

**Department of Clinical Pharmacy
School of Pharmacy
University of Colorado Denver**

Standards and Procedures for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and/or Tenure

Final October 29, 2008

Approved by the DOCP faculty November 24, 2008; Revised August 31, 2009

1. Introductory Statement

This document describes with specificity the expectations and standards that will be used by the Department of Clinical Pharmacy to evaluate whether candidates meet the general criteria for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure at the University of Colorado Denver (UC Denver). The Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) Evaluation 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.

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," "good", "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 (teaching, service, and research and scholarly work) 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.

2. School of Pharmacy Mission Statement

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

The school's faculty endorses the concept that pharmaceutical care, defined as "the responsible provision of drug therapy for the purpose of achieving definite outcomes that improve a patient's quality of life" constitutes the essence of the pharmacy profession and as such must provide the foundation for every aspect of the school's professional curriculum. Faculty members are committed to teaching excellence and to continuous monitoring of the professional curriculum to assure its faithfulness and relevance to the tenets of pharmaceutical care. Pursuant to this commitment, faculty members welcome the scrutiny provided by student and peer evaluations and by outcomes measurements that assess overall teaching quality and lead the way to improvements in the school's instructional programs.

The faculty also is dedicated to the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge. Encouraging faculty members to engage in creative activities that have a positive impact on the well-being of society, providing these faculty members with the resources necessary to develop into accomplished scholars and supporting graduate, post-graduate and post-professional research training programs are major priorities of the School of Pharmacy.

The faculty of the School of Pharmacy recognizes the value of diversity in enriching the school's cultural, learning and scholarly environment and is dedicated to promoting diversity within itself and among the school's students and staff. To achieve this goal, the school makes every effort to recruit and retain individuals from diverse educational, cultural, ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.

The faculty also recognizes its responsibility to advance the profession of pharmacy through public advocacy, provision of opportunities for life-long learning and participation in the affairs of local, national and international pharmacy organizations.

(Adopted November 8, 1999; revised January 8, 2002)

3. Department of Clinical Pharmacy Mission Statement

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

4. Appointment

4.1 Criteria for appointment as assistant professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization. Appointment as assistant professor (tenure track or clinical-teaching track) requires that a candidate has demonstrated a potential for independent teaching, research and scholarly work and, where appropriate, innovative clinical practice. The

candidate must also have the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals and/or graduate students.

4.2 Criteria for appointment as associate professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization. Appointment at 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. Ideally, the candidate should have demonstrated the ability to train post-doctoral professionals and/or graduate students as evidenced by an ongoing post-doctoral residency or fellowship-training program and/or advising and teaching of graduate students.

Appointment at the rank of associate professor (clinical-teaching track) requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching, scholarly work, and clinical practice. Ideally, the candidate should have demonstrated the ability to participate in the training of post-doctoral professionals and/or graduate students.

4.3 Criteria for appointment as professor

Candidates must have the highest academic degree attainable in their field of specialization. Appointment at the rank of professor implies advanced academic maturity and evidence that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national/international authority in his/her chosen field of study by maintaining an ongoing program of research or scholarly works, teaching, clinical practice and service. Distinction in clinical practice or service (university, professional/scientific, public) will supplement the candidate's record of scholarship and teaching, but may not serve as the primary basis for appointment as professor.

5. Reappointment

Utilizing the criteria for promotion, the Department's ARPT Evaluation committee will evaluate and determine a faculty member's progress toward promotion. The review will utilize an external review process and will occur in the fourth year of the member's initial appointment. The ARPT Evaluation Committee will send its assessment of progress towards promotion and a recommendation for re-appointment to the department chair.

6. Promotion

Excellence in teaching, research, service and clinical practice are meaningful parameters for academic promotion. Although a balance among these functions is obviously desirable, it is recognized that the best use of professional talent may dictate that a faculty member's contributions not be equally balanced across teaching, scholarly work, service and clinical practice. Therefore, it is understood that each faculty member is unique and will be individually judged against the criteria described below for promotion. In evaluating the candidate's accomplishments against these criteria, the faculty member's distribution of effort to teaching, scholarly work, service and clinical practice must be considered. Finally, it is understood that if a criterion is not relevant for the candidate, then it will not be considered.

6.1 Criteria and indicators for promotion to assistant professor
(this section is intentionally left blank)

6.2. Criteria and indicators for promotion to associate professor

Promotion to the rank of associate professor, concurrent with the awarding of tenure, if applicable, normally occurs at the end of the seventh year of service at the rank of assistant professor. Promotion and tenure require that the candidate possess the terminal degree in his/her field. 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 ARPT Evaluation Committee.

