculty members in the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science are appointed and promoted on the basis of their achievement and standing in each of these areas. Below is a more detailed discussion of criteria for promotion.

Scholarship/Research

In the broadest sense, scholarly/research activity describes the organized scientific pursuit of new knowledge. One significant quantifiable endpoint for evaluating progress in scholarly/research activity is the subsequent publication of original results. The key criteria for acceptability should include:

1. Scholarly and/or research publications (indicate if peer-reviewed).
 - a. Manuscripts reporting the results of original research and published in refereed, peer-reviewed journals of high quality and appropriate for the discipline.
 - b. Books, book chapters, reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles in professional publications (ideally peer-reviewed), research reports to sponsors, accepted manuscripts, research notes and bulletins, book reviews

2. Publication of original, high quality research is the primary criterion (see number 1a), however, the following refereed publications might constitute some of the types of acceptable research/ scholarly activities:
 - a. Large series "case reports" with extensive follow-up or patient monitoring or assessment by the authors. Also, the work should be original and make a significant contribution to the literature.
 - b. In-depth, critical reviews of a wide body of knowledge published in a journal predominantly devoted to primary publications as described above.
 - c. Books and/or book chapters if meeting the criteria set forth above.
 - d. Presentations, posters, abstracts and/or symposia if published and meeting the spirit of the criteria of a primary publication and those above with the goal of taking

abstracts to full article publication.

3. Membership on journal editorial boards, reviewing publications or granting agencies that review grant applications for funding.

4. Scholarly reviews of the candidate's publications.

5. Funded projects, grants, commissions and contracts (include source, dates, title and amount) completed or in progress.

6. Presentation of research papers before technical and professional meetings. Distinguish between invited and submitted presentations.

7. Other evidence of research or creative accomplishments as appropriate (*e.g.*, patents, new product development, citation index analysis).

8. Record of participation in and description of seminars and workshops (including short descriptions of activity, with titles, dates and sponsor); indication of role in seminar or workshop (*e.g.* leader, participant).

9. Description of outreach or other activities in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (*e.g.*, consultant, journal editor, reviewer for refereed journal, peer reviewer of grants, speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, educational institutions).

10. Description of new computer software, video or multimedia programs developed.

11. List of honors or awards for scholarship.

12. Lists of grants and contracts, with an indication of the candidate's role in preparing and administering grants and contracts.

13. Application of research scholarship in the field, including new applications developed and tested; new or enhanced systems and procedures demonstrated or evaluated for government agencies, professional and industrial associations, or educational institutions.

14. Technology transferred or adapted in the field.

15. Technical assistance provided.

16. Other evidence of impact on society of scholarship/research and creative accomplishments.

17. Evidence of professional, graduate and post-doctoral students' scholarly achievements (*e.g.* publications, awards, grants).

There is no minimum number of publications per year that guarantee promotion and/or tenure. Quality is the primary criterion. However, the Department's general feeling is that at least three major publications per year (peer reviewed) is considered necessary for promotion and/or tenure. This can be interpreted as being 15-20 quality publications for associate professor and 35-40 for full professor. However, it should be emphasized that this minimum does not guarantee advancement. Emphasis on scholarship is always given to the quality of the work and its impact on the field.

Regarding the generation of extramural funding, faculty members are expected to obtain the necessary financial support to develop an independent, high quality research program resulting in scholarly publications. Such support is expected to cover the costs of all personnel including graduate students, post-doctoral students and technical staff. Successful grantsmanship is viewed as a peer assessment of the quality of the faculty member's scholarship/research. Funded research includes all types of extramural funds including government and private grants, contracts, and industry sponsored research projects. In essence, the candidate should be able to demonstrate ability to personally attract extramural research funding, as defined above, during the review period. There should also be some indication of the likelihood of continued, long-term funding to support the research program.

Faculty participation in other formal scholarly/research activities should be considered either as a service or a research function. Some evidence of personal involvement in either type of function should be present at the time of the review. Such evidence might include serving on thesis and dissertation committees or advising students/residents/fellows in independent research projects. Primary scientific papers generated from these arrangements serve as separate evidence of involvement. Thus, at the time of review, faculty members should prepare a list of all formal and informal research arrangements indicating the extent of personal involvement in the project and any papers or manuscripts resulting from it. While collaborative research activities are always encouraged, the contribution of the faculty member to those research efforts should be very clear. This is especially true if the faculty members collaborates with more senior investigators within or outside the institution.

Teaching

All faculty members are expected to have teaching responsibilities and to actively participate in those efforts. Teaching is expected to occur at several levels, including professional and post-graduate education (*i.e.*, graduate students, residents, and fellows). The requisites of teaching effectively include: intellectual competence (a thorough knowledge of the material being presented), an ability to organize and present complex information, enthusiasm, ability to arouse interest in course content, and ability to relate practice experience to course content. Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, any combination of the items listed below. In joint instructional endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of the individual faculty member's contributions.

1. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.

2. Development or significant revision of programs and courses.

- a. Preparation of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula or programs of study.
- b. Collaborative work on interdisciplinary courses, programs and curriculum within the University or across institutions.
- c. Collects and evaluates data from students and colleagues regarding his/her own strengths and weaknesses for improvement of teaching.
- d. Develops and evaluates techniques of instruction.
- e. Develops and utilizes new tools for student and peer evaluation of his/her own teaching, and applies findings for improvement of teaching.
- f. Attends teaching seminars/courses to improve teaching quality.

3. Effectiveness shown by student evaluations and accomplishments.

- a. A list of courses and information from student questionnaires designed to reflect teaching effectiveness and creativity.
- b. Representative student comments that attest to a teacher's abilities to arouse student interest and to stimulate their work.
- c. Evaluation by students being trained in clinical, laboratory, or field (*e.g.*, clinical) activities.
- d. Letters of evaluation from former students attesting to the candidate's instructional performance both within the traditional classroom setting and beyond it.
- e. Performance of students on uniform examinations or in standardized courses.
- f. Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including information to show the students' success both in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance.
- g. Effective direction of graduate/professional study including theses and dissertations.
- h. Evidence of students coming from other institutions especially to study with the teacher.
- i. Successful direction of individual student work such as independent studies, special student projects and student seminars.

