

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Responsible administrator: Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Strategic Initiatives

Last updated/reviewed: *(Approved by HSOP Faculty Vote: 2/12/20)*

I. PROCESS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

A. Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee

1. Membership:

- a) In accordance with the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook* (3.6.5.B) faculty members eligible to participate in evaluation of the candidate at the department level are those of higher rank than the candidate for promotion and those with tenure in the case of a candidate for tenure.
- b) While the Department P&T Committee is normally comprised of eligible faculty from within the Department, the Dean may temporarily appoint eligible faculty members from a different department when necessary.

2. Procedures

- a) The Head of the respective academic department will be responsible for ensuring the University policies and procedures for promotion and tenure are followed as described in Section 3.6.5 of the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*. (<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/index.php>)
- b) As stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (3.6.5.E):
In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate, the head/chair (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. They shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, they shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. If these letters arrive in time, they shall be made available to the voting faculty; otherwise, they shall be sent on to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letters from these outside referees shall remain confidential and shall not be made available to candidates at any time.
- c) The HSOP Department Head has the final authority to determine who from the list of potential evaluators is most qualified/appropriate to submit a letter, who from the list of potential evaluators will be asked to submit an evaluation letter, and how many evaluation letters will be requested (with a minimum of three evaluation letters required). All letters requested by the Department Head and received from evaluators by the deadline will be made available to the voting faculty and sent to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (i.e., there will be no curating, "equal weighting", or selective inclusion or exclusion of letters).
- d) Following the department's Promotion and Tenure committee meeting, the Head of the respective department will transmit to the Dean the following

items:

- (1) Candidate's Dossier
- (2) Letters from Department P&T Committee, individual faculty members, and Department Head
- (3) Candidate's Rebuttal (if submitted)

II. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

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

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

B. Appointment and Promotion

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

For Tenure Track Faculty, the following guidelines define the School's expectations for candidates to be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor and from Associate Professor to Full Professor. The same criteria will be used for tenure considerations among faculty not seeking promotion (e.g., for faculty that enter the university at the rank of associate or full professor without tenure).

Further, the Department P&T committee will also determine the candidate's eligibility for tenure. According to the University's *Faculty Handbook*, decisions on tenure are different in kind from those on promotion. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) scholarship (research/creative work), 3) outreach, and 4) service as described in this Document, the candidate must also demonstrate professional collegiality. Annual review letters from Department Heads and 3-year review letters from Department P&T Committees will be considered in making promotion and tenure recommendations. The percent of designated effort in teaching, scholarship (research/creative work), outreach, and service is determined through the annual workload assignment process and the distribution of this workload should serve as a guide for anticipated productivity in each area. Workload and individual faculty requirements to address the School's mission vary across faculty and this should be considered in P&T recommendations.

Even though the same guidelines are used, Non-Tenure Track faculty are evaluated and reviewed distinctly different from Tenure Track Faculty. For Non-Tenure Track Faculty, the following evaluation and review guidelines apply only to promotions (i.e., changes in rank). The

difference between a Tenure and Non-Tenure Track appointment primarily is based upon the percentage of designated effort for each of the four areas of teaching, scholarship (research/creative work), outreach, and service. These workload assignments establish the percent of designated effort in teaching, scholarship, outreach, and service and determine the relative weighting used to assess a candidate for promotion. Tenure Track appointments typically are assigned heavier workloads in the areas of teaching and scholarship (research/creative work) so these areas may receive heavier focus in evaluation. Non-Tenure Track appointments typically are assigned heavier workloads in teaching and outreach and therefore these areas may receive heavier focus in evaluation. For Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track faculty, however, it is possible that an individual faculty member could perform at levels meritorious of promotion (and/or tenure) in areas outside of primary work assignment.

C. General Descriptions of Rating Categories

Each candidate for promotion will receive a rating of highest distinction, excellence, acceptable, or unacceptable for each of the following four components: teaching, scholarship, outreach, and service based on their effort allocation. The weighting of designated effort is based upon assigned workload. General descriptions of these ratings are provided below.

1. Teaching

Teaching encompasses all educational activities assigned to the candidate. These activities include classroom, laboratory, and workshop teaching and facilitation; student advising, mentoring, coaching & professionalization of students; graduate instruction and guidance; and work related to course or curricular development. Refer to Appendix A for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate teaching performance.

