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Standards and Procedures for Promotion and/or Tenure

The promotion and tenure process consists of extensive periodic peer review of faculty members at the school, campus and national levels. This process serves to direct the professional development of the candidate, and to insure for the faculty the selection of committed and talented individuals with sustained productivity at all levels of appointment. The Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure committee, elected from the faculty, is charged with the oversight of this process and with the implementation of the Procedures and Standards for the faculty, as defined by the Regents of the University of Colorado and described herein.

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee

The committee will consist of two associate professors and three full professors elected by the regular voting DOPS faculty from a ballot listing the names of all faculty members eligible to serve on the committee. All tenured faculty in the DOPS are eligible to serve on the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. The faculty receiving the highest number of votes will serve for a period of two years. In the initial year of the committee, the two members who received the lowest number of votes will serve a period of one year. In each year following, the members whose terms expire will be replaced by election. A faculty member may serve more than one consecutive term. The elections will take place in June of each year. The committee will elect a chairman from among its members.

Tenure Track Appointments

A. Process

Candidates with appropriate academic credentials are appointed to tenured or tenurable positions on the faculty of the University of Colorado School of Pharmacy based on their certifiable accomplishments or on their potential for making valuable contributions to the school's academic mission. For reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, faculty are evaluated in the areas of teaching, research and institutional/professional service. Requests for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure review are initiated by the department chair and forwarded to the DOPS Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee by the dean. The APT committee obtains outside evaluation letters of the candidate, which are subsequently shared with the department chair prior to the APT committee's deliberations. The department chair then provides his/her own letter to the APT chair. Also before the APT committee deliberations begin, the department chair solicits input from departmental faculty above the rank of the faculty candidate. Faculty are then invited to provide their letters directly to the chair of the APT committee. The APT committee then meets with the outside evaluation letters, chair's recommendation letter and any faculty letters in hand. The APT committee's recommendations are then transmitted back to the dean who initiates subsequent reviews as specified in the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook. Candidates assist with the evaluation process by assembling a dossier summarizing their accomplishments in the three areas listed above.

During the pre-tenure or probationary period, candidates for reappointment must demonstrate significant progress in all aspects of their academic responsibilities. Candidates also must demonstrate a commitment to work diligently to further the overall goals of the school. In addition to annual performance reviews, a comprehensive review for reappointment is conducted during the fourth year and...
a comprehensive review for promotion, and tenure is conducted during the seventh year. These reviews are initiated by the department chairman and are conducted by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee.

Annual performance evaluations of each faculty member are carried out by the department chairs and dean. These annual evaluations result in an overall performance rating of "unsatisfactory," "marginal," "satisfactory," "meritorious," "excellent" or "outstanding". The reappointment reviews together with the annual performance evaluations provide faculty members with specific information regarding progress toward promotion, and/or tenure. In general, candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to achieve and maintain a meritorious to outstanding level of performance in each of their three major areas of academic responsibility during the years prior to their final comprehensive review. It must be recognized however, that as stated in the Laws of the Regents, the process leading to the award of tenure is a summary evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation. The department chair may be invited to meet with the Committee and provide further details of the candidates performance during the comprehensive review process.

B. Criteria and Procedure for Initial Appointments

School of Pharmacy faculty members in the tenure track serve on the basis of limited appointments. These limited appointments are renewable annually subject to satisfactory performance.

Assistant Professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization and must provide evidence of ability to assume high quality, independent teaching, research, and service.

Associate Professor and Professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization and must present to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, through the department chair, a dossier similar to that required for promotion of current faculty members. The criteria for appointment at one of these levels will be the same as those described below for promotion.