- j. Evidence of effective advising of students.
- k. Documentation considered helpful for evaluation of teaching:
 - Teaching load report
 - Course objectives
 - Course syllabus
 - Titles of textbooks and recommended references
 - Patient case studies or discussion group materials
 - Examinations and quizzes
 - Student course evaluation(s)
 - Teaching site visitations by peers
 - Self-assessment report
 - Participation in graduate or postgraduate teaching or training

4. Effectiveness shown by peer evaluation of expertise in instruction.

- a. Peer evaluations by colleagues/supervisors who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, have team-taught with the candidate, used instructional materials designed by the candidate, or have taught the candidate's students in subsequent courses.
- b. Selection for teaching special courses and programs.
- c. Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation and international study and development projects.
- d. Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams and special commissions.
- e. Invitations to testify before academic or governmental groups concerned with educational programs.

5. Publication activities related to teaching.

- a. Textbooks, published lecture notes, abstracts, articles or reviews that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and scholarship.
- b. Adoption of a candidate's textbooks, especially repeated adoption, by institutions.
- c. Presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.

6. Grants related to instruction.

- a. Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or

Previous version: March 2014

Revised and approved June 1, 2015

- b. To fund stipends for membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs.
7. Election to offices, committee activities and other important services to professional associations and learned societies including editorial work and peer review related to teaching.
8. Departmental and institutional governance and academic policy and procedure development as related to teaching.
9. Successful integration of teaching and research or teaching and service in ways that benefit students.
10. Utilization of strategies to improve effectiveness in teaching.
- a. Communicates effectively with students and colleagues.
 - b. Prepares in advance for classroom and clinical content
 - c. Assists student(s) with transfer, utilization, and synthesis of previous knowledge.
 - d. Shares teaching load (*e.g.*, formal classes, seminars, and students in clinical area).
 - e. Provides environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.
 - f. Utilizes various teaching methods and assignments to encourage students' growth toward course goals.
 - g. Recognizes his/her own limitations and seeks consultation when needed.
11. Participates as preceptor to graduate students, residents, and postdoctoral fellows where appropriate.
12. Develops expertise in specific areas as evidenced by requests for participation in professional and scholarly activities.

The Committee needs as many criteria as are available to make a fair and accurate evaluation since no single criterion can be an adequate indicator of level of performance; therefore, as many documented criteria as possible should be submitted by the applicant for review.

Service

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in Departmental, College and/or University committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a College representative on a major University committee or task force); developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects.

Service to the profession or scientific field includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and the review of manuscripts in professional association and learned societies publications; and review of grant applications.

Evidence of the effectiveness of service to society, the University and the profession includes, but is not limited to, the sources listed below. In joint endeavors, the extent of individual faculty member's contributions should be identified.

1. University and Public Service

- a. Service on Department, College of Pharmacy, institutional, and University committees involving student, faculty, curriculum, and administrative decisions.
- b. University governance bodies and related activities.
- c. Contribution to continuing education programs and guest lectures to professional groups and civic groups.
- d. Involvement with Departmental administration in activities such as course coordination, supervision of faculty and/or non-faculty personnel, source evaluation or implementing methods to improve instruction.
- e. Professional and learned societies, including election to offices, committee activities, editorial work, peer review and other important service.
- f. Development, implementation or management of academic programs, projects or study-abroad initiatives.
- g. Development and organization of professional conferences.
- h. Reviewing grant applications.
- i. Editing and reviewing of manuscripts for professional association and learned societies' publications.
- j. Service on research review panels at state and national level.

2. Clinical Service

a. Responsibility for developing innovative roles for the pharmacist in a patient care setting and be a visible role model for professional and graduate students, residents, and fellows.

b. Written and verbal communications to other health care professionals. A representative sample of these communications shall be made available on request.

c. Maintenance of a competency level by reading and evaluating the scientific and professional journals, and attendance at meetings and conferences.

d. Involvement in creative activities such as new methods in service delivery and design.

e. Demonstrated direct influence on patient care.

3. Honors, awards and special recognition for service activities.

4. Program and project development and other creative activities.

a. Overview of needs assessment, and the objectives, methods and target audience. Description of selected activities and/or products that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to the program.

b. Description of how the program is compatible with Department, College, and University missions, and how the activities complement the teaching and research missions of the Department, College, and/or University.

c. Description of the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and implementation of the program. Did the activities demonstrate or test the applicability of the candidate's discipline to societal/human problems, require integration with other disciplines and/or generate new knowledge for the discipline and/or audience? How was this knowledge communicated to broader audiences? Has the program led to increased recognition of the candidate's professional expertise by external audiences?

d. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative evidence (*e.g.*, changes in test scores, increased production or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative evidence (*e.g.*, testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics) should be included.

5. Service-based instructional activities.

a. Listing of the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (*e.g.*, curriculum, course, workshop), the duration, the candidate's role in creating each, the target audience and the method of reaching the audience (*e.g.*, conference presentation, site visit).

b. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be included.

6. Consultation and technical assistance.

a. Listing of each type of assistance, the clientele, the contribution and the number of times provided.

b. Description of impact. Identification of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. What actions did the intended audience take as a result of this work? Both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be included.

7. Applied research.

a. Listing of publications relating to service to society including books, book chapters, articles and scholarly papers (indicate if peer-reviewed).

b. Quality and impact of written documents produced, including knowledge integration, creative solutions, technical manuals or other outcomes of applied research as evaluated by clientele and peers.

8. Copyrights, patents and inventions related to service activities.

9. Contracts, grants and gifts related to service activities.

10. Other service activities.

a. Selection for special service activities outside the state or nation.

b. Securing competitive grants and contracts to finance development and delivery of service innovations.

c. Requests by individuals from outside the state or nation to study the candidate's work and innovations.

d. Development of patents or instruments useful in solving important problems.

e. Performance of clinical activities in veterinary hospitals, psychology clinics, reading clinics, clinical pharmacy sites, special education clinics and other clinical settings.