A performance of “Highest Distinction” in teaching is characterized by evidence of innovative techniques, by a pattern of consistently high student and peer evaluations as an outstanding teacher and/or participant in a team-teaching process, evidence of high quality work by students mentored by the faculty member, and superior quality in the preparation of learning experiences.

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

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

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

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

A major contribution to the University is the scholarship of its individual members. Scholarship may be expressed through activities leading to discovery, integration, outreach, application, instruction, or education. Scholarship is exhibited by research in those areas leading to

publication and dissemination. Refer to Appendix B for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate Scholarship. Criteria for evaluating Scholarship include publication record, presentations, grants and contracts, honors and awards, copyrighted, patented, or licensed works, and sustainability of focused research. The weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP. For example, evidence of copyrights, patents, or other licensed works may carry more weight toward promotion in one department versus another. Sustainability of focused research is defined as evidence of extramural funding to sustain an independent research program and demonstrate a significant impact in science at a national/international level. To be of benefit to society, the results of scholarly or creative activity must be disseminated beyond the borders of the University by appropriate written or oral means.

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

"Excellence" in scholarship requires a consistent record of productivity and publication or public presentations as well as evidence of extramural funding (for tenured / tenure track faculty). The work should be considered scientifically sound and innovative by outside reviewers in the same field as the candidate and should show a clear pattern of growth and development in their research program.

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

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

3. Outreach

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

Daily outreach activities, outreach program development and/or implementation, and teaching/research/outreach activities may contribute to outreach scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts. Refer to Appendix C for specific examples of parameters that are used to assess and rate outreach performance. The weight or rank of criteria in this category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP, generally meaning that Tenure Track faculty have a relatively smaller focus on outreach than Non-Tenure Track faculty.

Outreach activities may include, but are not limited to community engagement, presentations, publications, and other activities such as clinical in-service educational programs (see Appendix C for details).

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

To receive a rating of "Excellence" in outreach, the candidate must demonstrate activity in more than 2 areas for promotion from assistant to associate professor, and in more than 3 areas for promotion from associate to full professor (see Appendix C).

To receive a rating of "Acceptable" in outreach, one must demonstrate activity in any area for promotion from assistant to associate professor, and in more than one area for promotion from associate to full professor, typically occurring at local or regional venues (see Appendix D).

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

4. Service

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

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

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

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

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

III. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR EACH FACULTY RANK

Descriptions of what is required to achieve the rank of Professor and Associate Professor within the areas of Teaching, Scholarship (Research/Creative Works), Outreach, and Service are summarized below. The criteria for evaluating faculty candidates are the same for Tenure and Non-Tenure Track faculty. The key difference between a Tenure and Non-Tenure Track appointment is based upon the percentage of designated effort for each of the four areas of teaching, scholarship (research/creative work), outreach, and service. The weight or rank of criteria within each category may vary depending upon the specific department within HSOP and/or the individual workload assignment. The evaluation of candidates who are only seeking tenure (e.g., for faculty that enter the university at the rank of associate or full professor without tenure) will take into consideration all the criteria for the current academic rank and include collegiality.

A. Professor

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

- *Only in exceptional and well-documented cases in which a faculty member is obviously deserving of promotion to Professor or Clinical Professor without meeting this requirement should they be recommended for promotion by the department head/chair, with majority support of the faculty members who hold rank superior to that of the candidate.*

For promotion to Professor or Clinical Professor, normally, a candidate must serve at least 4 complete years on full-time appointment at the associate professor or associate clinical professor level before he or she may be nominated for promotion to full professor.

- *Only in exceptional and well-documented cases in which a faculty member has met requirements for promotion to Professor or Clinical Professor in a shorter time should they be recommended for early promotion by the department head/chair, with majority support of the faculty members who hold rank superior to that of the candidate.*

B. Associate Professor

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

- *Only in exceptional and well-documented cases in which a faculty member is obviously deserving of promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Clinical Professor without meeting this requirement should they be recommended for promotion by the department head/chair, with majority support of the faculty members who hold rank superior to that of the candidate.*

For promotion to Associate Professor, normally, a candidate must serve at least 5 complete years on full-time appointment at the assistant professor level before they may be nominated for promotion to associate professor. Prior faculty service at other

colleges or universities or prior service in appropriate professional activities may qualify for consideration in meeting the requirement for years in rank for promotion.