C. Criteria and Indicators for Promotion and Tenure

Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching and original research. Promotion to the rank of associate professor concurrent with the awarding of tenure normally occurs at the end of the seventh year of service at the rank of assistant professor. Consideration may occur at a shorter interval only in circumstances of extraordinary accomplishment, or as specifically detailed in a faculty member’s letter of appointment. Promotion and tenure require that the candidate possess the terminal degree in his/her field and have demonstrated at least meritorious performance in teaching, research/creative work and institutional/professional service. A rating of excellent must be obtained in the candidate’s primary area of academic responsibility (typically research/creative work) as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate. Promotion and tenure are awarded only if there are clear indications that the candidate will continue to grow and develop as a productive academic scholar. The comprehensive review for promotion is initiated
by the department chair and conducted by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. Faculty members' distribution of effort to teaching, research and service will be considered in evaluating candidates' accomplishments.

In addition to teaching, scholarly work, service, and clinical practice, the APT Committee may also take into account other factors which are deemed to have a material bearing on decisions regarding appointment, reappointment, or promotion for individuals in either the tenure or clinical-teaching track. Material bearing includes instances of formal disciplinary action only when reason for disciplinary action might affect the candidate's teaching, research/creative work, clinical activity or service. Any additional factors must be directly related to, and have the potential to appropriately affect decisions regarding, whether or not the candidate has successfully met established criteria for teaching, scholarly work, service, and clinical practice. However, the merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendations for award of tenure.

In general, early promotion and tenure is not considered in DOPS. However, early promotion may be considered in those rare instances in which candidates have established a record of achievement in teaching, research/creative work, and service that is equal to the record expected of faculty being evaluated for promotion at the end of the seventh year of service. Additional criteria or higher standards may not be applied to candidates for early promotion. However, candidates should also not be suggested for early promotion except in cases where the candidate's overall academic record is exceptionally strong and unequivocally deserving of promotion. Evaluation for early promotion must be a joint decision of the candidate, the department chair, and the dean of the School of Pharmacy. An unsuccessful candidate for early promotion may reapply within the existing promotion clock.

Awarding of early tenure may be considered for candidates who have established a record of achievement in teaching, research/creative work, and service that is equal to the record expected of faculty being evaluated for tenure at the end of the seventh year of service. Additional criteria or higher standards may not be applied to candidates for early tenure. However, candidates should also not be suggested for early tenure except in cases where the candidate's overall academic record is exceptionally strong and unequivocally deserving of the awarding of tenure. Evaluation for early tenure must be a joint decision of the candidate, the department chair, and the dean of the School of Pharmacy. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

Indicators of teaching performance may include:

1. Student, self and peer evaluations of overall teaching quality.

2. Timeliness of information taught and its relevance to the contemporary practice of pharmacy as determined by peers.

3. Quality of instructional materials used in the classroom as determined by students and peers.

4. Ability to use examinations and grades to appropriately and equitably evaluate student performance as determined by peers.

5. Evidence of innovation that results in improvement in teaching effectiveness as determined by students and peers.
6. Receipt of teaching awards as well as other regional, national and international recognition accorded teaching accomplishments.

7. Evidence of teaching scholarship such as publication of course materials, software programs web sites, and textbooks.

8. Effectiveness in advising students.

9. Ability to recruit high quality graduate, postgraduate and/or post-professional students and to successfully guide them through their studies.

10. Course director assessment of contributions to course operation.

*Indicators of performance in research and creative work may include:*

1. Quality and number of publications including research articles, review articles, book chapters, case reports, letters to editor, etc. Assistant professors holding tenure track appointments with specified probationary periods are expected to establish an independent and sustainable externally funded research program that generates high quality, peer-reviewed publications at regular intervals. When assistant professors are considered for promotion and tenure, publications based on independent and original research projects initiated by the candidate are given more weight than publications based on research projects initiated in collaboration with a previous mentor. Independent and original components of collaborative research efforts, however, are encouraged.

2. Frequency with which published articles are cited by peers.

3. Grants and contracts received for scientific research and other creative endeavors, including patent application activity.

4. Opinions of peer academicians from other institutions and other academic units of the University of Colorado. (External evaluators are chosen so that some have and some do not have personal knowledge of the candidate.)