	Associate Professor	Professor
Teaching	<p>Contributes to Department's teaching load including the professional degree program (Pharm.D.) and post-graduate education; <i>i.e.</i>, fellows, graduate students, or residents. Collects and evaluates data from students and peers to improve teaching performance. Utilizes various teaching methods, materials, and assessment procedures to foster student learning and participates in student advising. Prepares in advance and continually updates teaching materials. Teaching effectiveness will be documented according to three major criteria: quality of teaching, quantity of teaching and innovative aspects of teaching. Receives positive student evaluations.</p>	<p>Provides leadership in Department's teaching load and academic program and supports the activities of junior colleagues. Receives recognition as a teacher through awards or other documentation. Significantly contributes to professional degree (Pharm.D.) program and post-graduate education, <i>i.e.</i>, supervises fellows, graduate students, or residents and serves on student committees. Provides evidence of course revision and/or development. Receives positive student and peer teaching evaluation with a record of student advising. Outstanding record of teaching effectiveness as documented according to three major criteria: quality of teaching, quantity of teaching and innovative aspects of teaching.</p>
Research and Scholarly Activities	<p>Engages in quality original scholarly/research activity as evidenced by publication in recognized refereed journals and presentation at peer-reviewed forums. Demonstrates the ability to independently plan, organize, direct, and sustain research activities in one or more areas of expertise. Potential of national recognition of current and future activities must exist as demonstrated by standing in the field. Solicits and demonstrates ability to attract extramural funding for scholarly pursuits to support research program and mentoring of students. Additional signs of the establishment of independence should be evident. Collaborative and inter-disciplinary scholarly activities are encouraged with a clear indication of the faculty member's contribution to those efforts.</p>	<p>Demonstrates outstanding, independent and mature scholarship as evidenced through sustained publication and presentation activities over a period of years. Establish and maintain a coherent line of inquiry. Provides evidence of peer- recognition at national and international levels for scholarly contributions. Demonstrates success in obtaining sustained extramural research funding. Involves students in research activities. Has contributed to collaborative and inter-disciplinary scholarly programs.</p>

Service	<p>Contributes to Department, College and University committees and special service activities. Serves the professional and scientific communities by service to those organizations and to journals and granting agencies.. Contributes to continuing education programs, professional and/or civic groups. If appropriate, provides clinical service <i>via</i> the provision of pharmaceutical care or other type of pharmacy practice.</p>	<p>Provides leadership in Department through service as committee chair and/or outstanding sustained service to committees. Contributes actively to College and University committees. Serves the professional and scientific communities through outstanding and continued service to those organizations as well as to journals and granting agencies. Provides evidence of service having national and international impact. If appropriate, provides clinical service <i>via</i> the sustained provision of pharmaceutical care or other type of pharmacy practice.</p>
---------	--	---

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND REAPPOINTMENT OF NON-TENURE-ELIGIBLE FACULTY

Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science
College of Pharmacy
The University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Introduction

The primary functions of University faculty are: the creation of new knowledge through scholarly and research activities; provide quality instruction to students in professional and graduate programs; provide service to the institution (department, college and university) and to professional and scientific organizations and public service. All of these functions must be met by faculty employed by the University, but not necessarily in equal measure. Meeting societal demands to provide these functions in a creative and effective manner leads to the rewards offered to a faculty member by this University (*i.e.*, promotion). Promotion and reappointment, therefore, should be based upon evidence and documentation of effective performance in these areas.

Faculty members in the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science comprise more than traditional tenure-track faculty. Faculty members in this Department are also given appointments in a clinical track series. The clinical track is provided to individuals who have primary responsibility for clinical service and teaching. Research and scholarship are important components, but not at the same level of tenure-track faculty.

Clinical pharmacy faculty members may choose to be promoted and/or reappointed under the guidelines of the Board of Regents' Conditions of Faculty Service (6-201; Rev. 2/1/84), which are supplemental to the University policy outlined in Chapter III of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* (UHAP), including any published supplements or revisions. The guidelines established in this document provide the basis for promotion and reappointment for clinical pharmacy faculty and it is strongly recommended that faculty members thoroughly read each of these University documents. The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for promotion and reappointment for Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science faculty members.

To initiate the process, a memorandum from the candidate indicating the desire to be promoted should be provided to the Department Head at the beginning of the academic year. Documentation, as required by these guidelines, must be provided accordingly.

Committee on Faculty Status

The Department's Committee on Faculty Status (3.11.01) is responsible for evaluating faculty for promotion and/or reappointment. The Department Head appoints the Committee at the beginning of each academic year. This Committee may consist of tenured and non-tenure eligible faculty members representing the academic ranks of associate professor and professor, but for promotions involving non-tenure eligible faculty members the majority of committee members should be non-tenure eligible. The chairperson of the Committee is appointed annually by the Head of the Department. In cases where a candidate is being considered for promotion to full professor, the Committee will consist of only full professors.. The Committee will generally provide its review of the candidate during August to September. That review, along with the Department Head's letter of review, is transmitted to the Dean by October 15.

C:/main/promgidclinfac

October, 2007 (adapted from document dated October, 1996)

Revised and approved 2014.

Promotion and Reappointment Review Procedure

At the beginning of each academic year, the Department Head shall provide the Faculty Status Committee chairperson with a list of names of faculty who are to be reviewed for promotion. An individual faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion may request a review at the beginning of an academic year (July 1st) by written request to the Department Head. In turn, each faculty member to be reviewed shall be notified by the Department Head, in writing, of his/her scheduled review. Each faculty member shall be reminded of the University and College of Pharmacy policy and guidelines for promotion. She/he shall be given a deadline for submitting to the Department Head documentation (the candidate's dossier) supporting creative and effective performance in scholarship/research, teaching and service.

The faculty member should submit a list of at least five prominent individuals (with academic rank higher than the candidate) outside the University who would be able to provide a competent and fair review of the individual being considered for promotion. The Department Head will also choose at least five prominent individuals outside the University who would be able to provide a competent and fair review of the individual being considered for promotion. No more than half of the total number of outside evaluators may be from the candidate's list. The Department Head will distribute the candidate's dossier to the outside evaluators. Upon completion of their evaluation, the outside evaluators will send a letter of their evaluation of the candidate's dossier to the Department Head. The Department Head will then add the outside evaluators' letters to the candidate's dossier and then submit the candidate's dossier to the Departmental Faculty Status Committee.

Once the candidate's dossier is received, the Committee members will review the dossier and then meet in one or more closed sessions. A written ballot will be taken and the results will accompany the written report of the deliberations and the decision of the Committee with regard to promotion. This evaluation will then be submitted to the Department Head. A minority report may accompany the Committee report if the decision is not unanimous. The Department Head will review the report(s) and forward a memorandum containing his/her own recommendation to the Dean of the College of Pharmacy. The Dean will forward this to the College Faculty Status Committee along with the candidate's dossier and the Departmental Faculty Status Committee's report. The College Faculty Status Committee will review the materials and submit their assessment to the Dean. The Dean will make his/her assessment and inform the Provost of his/her decision.