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. Service (university, professional, scientific, public) and innovative clinical practice will be taken into consideration but are not in themselves a primary basis for promotion. Ideally, the candidate should have demonstrated the ability to train advanced degree professionals and/or graduate students as evidenced by an ongoing post-doctoral residency or fellowship-training program and/or advising and teaching of graduate students.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor (clinical-teaching track) requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate, by independent effort, has developed a program of teaching, scholarly work, and clinical practice. Service (university, professional/scientific, public) will be taken into consideration but is not itself a basis for promotion. Ideally, the candidate should have demonstrated the ability to participate in the training of advanced degree professionals and/or graduate students.

In addition to teaching, scholarly work, service, and clinical practice, the ARPT Evaluation 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. 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. The program requirements of the DOCP may be considered at the time of the appointment or reappointment. However, the merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendations for award of tenure.

Early promotion 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 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.

6.2.1 Assessment of teaching

The requisites for effectiveness of a teacher include intellectual competence, integrity, creativity, independence, enthusiasm and an ability to effectively transmit knowledge to students, to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to pursue creative work. Evaluation of effectiveness of teaching will include classroom and clerkship performance, curriculum materials and educational development activities.

Example criteria for evaluating a candidate's teaching include the following:

6.2.1.1 Teaching effectiveness, as judged by student, peer, and self-assessments, and accompanied by an evaluation from the department chair.

6.2.1.2 Receipt of teaching awards as well as other regional, national and international recognition accorded teaching accomplishments.

6.2.1.3 Evidence of teaching scholarship such as publication of course materials, software programs and textbooks and the degree of adoption of these by peer institutions.

6.2.1.4 Development of a new course or clinical rotation, or revising an existing course.

6.2.1.5 Incorporation of innovative teaching strategies in a course (e.g. problem based learning, web based teaching).

6.2.1.6 Receipt of an educational development grant or directing an experimental educational program.

6.2.1.7 Participation in the education of advanced degree professionals (e.g., residents, fellows) and/or graduate students.

6.2.1.8 Ability to recruit high quality graduate, postgraduate and post-professional students and to successfully guide them through their studies and place them in prestigious positions.

6.2.2 Assessment of research and scholarly work

Innovation, originality, creativity and peer recognition are the essential characteristics of scholarship. The requisites for effectiveness of a scholar include evidence that the candidate has established him/herself as a focused, independent scholar who is capable of conducting research and scholarly work of high quality. The Department recognizes that scholarship may be pursued by faculty within four broad forms: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. Definitions of these forms of scholarship are found in Appendix A. (1)

Example criteria for evaluating a candidate's research and scholarly work include the following:

6.2.2.1 Quality and number of research articles, review articles, book chapters, case reports, letters to editor, abstracts at scientific and professional meetings and other scholarly works published as the primary or senior author.

Primary authorship is defined as the author who is substantially responsible for initiating, conducting and reporting the research or scholarly work. Publications in which the candidate is a co-author will contribute. It is the responsibility of the candidate to establish as clearly as possible his/her role in joint efforts. Co-authored publications, however, will not be the sole basis for promotion or awarding tenure.

Assistant professors holding tenure track appointments with specified probationary periods are expected to establish an independent, externally funded research program that generates high quality, peer-reviewed publications at regular intervals. When these faculty members are considered for promotion and tenure, publications based on research projects initiated at the University of Colorado are given more weight than publications based on research projects initiated elsewhere.

6.2.2.2 Frequency with which published articles are cited by peers.

6.2.2.3 The ability to secure grants and contracts for scientific research and other creative endeavors from sources outside the University to support his/her independent research efforts.

6.2.2.4 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).

6.2.2.5 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 professional and 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; and e) invitations to speak at academic institutions and scientific symposia.

6.2.3 Assessment of institutional and professional service

The expectations for service are collegiality and active, effective participation in departmental, school, campus, and university committees and activities. Recognition should also be given to faculty who make significant service contributions to student welfare, health professions, the community, the state and the nation in their special

capacities as scholars. The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement, leadership and the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems or other creative activities.

Example criteria for evaluating a candidate's institutional and professional service include the following:

6.2.3.1 Extent and quality of institutional committee service.

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

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

6.2.3.4 Participation in department functions and initiatives.

6.2.3.5 Participation in school functions, student-sponsored programs and local professional activities.

6.2.3.6 Extent and quality of service to professional and scientific organizations.

6.2.3.7 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.

6.2.4 Assessment of clinical practice

The expectations for clinical practice are to establish, maintain or support a high level practice that will serve as a vehicle for teaching and scholarly activities. The candidate must demonstrate competence in a specific field of pharmacy practice. Evaluation of the clinical competence of the candidate should be made by clinical practitioners.