- *Only in exceptional and well-documented cases in which a faculty member has met requirements for promotion to Associate Professor or Associate Clinical Professor in a shorter time should they be recommended for early promotion by the department head/chair, with majority support of the faculty members who hold rank superior to that of the candidate.*

IV. PROMOTION REVIEW PROCEDURES

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

A. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Teaching evaluations are provided through multiple sources of data including: standardized student evaluations, formative peer faculty evaluations (including peer evaluations in team taught courses), outcome assessment data, HSOP course reviews, faculty portfolio submissions, and the candidate's annual performance appraisal. Teaching performance should be evaluated based on the most relevant sources of data for the learning environment. Student evaluations of team taught courses may not accurately reflect individual contributions, and therefore, in these circumstances extra attention should be given to alternative data sources such as formative peer faculty evaluations.

Section 3.6.1.A of the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook* provides specific guidance on the evaluation of teaching effectiveness:

Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

1. Peer Review Procedure

The purpose of peer review is to provide a systematic evaluation of teaching so that a performance profile of each candidate is presented to the eligible voting faculty for P&T. Because the percentage of workload effort dedicated to teaching can vary between departments, the approach of the peer review to evaluate teaching excellence may also differ between departments and disciplines. At a minimum, a

peer evaluation should be conducted by 1 or more faculty members or qualified staff selected by the candidate or appointed by the Department Head of the respective department. When practical, one of the peer review faculty members should be from outside the candidate's department. In concert with the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*, peer evaluations for at least one class for each of the three preceding years must be submitted with promotion and/or tenure materials. The evaluations should reflect the candidate's teaching in the different kinds of courses he or she is assigned to teach. Reports based on team teaching are an acceptable form of peer review.

2. Areas of Evaluation

Faculty members and qualified staff providing peer reviews will base their evaluation of the faculty member's preparation and delivery of lectures in the traditional, general lecture format, preparation and delivery of educational materials that complete and enhance team-taught courses, leading of small group discussions, clinical and laboratory teaching, and course management (where appropriate). In cases where the candidate's teaching workload assignment includes new course or curricular development and/or iterative modifications of ongoing, team-taught courses, peer assessment may be considered as evidence of the quantity and/or quality of work performed in this domain of teaching. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure their dossier includes appropriate description and documentation of their contributions to team-taught courses and course/curriculum development projects. Because the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook* includes student mentoring, advising, and supervised research under Teaching, candidates must ensure their dossier includes sufficient documentation of these areas if they want that information to be included in their evaluation.

3. Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty members and qualified staff providing peer reviews will evaluate the candidate's performance, employing "Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching" (See Appendix A). Those providing peer reviews will then assign a ranking of unacceptable, acceptable, excellence, or highest distinction. In addition to the items listed in Appendix A, the eligible voting faculty for promotion and tenure will use peer review letters (including reviews for team taught courses), excerpts from the faculty formative portfolios, the statement of teaching philosophy, HSOP course reviews, student evaluations, documentation of successful student advising, mentoring, and supervised research, and the candidate's dossier to provide an overall ranking in teaching. Faculty may be evaluated as teams based on student learning outcomes.

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

1. Procedure

a) Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in scholarly areas. The areas that will be given consideration under the scholarship requirements for tenure and/or promotion are listed under "Areas of Evaluation" with a description of how accomplishments in each area will be weighted during deliberations.

b) **Evaluation Mechanism**

1. The candidate is to prepare:
 - a. a list of their scholarly activities as requested in the promotion dossier, and
 - b. a statement describing their primary contributions to their specific field or fields of scholarship.
2. The eligible voting faculty for P&T will use the information within the dossier, letters from external reviewers, and information provided by the candidate's Department Head to rate the candidate as being unacceptable, acceptable, having excellence, or highest distinction according to the developed criteria discussed further in this section.