Criteria for Promotion and Reappointment

The quality of scholarship/research, teaching and service are the traditional areas in which an academic is evaluated for consideration for promotion. Clinical faculty in the Department are appointed and promoted on the basis of those criteria with emphasis given to professional competence.

All faculty members should possess personal characteristics that contribute to their intellectual breadth, emotional stability, and maturity. There must also be enough vitality and forcefulness to constitute effectiveness, compassion, and willingness to cooperate so that the faculty member can work in harmony with others, exhibiting a team spirit. At the same time, the faculty member is encouraged to maintain independence of thought and action. The following characteristics are important in this area:

1. Cooperation with staff, faculty, and students
2. Integrity
3. Conscientiousness
4. Industriousness
5. Motivation
6. Emotional stability
7. Maturity
8. Self-reliance
9. Good judgment
10. Initiative

Scholarly/Research Activity

In the broadest sense, scholarly/research activity describes the organized scientific pursuit of new knowledge. One significant quantifiable endpoint for evaluating scholarly/research activity is the subsequent publication of its results. The key criteria for acceptability should include:

1. Applicability to current health care practice in a broad sense.
2. Originality and uniqueness of the knowledge developed (heuristic value).
3. Demonstration of significant contribution to the scholarly/research activity and the resulting publications.

The following refereed publications might constitute some of the types of acceptable research/scholarly activities:

- a. Case report or case series with extensive follow-up on patient monitoring or assessment by the authors. Also, it should be a unique and significant contribution to the literature.
- b. In-depth, critical reviews of a wide body of knowledge published in a journal predominantly devoted to primary publications as described above.
- c. Books and/or book chapters if meeting the criteria set forth above.
- d. Report of an original research effort.
- e. Presentations, posters, abstracts and/or symposia if published (e.g., in a peer-review journal) and meeting the spirit of the criteria of a primary publication and those above.

C:/main/promgidclinfac

October, 2007 (adapted from document dated October, 1996)

Revised and approved 2014.

At least two major publications per year (peer reviewed, e.g., items a through d above) while in residence at the University is considered necessary for promotion and/or reappointment. However, this minimum does not guarantee advancement; quality is the primary criterion. The total number of publications may be averaged over the total years while in University residence.

Major works-in-progress should comprise a separate category in which current projects and their status may be listed. This category can include current or ongoing funded or non-funded scholarly/research projects or primary scholarly/research manuscripts in preparation. Faculty members should include in this area of review the progress of all ongoing or continuing scholarly/research projects and plans for new projects (e.g., grant proposals or protocols in preparation).

Funded scholarly/research activity includes all types and sources of extramural funding including governmental, private grants, and industry sponsored research projects. The candidate should be able to demonstrate effort towards obtaining extramural research funding, as defined above, during the review period. Competitive intra-mural funding should also be listed for evaluation.

Faculty participation in other formal scholarly/research projects should be considered either as a service or as a research function. Evidence of personal involvement in either type of function should be present at the time of the review. Such evidence might include serving on thesis committees or advising students/residents/fellows in independent research projects. Primary scientific papers generated from these arrangements serve as separate evidence of involvement. Thus, at the time of review, faculty members should prepare a list of all formal and informal research arrangements indicating the extent of personal involvement in the project and any papers or manuscripts resulting from it. While collaborative research activities are always encouraged, the contribution of the faculty member to those research efforts should be very clear. This is especially true if the faculty member collaborates with more senior investigators within or outside the institution.

Teaching

All faculty members are expected to have teaching responsibilities and to actively participate in those efforts. Teaching is expected to occur at several levels, including professional and post-graduate education (*i.e.*, graduate students, residents and fellows). The requisites of teaching effectively include: intellectual competence (a thorough knowledge of the material being presented), an ability to organize and present complex information, enthusiasm, ability to arouse interest in course content, and ability to relate practice experience to course content. Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, any combination of the items listed below. In joint instructional endeavors, the evidence should specify the extent of each person's contribution.

1. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments.
2. Development or significant revision of programs and courses.
 - Preparation of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula or programs of study
 - Collaborative work on interdisciplinary courses, programs and curricula within the

C:/main/promgidclinfac

October, 2007 (adapted from document dated October, 1996)

Revised and approved 2014.

- University or across institutions
- Collects and evaluates data from students and colleagues regarding own strengths and weaknesses for improvement of teaching
- Develops and evaluates techniques of instruction
- Develops and utilizes new tools for student and peer evaluation of own teaching, and applies findings for improvement of teaching
- Attends teaching seminars/courses to improve teaching quality

3. Effectiveness shown by student evaluations and accomplishments.

- A list of courses and information from student questionnaires designed to reflect teaching effectiveness and creativity
- Representative student comments that attest to a teacher's abilities to arouse student interest and to stimulate their work should be reported
- Evaluation by students being trained in clinical, laboratory, or field (e.g., clinical) activities
- Letters of evaluation from former students attesting to the candidate's instructional performance both within the traditional classroom setting and beyond it
- Performance of students on uniform examinations or in standardized courses
- Accomplishments of the teacher's present and former students, including information to show the students' success both in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance
- Effective direction of graduate/professional study including theses and dissertations
- Evidence of students coming from other institutions especially to study with the teacher
- Successful direction of individual student work such as independent studies, special student projects and student seminars
- Evidence of effective advisement of students
- Documentation considered helpful for evaluation of teaching:

Teaching load report
 Course objectives
 Course syllabus
 Titles of textbooks and recommended references
 Patient case studies or discussion group materials
 Examinations and quizzes
 Student course evaluation(s)
 Teaching site visitations by peers
 Self-assessment report
 Participation in graduate or postgraduate teaching or training.

4. Effectiveness shown by peer evaluation of expertise in instruction.

- Peer evaluations by colleagues/supervisors who are familiar with the candidate's teaching, have team-taught with the candidate, used instructional materials designed by the candidate, or have taught the candidate's students in subsequent courses.
- Selection for teaching special courses and programs.
- Participation in special teaching activities outside the University, including international assignments, special lectureships, panel presentations, seminar participation and international study and development projects.
- Membership on special bodies concerned with teaching, such as accreditation teams

C:/main/promgidclinfac

October, 2007 (adapted from document dated October, 1996)

Revised and approved 2014.

and special commissions.