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

*Indicators of institutional and professional service may include:*

1. Extent and quality of institutional committee service.

2. Extent and quality of participation in professional continuing education programs.

3. Willingness to accept leadership roles and to effectively carry out special assignments.

4. Participation in school functions, student-sponsored programs and local professional activities, and the conscientious execution of departmental responsibilities.
5. Extent and quality of service to professional and scientific journals and organizations.

6. Extent and quality of service on evaluative panels or teams such as grant or protocol review panels, site visit teams, educational panels and academic program evaluation teams.

7. Invited lectures or presentations.

Professor with Tenure

Promotion to the rank of associate professor (tenure track) requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching and original research. Promotion to the level of professor requires that the candidate demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in teaching, research and institutional/professional service, as described above. The individual must also have earned national and international recognition in his/her field of research and creative work.

The indicators utilized in assessing performance in the three academic areas are as indicated above for tenure decisions. Normally, reviews for promotion from associate professor to professor are conducted during the candidate's sixth year at the rank of associate professor. Comprehensive reviews for promotion are initiated by the department chair and conducted by professors with tenure on the DOPS Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee.

Advising/Mentoring of Candidates for Promotion and/or Tenure

Every candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure shall consult with and be advised by the DOPS chair regarding the areas of performance that will be examined, other factors that have a material bearing on the decision, the standards of performance that must be met, and the DOPS criteria that will be used in reaching a decision about the candidate's performance. Candidates should be advised of this information at the time of initial appointment to the School of Pharmacy faculty and reviewed at the time of the comprehensive midpoint evaluation, as well as at other times as deemed appropriate and/or necessary by the candidate and/or DOPS chair.

Post-tenure Review

Five years following the award of tenure and every five years thereafter, or upon the request of the department chair, tenured faculty will undergo post-tenure review. This evaluation will be performed by the APT Evaluation Committee however, there is no external review. Upon completion, the APT Committee's written assessment will be sent to the department chair. The department chair will also perform a separate evaluation of the faculty member and provide a written assessment to the dean of the School of Pharmacy. The faculty member will receive a copy of assessments of both the APT Evaluation Committee and the department chair. Faculty members will be informed in writing of the final results of post-tenure evaluations by the department chair or dean. All post-tenure reviews are forwarded to the Provost, who will keep them on file for ten years. Complete details of the Board of Regents Post-tenure Review Policy, including the creation and implementation of a Performance Improvement Agreement, can be found at: https://www.cusys.edu/policies/Personnel/posttenure.html
Clinical/Teaching Track Appointments

Clinical/teaching track appointments are non-tenurable but promotion reviews within this track occur on the same schedule as described for tenure-track appointments.

A. Process

Candidates with appropriate academic credentials are appointed to positions on the faculty of the DOPS based on their certifiable accomplishments or on their potential for making valuable contributions to the school's academic mission. For reappointment and promotion, faculty are evaluated in teaching, research, service and where appropriate, clinical practice. Requests for reappointment and/or promotion review are initiated by the department chair and forwarded to the School of Pharmacy's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee by the dean. The Committee's recommendations are transmitted back to the dean who initiates subsequent reviews as specified in the University of Colorado Faculty Handbook. Candidates assist with the evaluation process by assembling a dossier summarizing their accomplishments in the areas listed above.

During the probationary period, candidates for reappointment must demonstrate significant progress in all aspects of their academic responsibilities. Candidates also must demonstrate a commitment to work diligently to further the overall goals of the school. In addition to annual performance reviews, a comprehensive review for reappointment is conducted during the fourth year and a comprehensive review for promotion is conducted during the seventh year. These reviews are initiated by the department chairman and are conducted by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee.

Annual performance evaluations of each faculty member are carried out by the department chairs and dean (see Faculty Annual Performance Evaluation, SOP Faculty Handbook). These annual evaluations result in an overall performance rating of unsatisfactory, marginal, satisfactory, good, meritorious or outstanding. The reappointment reviews together with the annual performance evaluations provide faculty members with specific information regarding progress toward promotion. In general, candidates for promotion are expected to achieve and maintain a meritorious to outstanding level of performance in each of their major areas of academic responsibility during the years prior to their final comprehensive review. In evaluating candidates' accomplishments, faculty members' distribution of effort to teaching, research, institutional/professional service and where appropriate, clinical practice, will be considered.