2. **Areas of Evaluation**

a) **Peer reviewed publications**

- The eligible voting faculty for P&T recognize that publication in peer-reviewed refereed journals is a strong indication of scholarship.
- Priority is given to publication in the most prestigious journal(s) in each specialty, which is determined by qualifying factors such as impact factor, index sources (e.g., PubMed), reputation, rankings, duration of journal existence, and other metrics – it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide relevant information necessary for committee members to determine a journal's prestige and impact within a field.
 - *As a guiding principle, publications in "standalone" journals that require a fee for publication or other journals appearing on various lists of predatory journals should be viewed with great scrutiny and may, when appropriate, be significantly discounted or even excluded from consideration when evaluating scholarly productivity*
- Publications in preparation will **not** be considered.
- For promotion and/or tenure, peer-reviewed or refereed work is valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed endeavors.
- Customs and norms for ordering of authors can vary across scientific discipline. In general, authorship on multi-author publications will be considered as 1st author (or corresponding author) = last author > 2nd author > 3rd author, etc. Disciplines that maintain a research laboratory may place greater value on last author publications,

while clinical, social, and administrative sciences may place greater value on first author papers, at least when considering promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor. Additional information provided by the candidate about his/her contribution and percent involvement to the research effort will be considered.

- Independence is a necessary criterion of scholarship. However, independence can be compatible with collaboration. Independence in collaboration means that the participant brings a unique contribution to the project without which the project would suffer. Independence will be evaluated in context of the growing role of team-based science.
- In general, original research publications will be more highly valued than critical reviews and book chapters. Examples of acceptable publications include, but are not limited to:
 - More Highly Valued
 - Original research in full length manuscripts
 - Systematic Reviews / Meta-Analyses
 - Evaluative (data-driven) descriptions of practice and teaching innovations
 - Moderately Valued
 - Critical reviews in refereed journals
 - Case reports
 - Less Highly Valued
 - Book chapters (Evidence of peer review beyond editorial staff must be provided)
 - Book reviews (Evidence of peer review beyond editorial staff must be provided)

b) **Non-Peer reviewed publications**

These will be considered by eligible voting faculty for P&T, although they will be weighted less heavily than peer reviewed publications. These may include, but are not limited to:

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

c) **Presentations at Scientific or Professional Meetings**

In general, papers or posters presented at professional meetings will be weighted as follows:

- International > National > Regional > State-Local
- Invited > Submitted
- Peer > Non-peer reviewed

-
- Original Work > Review Paper

- Abstracts are considered only as adjuncts to papers presented and not as publications and should **not** be listed under publications.
- Attendance at meetings is **not** considered evidence of scholarship.

d) **Grants and Contracts / Creative Endeavors**

In general, grants and contracts will be weighted as follows:

- Funded > Under review (scored) > Under review (non-scored)
 - Competitive peer-reviewed > research grant from government/foundations/commercial entities not employing rigorous methods to ensure peer review > non-competitive training/service contracts
 - Principal Investigator = Multiple Principal Investigator > Other Key Personnel
 - Full Grants > Starter Grants
 - Outside Extramural Agency Grants > Intramural Grants (within University)
 - Research/Creative Grants > Service Grants
- Grants or contracts in preparation will **not** be considered.
 - Consideration will be given to percentage of time devoted to project and responsibilities of the investigator.
 - A consultant who is **not** listed as key personnel is **not** considered as part of grants and contracts. Instead, it should be placed in the outreach category.

e) **Copyrighted, patented, licensed, and other works**

In general, intellectual property will be weighted as follows:

- International > National > Regional > State-Local impact and significance
 - Individual > research group > collaborating group percent contribution
- Submission for a copyright, for provisional or full patent, or of a licensed work will be considered during the evaluation period
 - Evidence for issuance of a full U.S. patent, commercial licensure, listing of a copyright and trademark will be weighted more than evidence of submission during the evaluation period

3. **Criteria for Scholarship (Research/Creative Works)**

The eligible voting faculty for P&T will assess the importance and quality of scholarly work by considering the target audience, the standing of the journal or book, the rigor of the review process, the type of publication, and the impact of the work. For example, consideration is given to the quality of books, chapters or articles and the audience reached. Specifically, as to chapters in books or textbooks the following should be

considered: importance of the book; standards applied in selection of authors; review-type material or new data or new conceptual/theoretical formulations; standing of the publisher; professional reactions to the book including reviews; and, the level of use of the book (instructional, advance, scholarship, etc.).