- Invitations to testify before academic or governmental groups concerned with educational programs.

5. Publication activities related to teaching.

- Textbooks, published lecture notes, abstracts, articles or reviews that reflect a candidate's teaching contributions and scholarship.
- Adoption of a candidate's textbooks, especially repeated adoption, by institutions.
- Presentation of papers on teaching before learned societies.

6. Grants related to instruction.

- Receipt of competitive grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities or to fund stipends for students.
- Membership on panels to judge proposals for teaching grants/contracts programs.

7. Election to offices, committee activities and other important service to professional associations and learned societies including editorial work and peer review as related to teaching.

8. Departmental and institutional governance and academic policy and procedure development as related to teaching.

9. Successful integration of teaching and research or teaching and service in ways that benefit students.

10. Utilization of strategies to improve effectiveness in teaching.

- Communicates effectively with students and colleagues.
- Prepares in advance for classroom and clinical content.
- Assists student(s) with transfer, utilization, and synthesis of previous knowledge.
- Shares teaching load, e.g., formal classes, seminars, and students in clinical area.
- Provides environment conducive to effective teaching and learning.
- Utilizes various teaching methods and assignments to encourage students' growth toward course goals.
- Recognizes own limitations and seeks consultation when needed.

11. Participates as preceptor to students, residents, and postdoctoral fellows where appropriate.

12. Develops expertise in specific areas as evidenced by requests for participation in professional and scholarly activities.

The Committee needs as many criteria as are available to make a fair and accurate evaluation since no single criterion can be an adequate indicator of level of performance; therefore, as many documented criteria as possible should be submitted by the applicant for review.

C:/main/promgidclinfac

October, 2007 (adapted from document dated October, 1996)

Revised and approved 2014.

Service

Service to the University includes, but is not limited to, participating in Department, College and/or University committee work and/or governance; contributing to administrative support work (such as serving as a College representative on a major University committee or task force); developing, implementing or managing academic programs or projects.

Service to the profession or scientific field includes, but is not limited to, offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; development and organization of professional conferences; editorships and review of manuscripts for professional association and learned societies; and review of grant applications.

Evidence of the effectiveness of service to society, the University and the profession includes, but is not limited to, the items listed below. In any joint endeavors, the extent of individual faculty member's contributions should be identified. Also, competitive service contracts should also be listed for evaluation.

1. Clinical Service

- Responsibility for developing innovative roles for the pharmacist in a patient care setting and be a visible role model for professional, and graduate students, residents, and fellows.
- Written and verbal communications to other health care professionals. A representative sample of these communications shall be made available on request.
- Maintenance of a competency level by reading and evaluating the scientific/professional journals, and shall attend meetings and conferences.
- Involvement in creative activities such as new methods in service delivery and design.
- Extensive scholarly writings, other than those described under the research/scholarly activity classification listed below.
- Demonstrated direct influence on patient care.

2. University and Public Service

- Service on Department, College of Pharmacy, institutional, and University committees.
- Service on professional committees at the local, state, and national level and shall serve on review panels and site visitation committees to upgrade the profession of pharmacy.
- Hold office at the state and/or national/international level.
- Contribution to continuing education programs and guest lectures to professional groups and civic groups.
- Involvement with Departmental administration in activities such as course coordination, supervision of faculty and/or non-faculty personnel, source evaluation or implementing methods to improve instruction.
- Professional and learned societies, including election to offices, committee activities, editorial work, peer review and other important service\Development, implementation or management of academic programs, projects or study-abroad initiatives.
- Development and organization of professional conferences.
- Reviewing grant applications.

C:/main/promgidclinfac

October, 2007 (adapted from document dated October, 1996)

Revised and approved 2014.

Specific Criteria for Various Ranks

Just as with the University in general, the Department's primary means for accomplishing its goals is through the faculty; success depends largely on the quality of the faculty. Consistent with the mission of the Department, faculty members are appointed to the following ranks.

Instructor (NTE)

Non-tenure-eligible instructors are appointed for a period of one year or less. An indefinite number of annual renewals is possible. An individual holding such a title may be promoted to non-tenure-eligible assistant professor within three years of initial appointment provided their annual evaluations under Section 3.10 meet the criteria in Subsection 3.13.03 of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* (UHAP).

Assistant Professor (NTE)

Appointment or promotion to non-tenure-eligible assistant professor will be recommended largely on evidence of promise, adequate training, depth of knowledge in a particular specialty, and capacity to undertake high quality teaching, research, and service. A non-tenure-eligible assistant professor is appointed initially for a one-year period. This appointment may be renewed an indefinite number of times subject to satisfactory annual performance evaluations. Promotion to non-tenure-eligible associate professorship is possible after a minimum of three years of service in rank. Non-tenure-eligible assistant professors must be informed by the Department Head every five years that they are being reviewed for retention in rank or for promotion to non-tenure-eligible associate professor. Such recommendations shall be considered by the Standing Departmental and College Committees on Faculty Status, and be forwarded to the Provost. See *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* [3.13.03].

Associate Professor (NTE)

Appointment or promotion to the level of non-tenure-eligible associate professor will require evidence of an established and productive career in addition to the qualifications required of a non-tenure-eligible assistant professor. Such an individual should be known at the state and national/international levels for his or her particular expertise. Such a person should contribute to the Departmental program in a significant fashion. Annual reappointments may be made an indefinite number of times, subject to satisfactory performance evaluations. A non-tenure-eligible associate professor may be recommended for promotion to the rank of non-tenure-eligible professor at any time but normally shall be reviewed for retention in rank every six years. During the fifth year, the faculty member must be informed by the Department Head that he or she has the right to be reviewed for retention in rank or for promotion to non-tenure-eligible professor. A review will be conducted unless the faculty member declines in writing. Recommendations resulting from these reviews must be considered by the Standing Departmental and College Committees on Faculty Status, as well as the Department Head and Dean, and forwarded to the Provost's office for decision. See *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* [3.13.04].

Professor (NTE)

Appointment or promotion to the level of non-tenure-eligible professor will require unique qualifications regarding expertise and experience in addition to those possessed by non-tenure-eligible associate professors. Such an individual must have achieved national and/or international recognition through peer organizations and should bring distinction to the Departmental program for his/her particular expertise. Non-tenure-eligible professors may be reappointed annually provided they continue to meet the criteria for the rank and perform satisfactorily as determined by annual performance evaluations.