B. Criteria and Procedure for Initial Appointments

School of Pharmacy faculty members in the clinical/teaching track serve on the basis of limited appointments. These limited appointments are renewable annually subject to satisfactory performance.

Assistant Professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization and must provide evidence of ability to assume high quality independent teaching, research, institutional/professional service, and where appropriate, clinical practice.

Associate Professor and Professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization and must present to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, through the department chair, a dossier similar to that required for promotion of current faculty members. The recommendation of the
Committee is forwarded to the dean. The criteria for appointment at one of these levels will be the same as those described below for promotion.

C. Criteria and Indicators for Promotion

Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor normally occurs at the end of the seventh year of service at the rank of assistant professor. Consideration may occur at a shorter interval only in circumstances of extraordinary accomplishment or as specifically detailed in a faculty member’s letter of appointment.

Promotion requires that the candidate possess the terminal degree in his/her field and must have demonstrated at least meritorious performance in teaching, research/creative work, institutional/professional service and where appropriate, clinical practice. A rating of excellent must be obtained in the candidate’s primary area of academic responsibility (typically research/creative work) as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate. Promotion is awarded only if there are clear indications that the candidate will continue to grow and develop as a productive academic scholar. The comprehensive review for promotion is initiated by the department chair and conducted by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor normally occurs at the end of the seventh year. In some cases, the promotion period may be extended up to a maximum of nine years for non-tenure clinical/teaching track faculty only. The purpose of extending the probationary period would be to allow faculty to correct perceived deficiencies in their portfolio prior to undergoing promotion review. Decisions to extend the probationary period will be made jointly with the individual faculty, the department chair, and the dean of the SOP. This decision will be made on a case-by-case basis and determined primarily based on an assessment of the candidate’s potential for successfully correcting any deficiencies in their promotion portfolio during the extended probationary period. Specific areas of the portfolio needing improvement prior to promotion review will be identified, and a written plan for correcting deficiencies with corresponding specific performance expectations will be developed. Should the candidate fall short of defined performance expectations during the extended probationary period, then the standard one year notice of termination will be given. Absent extraordinary extenuating circumstances, the promotion period will not be extended beyond nine years.

Indicators of teaching performance include:

1. Student, self and peer evaluations of overall teaching quality.

2. Timeliness of information taught and its relevance to the contemporary practice of pharmacy as determined by peers.

3. Quality of instructional materials used in the classroom as determined by students and peers.

4. Ability to use examinations and grades to appropriately and equitably evaluate student performance as determined by peers.

5. Evidence of innovation that results in improvement in teaching effectiveness as determined by students and peers.
6. Receipt of teaching awards as well as other regional, national and international recognition accorded teaching accomplishments.

7. Evidence of teaching scholarship such as publication of course materials, software programs web sites, and textbooks.

8. Effectiveness in advising students.

9. Ability to recruit high quality graduate, postgraduate, and/or post-professional students and to successfully guide them through their studies.

10. Course director assessment of contributions to course operation.

Indicators of performance in research and creative work include:

1. Quality and number of publications, including research articles, review articles, book chapters, case reports, letters to editor, etc. When assistant professors are considered for promotion, publications based on independent and original research projects initiated by the candidate are given more weight than publications based on research projects initiated in collaboration with a previous mentor. Independent and original components of collaborative research efforts are encouraged however.

2. Frequency with which published articles are cited by peers.

3. Grants and contracts received for scientific research and other creative endeavors.

4. Opinions of peer academicians from other institutions and other academic units of the University of Colorado. (External evaluators are chosen so that some have and some do not have personal knowledge of the candidate.)