Concerning articles in refereed journals, the following are considered: the primary target audience; the standing of the journal in the discipline or profession; if reviewed, the rigor of the review process; the method for selecting articles, if not reviewed; the scope of the paper - review, scholarly, or a form of public service activity. Articles in “standalone”, “fee-to-publish”, predatory journals may be discounted, or excluded, from consideration by eligible voting faculty. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide data and documentation to inform the proper weighting for each article they wish to include in the evaluation of their scholarly productivity.

Evidence of professional honors or awards that confer local, regional, national, or international recognition for research/creative efforts will be considered but is not required. When present, honors and awards will be considered in the determination of unacceptable, acceptable, excellence, highest distinction in addition to the areas listed below:

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

C. Evaluation of Outreach

1. Procedure

a) *Purpose*

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality of the candidate’s activity in outreach.

b) *Evaluation Mechanism*

1. The candidate is to prepare a “reflective commentary” of their major achievements related to outreach and a list of their past and current outreach activities.
 - a. The reflective commentary should conform to the format outlined in section 3.6.5.C.3.a of the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*
 - b. The list of outreach activities should conform to the format outlined in section 3.6.5.C.3.b of the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook*
2. The eligible voting faculty for P&T will use this information along with the information provided by the Department Head to

rate the candidate's outreach performance as unacceptable, acceptable, excellence, or highest distinction.

2. **Areas of Evaluation**

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

a) **Community engagement:**

1. Evidence of development and maintenance of new or innovative types of pharmacy services
2. Evidence that activity has had or continues to have demonstrable effect on health care outcomes
3. Evidence that activity has influenced the nature of other types of health care delivery (e.g., prescribing of physicians or medication administration by nurses) toward more optimal delivery of health care
4. Evidence that activity has led directly to the establishment of new standards of patient care
6. Evidence of application of collaborative and translational activities within his/her daily practices and/or area of expertise that specifically improves patient care outcomes
7. Evidence of participation in the development of health care policies or improvements in drug-use programs and processes (e.g., quality of service-related outcomes)
8. Evidence of national recognition in his/her area of expertise
9. Evidence of faculty engagement in solutions of community-based problems consistent with his/her expertise.

b) **Presentations and Publications:**

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

c) **Consultation:**

1. Consulting is considered outreach, provided the individual person is being called upon as an individual or a member of a group (i.e., Commission, Task Force, Advisory Committee, etc). Serving as a Chairperson of such a group is highly valued. Consultation can include things like advising governmental

agencies, industry, professional groups, providing expertise on grants/contracts-supported projects, or testimony in court.

d) **Other activities:**

1. Pharmacy-related community service projects
2. Non-school lectures, teaching, or technical assistance in areas relevant to professional expertise
3. Volunteer outreach clinical activities
4. Education or healthcare planning programs
5. Testifying at public hearings
6. Membership on site visit teams (e.g., accreditation teams)
7. Assistance in securing gifts (funding or in-kind)

3. Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria for determining unacceptable, acceptable, excellence, and highest distinction vary depending upon whether the promotion is from the Assistant to Associate Professor or from the Associate to Full Professor level. See attachment Appendix C that provides example criteria in tabular form.

D. Evaluation of Service

1. Procedure

a) **Purpose**

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in service areas. The areas that will be given consideration under the service requirements for tenure and/or promotion, along with the criteria for evaluation, are discussed later in this section.

b) **Evaluation Mechanism**

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

2. Areas of Evaluation

The following areas of evaluation have been selected to reflect the candidate's service to the Department, School, University, the candidate's profession, disciplines outside the

candidate's own profession, and the community. The following are presented as examples. Thus, evidence of service may include, but is not limited to the following:

a) **Service to the University, School, and/or Departments**

1. **Assignments**

- Standing Committees and Subcommittees
- Ad Hoc Committees
- Committee/Task Force memberships
- Committee chairmanships
- Search Committees
- Residency coordination
- Faculty senate membership
- Graduate Program Officer

2. **Administrative Services**

- Assistant or Associate Dean
- Department Head
- Director or Executive Director
- Formally established research service centers director, per university policy

b) **Service to the Candidate's Profession**

- Local, state, or national board activities (including preparation of board questions or evaluation of instruments)
- Leadership positions held in professional societies or associations (Elected > Appointed)
- Committee activities in professional societies or associations (Chair > Member)
- Organization/coordination of local, state, or national programs or meetings
- Membership on state, regional, or national review panels, study sections, councils, etc.
- Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities (May be counted as either outreach or service at the candidate's discretion)
- Leadership in the development of continuing professional education programs for personnel in the field (National > State > Local)

3. Criteria for Service

The criteria for determining unacceptable, acceptable, excellence, and highest distinction vary depending upon whether the promotion is from the Assistant to Associate Professor or from the Associate to Full Professor level since the extent of service activity would differ for candidates of these two different levels. See Appendix D for examples of these criteria in tabular form.