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOLOGY & TOXICOLOGY
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY/THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Introduction

Promotion and tenure at The University of Arizona requires evidence of excellent performance, and the promise of continued excellence, in the primary responsibilities of faculty, which includes teaching, research and scholarship, and public and professional service. Tenure eligible faculty in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are promoted and/or tenured according to the guidelines of the Board of Regents' Conditions of Faculty Service (6-201; Rev. Nov. 1991), which are supplemental to the University policy outlined in Section 3.3 of the current edition of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) (<http://hr.arizona.edu/policy/appointed-personnel/>) including any published supplements or revisions thereof. It is recommended that faculty undergoing promotion and/or tenure thoroughly read these documents. The purpose of the present document is to provide more specific guidelines regarding the promotion and tenure of faculty in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology.

Committee on Faculty Status

The Department's Committee on Faculty Status is responsible for the first of several evaluations that take place for promotion and/or tenure at the University of Arizona. Members of this Committee are appointed by the Department Head and will consist of at least three tenured faculty members. The Department Head shall appoint the chair of this Committee annually. In cases where a candidate is being considered for promotion to professor, the Committee will consist of only tenured faculty at the rank of professor. The Committee on Faculty Status will also review the annual reports submitted by faculty members as part of their Annual Performance Review (see below).

Assessment on Progress Toward Promotion and Tenure: Annual Performance Reviews

As described in Section 3.2 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, all faculty members must submit annual reports that will be reviewed by the Committee on Faculty Status. The Committee's review of the faculty member's annual report will summarize his/her effort in the areas of teaching, research and service and when appropriate may comment on their progress towards promotion and tenure, particularly during the faculty member's probationary period. The Committee's review is forwarded to the Department Head who prepares their own written evaluation of the faculty member's annual report and meets with the faculty member to discuss the written evaluation, assignments and expectations for the next annual review. If the faculty member is eligible for promotion and/or tenure, this meeting will include a discussion of the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure, which is expected to include any opinions expressed by the Committee in their review.

Faculty members who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure should use these annual review meetings to obtain specific feedback regarding their progress toward promotion and/or tenure. It is noted that the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel specifically states in Section 3.3 that while annual performance reviews may be considered in the promotion and tenure process, such evaluations are not determinative of promotion and tenure decisions and satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and/or tenure. Thus, among other considerations, promotion and/or tenure requires scholarly accomplishment over a

period of years in a broader range of faculty responsibilities and includes assessments by Outside Evaluators, which is not a part of the annual review process.

Assessment on Progress Toward Promotion and Tenure: Third Year Retention Review

University policy (Section 3.3 of the UHAP) indicates that tenure eligible assistant and associate professors must undergo a retention review in their third year prior to the required promotion and tenure review in their sixth year. Every year the Department Head will notify those faculty members who will undergo the Third Year Retention Review according to University guidelines. As part of the Third Year Retention Review the faculty member will prepare a Promotion Dossier according to the *Guide to the Promotion Process*, using the promotion and tenure dossier templates supplied by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (<http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/guide-promotion-process>). This Promotion Dossier must include all the elements of the six-year promotion review, except for the letters from Outside Evaluators. The Third Year Retention Review becomes, in effect, a dress rehearsal for the promotion and/or tenure review that is normally conducted in the sixth year. The purpose of the retention review is to provide a critical assessment of the faculty member's progress toward promotion and/or tenure. The Committee on Faculty Status will conduct a review and provide a written report with its conclusions to the Department Head. The Department Head will then meet with the faculty member to communicate the results of the Committee's report and identify strengths and weaknesses that the faculty member is making toward promotion and/or tenure. Any significant problems that are identified should be communicated to the faculty member in writing by the Department Head. The Committee's report and the Department Head's recommendation are then forwarded to the Dean and the College Committee on Faculty Status for their review and recommendation.

If the results of the Third Year Retention Review warrant the need for an interim review prior to the mandatory sixth year promotion review, the Department Head or Dean or College Committee on Faculty Status may request an additional fourth and/or fifth year review. If the results of the Third Year Retention Review, or any subsequent probationary review, recommend nonrenewal of an appointment, then the faculty member's dossier must proceed through a review by the College and University Committees on Faculty Status and the Provost's Office as described in section 3.3 of the UHAP.

Promotion and Tenure Review Procedure

Faculty members undergoing mandatory reviews (e.g., third year retention and sixth year promotion) must be notified of their upcoming review in writing by the Department Head no later than April 1, of the academic year preceding the year of their review. Outside of the mandatory reviews, faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must do so, in writing, to the Department Head no later than April 1, of the academic year preceding the year they wish to be reviewed. After such written notification the candidate should meet with the Department Head and be reminded that the preparation of his/her Promotion Dossier must be according to the *Guide to the Promotion Process* (<http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/guide-promotion-process>) using the supplied instructions, templates, etc. The candidate should also be made aware of the Annual Workshop on the preparation of Promotion Dossiers, which generally occurs in mid-April, and is conducted by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The candidate must deliver his/her finalized Promotion Dossier, as well as a list of suggested Outside Evaluators, to the Department Head on a mutually agreed upon deadline, preferably in July, but no later than the first week in August.

Once the letters from the Outside Evaluators are received, they are added to the candidate's Promotion Dossier and the Department Committee on Faculty Status will convene and review the

Promotion Dossier in one or more closed-door sessions. The Committee will prepare a written report that summarizes its deliberations, recommendation and the results of the Committee's vote for promotion and/or tenure. In instances when the vote is not unanimous, a minority opinion must accompany the report. The Committee's report will be added to the Promotion Dossier and submitted to the Department Head.

The Department Head will review the report and add his/her letter to the Promotion Dossier with their own recommendation regarding the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. At this time the Department Head will advise the candidate in writing of his/her recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure (or renewal or nonrenewal of an appointment) and will forward the Promotion Dossier to the Dean's Office for review by the College Committee on Faculty Status and the Dean, respectively. The recommendations of College Committee on Faculty Status and the Dean regarding the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate will be added as separate letters to the Promotion Dossier and will be submitted to the Office of the Provost no later than January 15th. The candidate's Promotion Dossier will then be reviewed by the University Committee on Faculty Status who will make their recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure and add their letter to the Promotion Dossier before sending it to the Provost for a final decision. The Provost's letters of decision are sent to the candidates by the end of April. Candidates may appeal the Provost's decision by writing to the President of the University within thirty days of the Provost's decision.

General Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

The criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are essentially the same as the University's. Thus, the candidate must present evidence of excellent performance, and the promise of continued excellence, in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and public and/or professional service and/or outreach. In addition, candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are evaluated in the area of their involvement with graduate training programs.

The evaluation of performance in each of these areas will be conducted in the context of the candidate's workload assignment during the period in rank as agreed upon by the candidate and the Department Head. Thus, the expectations of the Committee on Faculty Status will be greater in those areas that constitute a higher percentage of the candidate's workload assignment. It should also be noted that the Committee looks for evidence of excellence in all areas of responsibility and a superior performance in one area will not assure promotion and/or tenure if the candidate's performance in other areas is judged to be inadequate. Therefore, it is important for the candidate and the Department Head to agree on a pragmatic workload assignment during the period in rank.

The remainder of this document contains more specific criteria that may be considered by the Committee on Faculty Status in its evaluation of candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure. It is not intended to be inclusive, nor does it imply that each and every criterion be satisfied for promotion and/or tenure.

Specific Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure In the Area of Teaching

All faculty members in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are expected to excel in the area of teaching and should be able to document their teaching effectiveness in their Promotion Dossier. Thus, candidates being considered for promotion and/or tenure should have a compelling teaching philosophy set forth in their Candidate Statement. They should also provide supporting documentation, including a list of courses taught (with information regarding unit credit and number of students) and syllabi for courses they coordinate. Other significant teaching activities include

undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral students mentored or advised, honors and senior projects advised, etc. Any special contributions to instructional innovation, such as publications related to teaching or the development of unique online course materials, should be noted as well as any awards or grants received related to teaching.

Candidates will be expected to provide evidence of their teaching effectiveness through outcomes measurements, such as the official Teacher Course Evaluations (TCE). It is important, therefore, that faculty members have TCEs performed on a regular basis in the courses in which they teach and/or coordinate. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure may wish to include letters in their Promotion Dossiers from students and/or course coordinators that comment on teaching effectiveness. In addition, current University guidelines on promotion and tenure require Promotion Dossiers to include written peer review teaching evaluations resulting from classroom visitations and/or auditing of online courses. These evaluations must be signed and dated by the reviewer and conducted according to the guidelines provided by the Office of Instruction & Assessment (<http://oia.arizona.edu/project/peer-review-teaching-protocol>). It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to arrange for these peer-review teaching evaluations, which should be conducted well before going up for promotion and/or tenure.

Specific Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure In the Area of Service

All faculty members in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are expected to excel in the area of public and/or professional service and/or outreach, which should include activities at the local, national and international levels. Activities at the local level could include service on various departmental, college and/or university committees as well as activities in the local Tucson community or at the level of the state or region of the western/southwestern United States. These activities could be professional, such as writing letters of recommendations or reviewing grants for the regional chapter of the American Heart Association or the Arizona Biomedical Research Commission, or they could be public, such as giving a talk to a civic group or serving as a judge or mentor for a high school science fair.

Service and outreach at the national and international levels could include any activities with national or international level organizations, which could include governmental entities or private foundations and/or companies. Typically such service involves the peer review of manuscripts and/or grants, journal editorial responsibilities and/or serving as an elected or appointed officer of a public or private organization. However, it could also involve such activities as serving as an external reviewer for the promotion and tenure process at another university or serving on the external scientific advisory committee or scientific board of a private company.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should document their service and outreach activities in the Curriculum Vitae of their Promotion Dossier. Candidates whose service activities represent a majority of their workload assignment and are integral to their program of study should also consider the preparation of a separate Service and Outreach Portfolio to include in their Promotion Dossier (see Dossier Section 8: Optional Service and Outreach Portfolio; <http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion-and-tenure#pt>). In addition, candidates should clearly describe their goals and notable accomplishments in their Candidate Statement as it concerns their activities in the area of service and/or outreach. In general the expectations of the Committee on Faculty Status in the area of service are less for candidates who are being considered for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure as compared with promotion to full professor; however, this will also depend upon the candidate's workload assignment in this area. For candidates being considered for promotion to full professor, clear evidence of significant service and/or leadership at the national and international levels is necessary.

Specific Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure In the Area of Research and Scholarship

All faculty members in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are expected to excel in the area of research and scholarship, especially since in most cases this will represent the dominant portion of the candidate's workload assignment. In keeping with current University guidelines, the Committee on Faculty Status takes an inclusive view of scholarship that recognizes traditional measures of scholarship, such as peer-reviewed publications, invited research presentations and external funding success, as well as other integrative and applied forms of scholarship that could include nontraditional activities, such as the commercialization of translational research, successful patent applications and/or expert witness testimony. In all cases, however, it is incumbent upon the candidate to explain in their Candidate Statement how such traditional and/or nontraditional forms of scholarship contribute to a body of knowledge that can be associated with the candidate and represent his/her research accomplishments and goals.

Performance in the area of research and scholarship will be assessed by the information provided in the candidate's Curriculum Vitae of their Promotion Dossier, specifically with respect to their list of publications and other creative activity, invited scholarly presentations, and external funding support. The significance of the candidate's performance in his/her field of study will also be evaluated by awards or honors received, editorial reviews that highlight the candidate's work and/or media presentations that may feature the research and scholarship of the candidate. The Committee will also consider the candidate's work in progress, such as manuscripts and grants that may be in preparation, or under review; however, such work will receive considerably less weight than published manuscripts and awarded grants. In addition, greater import will be given to published manuscripts and grants received during the candidate's period in rank.

The Committee may consider the scholarly impact of the candidate's publications by citation analysis taking into account the total number of publications, the number of times the candidate's work has been cited and/or the general quality of the journals in which the work was published. For the most part, greater weight will be given to the total number of publications and the number of citations the candidate's work has received. While there is no minimum number of publications that will guarantee promotion and/or tenure, more is generally better. As a very general guideline candidates being considered for promotion to associate professor and/or tenure would be expected to have twenty or more peer reviewed publications, while candidates being considered for promotion to full professor would be expected to have forty or more. All publications listed in the candidate's Curriculum Vitae should be readily accessible either online or through the University's library system. In addition, the candidate's publications should be indexed by citation indexing services such as the Web of Science or Google Scholar. Publications that are not readily accessible, or not indexed by a citation service, will likely be deemed insignificant. The Committee generally gives greater weight to peer-reviewed publications, but highly cited invited chapters, or reviews, in scholarly books and/or journals are valued.