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

Indicators of institutional and professional service:

1. Extent and quality of institutional committee service.

2. Extent and quality of participation in professional continuing education programs.

3. Willingness to accept leadership roles and to effectively carry out special assignments.

4. Participation in school functions, student-sponsored programs and local professional activities, and the conscientious execution of departmental responsibilities.

5. Extent and quality of service to professional and scientific journals and organizations.

6. Extent and quality of service on evaluative panels or teams such as grant or protocol review panels, site visit teams, educational panels and academic program evaluation teams.
7. Invited lectures or presentations.

*Indicators of Clinical Practice may include*

1. Ability to render high quality patient care service as evaluated by clinical practitioners, peers and supervisors.

2. Evidence that the candidate establishes, maintains or supports a high level practice that serves as a vehicle for teaching and scholarly activities, as evaluated by students, peers and supervisors.

3. Evidence of continued professional competency as a clinical practitioner as evidenced by completion of continuing education credits and certification programs.

**Professor**

Promotion to the level of professor requires that the candidate demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in both teaching, research, institutional/professional service and where appropriate clinical practice. In addition, the candidate must have demonstrated a strong record of service to the university and to his/her profession. The individual must also have earned national and international recognition in his/her field of research and creative work and be a recognized leader in service to the school and the profession.

The indicators utilized in assessing performance are as indicated above for promotion decisions. Normally, reviews for promotion from associate professor to professor are conducted during the candidate's sixth year at the rank of associate professor. Comprehensive reviews for promotion are initiated by the department chair and conducted by an ad hoc committee of professors with tenure established by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee.

**Comprehensive Reviews of Faculty**

Comprehensive reviews of faculty members in the School of Pharmacy are conducted for decisions regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Comprehensive reviews entail internal peer review of teaching, institutional/professional service, and scholarly activity. In addition, letters are obtained from external reviewers regarding service and scholarly activity. Assistant professors undergo two comprehensive reviews. The first is for reappointment and occurs during the fourth year of the probationary period for promotion, or promotion and tenure. The second is for promotion or for both promotion and tenure and normally occurs during the seventh year of service at the rank of assistant professor. Associate professors undergo a comprehensive review at the time they are considered for promotion to the rank of full professor. The personnel director keeps a master calendar of comprehensive review schedules according to university guidelines. Department chairs are responsible for initiating comprehensive reviews for faculty members in their department. The personnel director notifies the department chairs at the beginning of each fiscal year of the faculty members in their departments who are required to undergo comprehensive review during that year.

To initiate a comprehensive review, the department chair submits a memorandum and a faculty member’s dossier to the dean who forwards these materials to the DOPS Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure committee. The APT committee, working in conjunction with the department chair, then solicits written evaluations from appropriate School of Pharmacy faculty members in accordance with the procedure described below.
The chair of the APT committee assumes responsibility for the next phase of the comprehensive review process which involves solicitation of a minimum of four letters of evaluation from external reviewers, at least two of whom are not personally familiar with the candidate. The APT committee obtains outside evaluation letters of the candidate, which are subsequently shared with the department chair prior to the APT committee’s deliberations. The department chair then provides his/her own letter to the APT chair. Also before the APT committee deliberations begin, the department chair solicits input from departmental faculty above the rank of the faculty candidate. Faculty are then invited to provide their letters directly to the chair of the APT committee. The APT committee then meets to consider the outside evaluation letters, the chair’s recommendation letter and any faculty letters in hand. A standardized letter for soliciting external reviews is appended to the dossier checklist.

Following completion of the steps described above, the chair of the APT committee provides the dean with a written summary of the committee’s actions and recommendations. This summary shall include a separate vote tally on each category of academic responsibility being evaluated (teaching, research/creative work, service, and, if applicable, clinical practice) as either “not meritorious,” “meritorious,” or “excellent.” The specific tally and outcome of votes taken at every step must be included. In cases involving only reappointment, the dean makes the final decision at this point and informs the faculty member and the department chair. In cases involving promotion, and/or tenure the dean requests a subsequent review of the candidate’s qualifications by an independent review committee, which he/she appoints on an ad hoc basis.