E. Evaluation of Collegiality

1. Procedure

a) Purpose

In appraising a candidate's collegiality, P&T Committee members should keep in mind that the successful candidate for tenure and/or promotion will assume what may be an appointment of 30 years or more in the department.

b) Definition

Collegiality can be defined as the ability for an individual to work productively with faculty, students, colleagues, staff members, and constituents in all University environments as it relates to teaching, scholarship, outreach, and service. Collegiality encompasses the basics of the professional ethics of the academic world: respect for persons, integrity of intellectual inquiry, concern for the needs and rights of students and clientele, and awareness of workplace safety.

c) Evaluation

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

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

APPENDIX A. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING

	ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE*	HIGHEST DISTINCTION*
Teaching Activities	Employs teaching methods and methods of presentation consistent with the educational philosophy of HSOP	As in acceptable, but to the highest quality as demonstrated by peer review, student evaluations, copies of course materials, publications, or other relevant data	As in excellence, but includes superior evidence of the highest quality and commitment to student success. This may be evidenced by numerous factors, including exceptional student or peer evaluations, or receipt of awards or honors for teaching or educational accomplishments
	Employs assessments (e.g., exams, projects, papers, etc.) that reflect the objectives of the course or teaching activity and are appropriate to the objectives, content, and skills being evaluated	May be evidenced by participation in interdisciplinary coursework offered by other Colleges/Schools at Auburn University or other academic institutions	
	Speaks in a manner that is appropriate to the level of knowledge/ability of the students	Provides leadership in the development of teaching skills among faculty	
	Provides up-to-date instructional materials and is knowledgeable in the area of instruction or proficient in clinical skills	Develops innovative techniques or methods for instruction and evaluation/assessment	
Course or Curricular Development	When applicable, faculty member provides formal course, individual, or team-teaching peer evaluation	Assumes responsibility for improving instructional and/or training programs through designing or redesigning courses or units within courses, or by developing new programs such as residencies and fellowships	As in excellence, with evidence of peer support for quality. Also can include outcome assessment data, publications, or awards to support higher levels of student learning
Student Mentoring	When applicable, serves on Master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation committees as primary advisor or committee member	Advises or assists students or student organizations; or students, residents, or fellows present research conducted under the supervision of a faculty member at local/national professional or scientific meetings	Evidence of student mentoring above and beyond normal expectations, as documented by artifacts such as student feedback, mentoring awards, or leadership roles in student organizations

*All elements may not apply to each faculty member; candidates will be evaluated based on evidence related to their primary work assignment

APPENDIX B. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SCHOLARSHIP

	ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
Publications	Evidence of peer-reviewed publications	Evidence of peer-reviewed publications in recognized prestigious journals in the field	As in excellence, but with evidence of impact in research in the field
Presentations	Evidence of activity beyond state or local levels	Original work or area of expertise which is delivered as an invited presentation or underwent a peer-reviewed process at the national level; invited seminars at a University	As in excellence but, in addition, invited original work or area of expertise at the international level
Grants and Contracts	Demonstrated ability to fund scholarly work	Evidence of a sustainable extramural research program that advances the scientific capacity or reputation in the investigator's and school's research program.	As in excellence, but demonstrating an amount of funding or prestige of funding sources that demonstrates a leading reputation among scientific peers.
Honors and Awards	Has received a professional honor or award that confers local recognition for research/creative (i.e., scholarly) efforts	Has received a professional honor or award that confers statewide or regional recognition for research/creative (i.e., scholarly) efforts	Has received a professional honor or award which confers national or international recognition for research/creative (i.e., scholarly) efforts or has received multiple honors and/or awards at any level
Sustainability of focused research	Evidence of expertise; recognition in a defined area of scholarship	Evidence consistent with his/her sustained scholarly program	Evidence of a sustainable career path recognized as a result of his/her scholarly program
Copyrighted, Patented, Licensed, or Other Works	Evidence of submission for a copyright, submission of provisional or full patent application or submission of a licensed work or trademark	Evidence of copyright or licensed work with potential for regional significance; major contribution to the development of intellectual property; evidence for issuance of a full U.S. patent; evidence of commercial licensure of a full U.S. patent; listing of a copyright and trademark by the candidate	Evidence of copyright, patent, or licensed work with potential for national or international significance; evidence of a major percent contribution to the development of intellectual property; evidence for issuance of a full U.S. patent; evidence of commercial licensure of a full U.S. patent; listing of a copyright and trademark by the candidate