Invited scholarly presentations at meetings, universities, or other venues, and the candidate's success in attracting external financial support are important measures of performance in the area of research and scholarship. The Committee usually gives greater significance to presentations made at the national and/or international levels; however, the expectations of the Committee in this regard are less for candidates being considered for promotion to associate professor as compared with promotion to full professor. There is no absolute level of external funding necessary for promotion and/or tenure, except that it is sufficient to support a productive research program in terms of original peer-reviewed research publications and a research environment conducive to the training of graduate and postdoctoral students. While more funding support is generally better, it will not guarantee promotion

and/or tenure in the absence of a sufficient record of publications/creative activity and adequate performance in the areas of teaching and service.

External financial support may be in any form, but would typically consist of a mixture of grants from the federal, state and/or local governments, grants from private national and/or local organizations/foundations, and contracts and/or gifts from private companies and/or individuals. For promotion to associate professor and/or tenure the Committee would expect at least one substantial national level competitive award, as the principal investigator, from the federal government or a private organization plus some additional support from collaborative national level grants and/or grants from local governments/organizations, and/or grants or contracts from private industry. A substantial award would be a grant for three or more years at a level that exceeds \$50,000 in annual direct costs per year. For promotion to full professor the Committee would expect a record of continuous funding during the period in rank that involves support as principal investigator from at least three substantial national level awards (not necessarily concurrent), plus a variety of funding from other sources as noted above. In both cases, whether it is promotion to associate or to full professor, there should be the prospect of continued external funding support and future research and scholarly productivity.

Specific Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure In the Area of Graduate Training Programs

Faculty members in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology are expected to contribute to the training of students in the Graduate Program in Pharmacology & Toxicology and possibly additional graduate training programs within the University and/or beyond. This involvement in graduate training may take many forms, the most important being service as the supervisor/director/mentor of a student's dissertation and providing a stimulating and supportive environment for their research. Other types of involvement include service on dissertation committees, hosting rotation students in the faculty member's laboratory, participation in graduate training grants, service on executive committees for graduate programs, participation in graduate student lecture programs and social activities, etc.

The nature of graduate training is such that it involves elements of teaching, research and service; thus, there are several places in the Promotion Dossier where candidates for promotion and/or tenure may detail their involvement with graduate student training. The first is in the Candidate Statement. Although it is not specifically requested in the University's instructions, candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology should include a statement that specifically deals with graduate training in addition to their statements on research, teaching and service. This statement on graduate training may either be a separate statement, or a subsection of the statement on teaching. Candidates should use this statement to describe their philosophy, objectives and accomplishments with respect to graduate training and they may wish to direct the reader to other areas of their Promotion Dossier in support. For example, the candidate's Curriculum Vitae may list service on graduate program executive committees, or publications in which their students are first authors or co-authors. Similarly, the candidate's Teaching Portfolio should list the theses and dissertations directed by the candidate as well as other types of mentoring and advising of graduate students. The candidate may also wish to include letters of support from current and/or former students in their Evaluation of Teaching section of their Promotion Dossier. Finally candidates should list any involvement with graduate interdisciplinary programs (GIDPs), such the Physiology or Neuroscience GIDPs, in the GIDP Memberships section of their Promotion Dossier.

There is no specific level of involvement with graduate training that is required for promotion and/or tenure, which is also a function of the candidate's workload assignment. For promotion to associate professor and/or tenure, it would generally be expected that the candidate would be actively

involved in the training of at least one or two students by the time they have submitted their Promotion Dossier: having graduated one or more doctoral students at this time would be considered an achievement. For promotion to full professor, candidates would be generally expected to have graduated several doctoral students and be actively involved in the current and future training of several more. In addition to the matriculation of students, another important measure of the candidate's performance in graduate training is the number of papers co-authored by students and their success in finding postdoctoral positions and/or employment.

Letters from the Outside Evaluators: Selection and Significance

The letters from the Outside Evaluators have an extremely important role in the Committee's review of the candidate's Promotion Dossier. In short, these letters carry significant weight in the Committee's final recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure and, therefore, careful consideration should be given to the selection of these individuals. Specific details regarding the selection of the Outside Evaluators are provided in the Letters from Outside Evaluators section of the P&T Dossier Template (<http://facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/promotion-and-tenure#pt>). Although the University's instructions suggest that as few as three letters will suffice, the Committee on Faculty Status for the Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology requests a minimum of four letters and preferably five to eight. Both the candidate and the Department Head will prepare independent lists of potential Outside Evaluators. As noted previously, the candidate's list of four to six individuals will be provided to the Department Head along with the submission of their Promotion Dossier. These individuals cannot be recent collaborators or previous advisors, supervisors or close coworkers of the candidate. The final selection of the Outside Evaluators will be made by the Department Head and will consist of at least three individuals suggested by the candidate and at least three individuals of the Department Head's choosing. Letters must be solicited and received during the current promotion cycle.

The Outside Evaluators will receive a copy of the candidate's Promotion Dossier as well as a letter from the Department Head requesting a review of the candidate's Dossier and their specific recommendation regarding the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate. The Outside Evaluators are expected to be reasonably independent and are specifically asked how well they know the candidate. They are also expected to have an established national and/or international reputation in their field of study and to be qualified to evaluate the candidate's field of study. The Outside Evaluators are asked to comment on all the areas of the candidate's responsibilities; i.e., teaching, research and service, but the Outside Evaluators' review of the candidate's research and scholarship is the most critical. In particular, the Committee on Faculty Status is interested in the Outside Evaluators' opinion of the originality, significance and impact of the candidate's research and scholarship in their field of study and the recognition that the candidate has at the national and international levels. Letters from prestigious individuals at the national and international levels may help in this regard and are particularly important for promotion to full professor. Finally the Committee is interested in the Outside Evaluators' opinion of the candidate's promise of sustained research and scholarly productivity. Letters that do not include a specific recommendation by the Outside Evaluator regarding the promotion and/or tenure of the candidate are generally viewed as not being supportive of promotion and/or tenure even if the tone of the letter is positive regarding the quality of the candidate's Promotion Dossier.