To complete the comprehensive review process, the recommendations of the school’s APT committee, the dean’s review committee, and the dean are forwarded to the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC) and the CU Denver provost for further review. If the VCAC and the provost agree with the dean’s recommendation, the candidate’s file is sent to the chancellor of the university. In cases involving non-tenure track faculty members, the chancellor’s decision is final. In cases involving tenure track or tenured faculty members, the president (if he/she concurs with the chancellor’s recommendation) forwards the candidate’s file to the Board of Regents for final action. The dean notifies the faculty member and his/her department chair of the final action by the president or Board of Regents. Faculty members who have been denied reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure may appeal the decision through established University of Colorado procedures.

Procedures for Selecting Outside Evaluators

As part of the comprehensive review process, the APT committee solicits evaluations of candidates from appropriate faculty members, typically at other high education institutions or from industry. The APT committee selects the outside evaluators as follows.

1. Review and selection from list of suggested outside evaluators provided by the candidate.

2. Review and selection from list provided by the department chair.

3. Review and selection of outside evaluators by the APT committee members. These outside evaluators are selected based on their comparable scientific expertise in a relevant field to that of the candidate. In addition, the outside evaluator must be at the level or higher than the candidate’s request for promotion/tenure level – e.g. must be at the rank of associate or full professor with tenure for an assistant professor who is up for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure.
Procedure for Soliciting Evaluations from DOPS Faculty Members

As part of the comprehensive review process, the APT committee solicits evaluations of candidates from appropriate faculty members. The DOPS department chair convenes a meeting of one of the following three groups of faculty members:

1. all departmental faculty members at a rank above the rank of the candidate (for reviews of non-tenure track faculty members seeking reappointment or promotion).

2. all departmental, tenured faculty members (for reviews of non-tenured, tenure track faculty members seeking reappointment or promotion and tenure).

3. only departmental tenured faculty members at the rank of full professor (for reviews of tenured faculty members seeking promotion to the rank of full professor).

At this meeting the department chair reviews:

1. the date of the candidate's initial appointment

2. the candidate's present rank and associated conditions of appointment

3. the candidate's distribution of effort agreements for all years since the initial appointment or the most recent comprehensive review

4. the candidate's research, teaching and service accomplishments

5. the professional development status of the candidate

6. the results of the candidate's annual performance evaluations for all years since the initial appointment or the most recent comprehensive review.

Following the department chair's presentation, faculty members are given the opportunity to ask questions and to request additional information. The faculty members then are asked to submit to the chair of the APT committee independent written evaluations of the candidate's relative success in attaining the standards required for reappointment, promotion, or promotion and tenure in the School of Pharmacy.

Research Track Appointments

Individuals with research track appointments are full-time members of the faculty but are not eligible for tenure nor are they voting members of School of Pharmacy Faculty Senate. They must derive 100% of their salary and associated benefits from extramural sources of funding. In addition to a primary involvement in research, faculty in the research track are required to participate in departmental teaching programs, committee service and/or other departmental service defined by the department chairman.

A. Procedures

Research track appointments may range form one to three years. Requests for and documents supporting appointments (research instructor, research assistant, associate or full professor) will be forwarded to the
DOPS Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. Recommendations from this committee are forwarded to the chairman of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

B. Criteria for Appointment

Research track appointments will be at the level of research instructor, research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research full professor, depending on the qualifications of the candidate. Research instructors must have 2 years of postdoctoral experience and intend to apply for specific research funding which must be documented by a letter of endorsement from the faculty mentor. Research assistant professors must also have 2 or more years of postdoctoral research experience and derive a portion of their salary from extramural sources of funding on grants or contracts where they are principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (co-PI). Research associate professors must have at least 6 years at the level of research assistant professor or credentials supporting equivalent prior research experience. The applicant must present evidence of (1) significant research activity as indicated by publications, (2) funding of at least 50% of their salary from grants and contracts where they are PI or co-PI, and (3) student mentoring and/or participation in teaching. Research full professors will be expected to derive 100% of their salary from extramural sources of funding where they are PI or co-PI thus demonstrating their ability to function as an independent investigator. Criteria for appointment at this level include a record of sustained research funding, significant publication activity as well as mentoring graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.