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

APPENDIX C. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING OUTREACH

	ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor	Evidence of activity in any listed area	Evidence of activity in > 2 of the listed areas	As in Excellence, but with a consistent record of meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts on a regional, national, or international level
Promotion from Associate to Full Professor	Evidence of activity in > 1 of the listed areas	Evidence of activity in > 3 of the listed areas	As in Excellence, but with a consistent record of meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts on a national/international level.
Examples of Outreach Activities <i>* The listing of example outreach activities is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Thus, activities may include, but are not limited to these examples</i>	Outreach-related publications in peer-reviewed journals		
	Evidence of development and maintenance of new or innovative types of pharmacy services		
	Evidence that activity has had or continues to have a demonstrable effect on health care outcomes		
	Evidence that activity has influenced the nature of other types of health care delivery (e.g., prescribing of physicians or medication administration by nurses) toward optimal delivery of health care		
	Evidence that activity has led directly to the establishment of new standards of patient care		
	Evidence that activity has facilitated new or improved research opportunities related to health-specific questions		
	Evidence of application of collaborative and translational activities within his/her daily practices and/or area of expertise that specifically improves patient care outcomes		
	Evidence of participation in the development of health care policies or improvements in drug-use programs and processes (e.g., quality of service-related outcomes)		
	Evidence of receiving recognition in his/her area for outreach efforts		
	Evidence of faculty engagement in solutions of community-based problems consistent with his/her expertise		
	Reports, oral presentations, or posters to health professionals at regional, national, or international venues		
	Less formalized print or electronic media publications (e.g., newsletters)		
	TV, radio, personal appearances and/or presentations relevant to pharmacy		
	Participation in pharmacy-related community service projects		
	Provision of non-HSOP lectures, teaching, or consultation to lay groups in areas of relevant expertise		
	Volunteer outreach clinical activities, i.e., student-run patient care clinics		
Participation in education or healthcare planning programs			
Cultivation of new or improved research opportunities that have direct benefits to the public			
Providing technical assistance in areas relevant to professional expertise including expert testimony or serving as a consultant for research programs, industry, government agencies, or other professional groups (e.g., accreditation teams).Providing technical assistance in areas relevant to professional expertise			

APPENDIX D. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING SERVICE

	ACCEPTABLE	EXCELLENCE	HIGHEST DISTINCTION
Service to the University, School, and/or Departments	Record of active service on standing Department, School or University Committees or Task Forces	Active participation as a member of a major Department, School or University committee	As in Excellence, with active service as a Chairperson or provision of distinguished contribution/leadership as a member on a School/University Committee or Task Force; may include service awards or recognitions
Service to Professional Organizations and Healthcare Systems	Record of membership in local, state or national professional associations; attendance at professional association meetings and documentation of volunteer service on committees	Active service on committees in local, state or national professional organizations. Coordination of local, state, or national programs or meetings. This also includes serving as a residency program director	As in Excellence, but demonstration of leadership through examples such being an officer or committee chairperson in local, state, national, or international professional organizations; may include service awards or recognitions
Service to the Candidate's Profession	Some evidence of service activity to assist professional colleagues outside of the University relevant to areas of expertise.	Consistent evidence of activity with state, regional, or national professional societies, industry, governmental or regulatory agencies or groups. Examples of this may include membership on committees in professional associations and membership on editorial boards of professional journals.	As in Excellence, but evidence of significant quantity, quality, or impact of the activity; may include service awards or recognitions; may be evidenced by leadership roles in the profession.

The listing of service examples is not meant to be an exhaustive list. Promotion from assistant to associate professor should include examples of relevant service, and promotion from associate to full professor should include continuing or new active service during the time as associate professor