C. Criteria for Reappointment

The DOPS APT Committee evaluates all levels of research track appointments for reappointment. Research instructors, assistant, associate and full professors will be reappointed every three years; the reappointment decision will include an evaluation of the continuity of independent salary support, and/or continued efforts to obtain and maintain salary support from outside funding agencies. Additional criteria for reappointment of research instructors include (1) a letter of support from the faculty mentor, (2) evidence of excellence in research as evidenced by research publications by the candidate, and (3) participation in the programs of the department. Written documentation of these activities will be the same as that required for tenure-track faculty. Recommendations for reappointment will be forwarded from the APT committee to the department chair for review and final approval.

D. Annual Review of Research Track Faculty

Research faculty members are required to undergo annual performance evaluations beginning in November following the first full year of appointment. The evaluation is carried out by the supervising faculty member who is responsible for preparing a summary that is provided to the research faculty and forwarded to the department chair for review.

E. Participation in Departmental Programs

In addition to a primary involvement in research, faculty in the research track are required to participate in departmental teaching programs, committee service and/or other departmental service defined by the department chairman. Involvement in teaching might involve the presentation of lectures, instruction in laboratory based courses and/or coordinating journal clubs. Committee service would be related to the research activities of the department. Departmental service would be research-related and may include duties such as maintenance and oversight of departmental common equipment, and training users in proper use of this equipment. Typically, the level of involvement would be expected to be less than 5% of their time.
Comprehensive Reviews of Research Faculty

Comprehensive reviews of research faculty members are performed on the same schedule as faculty members in clinical/teaching and tenure tracks using the same criteria as described for these tracks. The primary responsibility of research track faculty is in the area of research and creative work but their activities in teaching and/or service (using indicators of teaching and service as noted for tenure track faculty above) will also be a part of the review process.

Conflict of Interest

All members of the APT Committee have a responsibility to fully disclose any real or potential conflicts of interest prior to evaluating a candidate’s qualifications for promotion or promotion and tenure. In the event that a member of the APT Committee has a real or potential conflict of interest with a candidate being evaluated, members of the APT Committee must make a decision regarding whether this real or potential conflict of interest constitutes sufficient reason to justify that member recusing himself/herself from discussion and voting on that candidate. In the event that a recusal is necessary and this recusal results in an insufficient number of DOPS faculty to comprise a committee such that there are a minimum of three committee members eligible to vote on a candidate’s promotion or promotion and tenure, the APT Committee shall notify the DOPS Department Chair who will identify an additional faculty member to serve. The criteria for these appointments are as follows:

- Faculty above rank (and tenured if necessary) from the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences,
- Faculty above rank (and tenured if necessary) from the Department of Clinical Pharmacy or
- University of Colorado faculty above the rank (and tenured if necessary) preferably with knowledge or expertise in the candidates’ field.
- The appointed faculty member will only participate in the evaluation of the candidate for which the regular APT Committee member has a conflict.
Check List of Documentation Required for Recommendations on Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

Items I-IV are provided to the department chair by the faculty member.

I. A CURRENT VITAE, in the following format:

A. GENERAL/PERSONAL INFORMATION
B. EDUCATION
C. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
D. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS
E. CONSULTING ACTIVITY
F. TEACHING ACTIVITY
   1. Undergraduate and Graduate Courses (by semester and/or quarter)
   2. Continuing Education
G. ADVISING ACTIVITY
H. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITY AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE
I. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS
J. HONORS
K. PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE
   1. Membership in Professional Organizations
   2. Review Panels
   3. Journal Referee
   4. Editorial Board
L. SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS
   1. Local
   2. State
   3. National
   4. International
M. GRANT/RESEARCH ACTIVITY

N. PUBLICATIONS (Provide a statement of candidates contribution to each published paper.)

1. Refereed Journals (published papers)
2. Non-refereed Journals
3. Review Articles
4. Book Chapters
6. Book Reviews and Letters
7. Other Publications

O. OTHER CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

II. TEACHING EVALUATIONS.

A. Submit the complete record of annual course evaluation scores.

B. Submit other evaluations of teaching including the most recent peer review. Multiple measures are critical to the fair evaluation of teaching.

C. Include a clear and separate analysis of individualized teaching contributions, i.e., independent study, supervision of graduate students, etc.

III. EXAMPLES OF PUBLICATIONS. Submit reprints of all the candidate's publications since the initial appointment or the most recent comprehensive review.

IV. LIST OF POTENTIAL OUTSIDE EVALUATORS. (for comprehensive review for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure only). Submit a list of individuals who could serve as outside evaluators. Include full mailing addresses, phone numbers, and e-mail addresses.

V. OUTSIDE LETTERS OF EVALUATION. (for comprehensive review for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure only)

A. A minimum of four external letters of evaluation are required for comprehensive reviews for reappointment, promotion or promotion and tenure. Two letters should come from individuals suggested by the candidate and at least two from qualified individuals not personally familiar with the candidate.

B. Copies of letters soliciting the evaluations should be included in the candidates dossier (standardized letter attached). These letters should specify that the request is for evaluation, not recommendation. Evaluators should be asked to make clear what their relationship is/has been to the candidate, on what part of the candidate's work their judgment is based and
whether the person being reviewed would be reappointed, promoted or receive tenure at their institution.

C. For each evaluator, the APT Committee should include a statement on the evaluator’s stature in the field. A Curriculum Vitae of each evaluator should be included.

VI. SCHOOL OF PHARMACY FACULTY’S LETTERS OF EVALUATION. Review for promotion requires letters of evaluation from each faculty member in the candidate’s department at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion. In cases of review for promotion including tenure, all tenured faculty members of the School of Pharmacy submit letters of evaluation. These letters are solicited by the department chair and submitted to the APT Committee chair.

VII. DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S LETTER OF EVALUATION

VIII. APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION. This letter serves as the basic documentation for the unit’s recommendation. It is prepared by the chairperson and must include an appraisal by the APT committee of:

A. Teaching Ability. As evidence, include student evaluations, assessments by colleagues or other individuals who may have observed the candidate’s teaching performance, receipt of teaching awards, etc. Colleague audits will supplement student evaluations. Consider both undergraduate and graduate teaching. Include with the student evaluations some discussion of the meaning of the student data.

B. Scholarly and Creative Work. As evidence, include:

1. An assessment of the merit of publications, including an indication of the prestige of the journals or books, the rigor of the referee screening required and the significance of the content, if possible.

2. A description of the candidate’s research activities and/or creative work, including an assessment of quality, quantity and consequence.

3. An analysis or critique of the outside reviews.

4. Published reviews of publications and/or creative work if available.

C. University and Public Service. Include an assessment of the candidate’s service contributions to the university, to his or her profession and to the public at large.

1. A statement describing step-by-step the procedures followed and actions taken by the APT Committee making the recommendation. Include reasons for the recommendation and any dissenting statements from the recommendation. The specific tally of votes taken at every step must be included.

2. Chairperson’s recommendation.

3. List of faculty members outside the School of Pharmacy suggested for service on Dean’s review committee. (Promotion or promotion and tenure reviews only.)
IX. DEAN'S REVIEW COMMITTEE STATEMENT (for comprehensive review for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure only) The APT committee's evaluation and recommendation is summarized as briefly as possible, giving the specific tally on votes and explaining the basis for differences, if any.

X. DEAN'S RECOMMENDATION (as needed). Where differences of opinion between the APT Committee, the Review Committee and/or the Dean have occurred and have not been resolved, each party in the disagreement shall submit a brief statement outlining the areas of disagreement and the reasons for its recommendation in that context.

XI. DEAN'S LETTER AND REQUEST FOR REGENT ACTION.