Example criteria for evaluating effectiveness as a practitioner include, but are not limited to:

6.2.4.1 Ability to provide high quality patient-specific pharmaceutical care, as evaluated by peers and supervisors, which promotes safe, effective and economical pharmacotherapy in patients.

6.2.4.2 Establishment of new and innovative types of pharmacy practices.

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

6.2.4.4 Evidence that the candidate has maintained and enhanced their professional competency through continuing education, conferences, and seminars.

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

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

6.2.4.7 Attainment of board or other forms of specialty certification.

6.3 Criteria and indicators for promotion to professor

Promotion to the level of professor requires that the candidate demonstrate exceptional accomplishments in teaching, research, and clinical practice (if appropriate). The individual must also have earned local, national and perhaps international recognition in his/her field of research and creative work, teaching or clinical practice and be a recognized contributor in service to the department, school, campus, university, and profession. The indicators utilized in assessing performance in the four academic areas are as indicated above for decisions on promotion to associate professor. 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 the ARPT Evaluation Committee.

Promotion to the rank of professor (tenure track) implies advanced academic maturity and that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national/international authority in his/her chosen field of study maintaining an ongoing program of research, teaching, clinical practice and service. Distinction in clinical practice and/or service (university, professional/scientific, public) will supplement the candidate's record of scholarship and teaching, but may not serve as the primary basis for promotion. If research is the major aspect of the candidate's activities, he/she must demonstrate an advanced level of scholastic productivity with regards to original peer-reviewed scientific publications (where the candidate is the sole, primary or senior author) and the ability to obtain ongoing extramural research funding (where the candidate is the principal or co-principal investigator). There should be evidence that the candidate's research productivity with respect to funding and publications has continued to grow since his/her promotion to associate professor. Generally, the candidate's research program should reflect a focus centered on a particular patient group, medical condition, therapeutic category or scientific concept.

Research-related awards conferred by academic, scientific or professional organizations can serve as evidence of national or international recognition. If teaching is the primary criterion for promotion, the candidate should have a substantial record of sustained, on-going, innovative activities marked by an extraordinary level of excellence in the scholarship of teaching. Evidence of such excellence includes student and peer evaluations, invited lectures, funding for pedagogical research and teaching innovations, publications related to teaching, and university or scientific/professional organization teaching awards. The candidate's teaching record must reflect continued growth and achievement since promotion to associate professor. Ideally, the candidate will have

demonstrated the ability to train advanced degree professionals and/or graduate students as evidenced by an ongoing post-doctoral residency or fellowship training program and/or the advising and teaching of graduate students. There should be evidence that the candidate has provided meaningful mentoring of junior faculty. Evidence of distinction in clinical practice or service includes peer and national recognition of innovation and leadership, publications and awards. Extensive, exceptional contributions in clinical practice and service may compensate for a reduced, but distinguished research and/or teaching record.

Promotion to the rank of professor (clinical-teaching track) requires advanced academic maturity and evidence that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national authority in his/her discipline through the development of a sustained program of teaching, scholarly work, and innovative clinical practice. Distinction in service (school, campus, university, professional/scientific, public) will supplement the candidate's record of scholarship but may not serve as the sole basis for promotion. If research is the major aspect of the candidate's activities, he/she must demonstrate an advanced level of scholastic productivity with regards to original peer-reviewed scientific publications (where the candidate is the sole, primary or senior author) and the ability to obtain ongoing extramural research funding (where the candidate is the principal or co-principal investigator). There should be evidence that the candidate's research productivity with respect to funding and publications has continued to grow since his/her promotion to associate professor. Generally, the candidate's research program should reflect a focus centered on a particular patient group, medical condition, therapeutic category or scientific concept. Research-related awards conferred by academic, scientific or professional organizations can serve as evidence of national or international recognition. If teaching is the primary criterion for promotion, the candidate should have a substantial record of sustained, on-going, innovative activities marked by an extraordinary level of excellence in the scholarship of teaching. Evidence of such excellence includes student and peer evaluations, invited lectures, funding for pedagogical research and teaching innovations, publications related to teaching, and university or scientific/professional organization teaching awards. The candidate's teaching record must reflect continued growth and achievement since promotion to associate professor. Ideally, the candidate should have demonstrated the ability to participate in the training of advanced degree professionals and/or graduate students. If clinical practice is a major aspect of the candidate's activities, he/she must have developed and implemented unique clinical pharmacy services that have achieved local and national recognition for their contribution to patient care. These accomplishments should be documented by excellence in the scholarship of application. In addition, the candidate should be recognized by peers, students and other members of the healthcare team for outstanding clinical practice performance.

7. Tenure

7.1 Criteria and indicators for tenure

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 in the tenure track. Tenure requires that the candidate possess the terminal degree in

his/her field and has demonstrated meritorious performance in teaching, research/creative work, and service with excellence in either teaching or research/creative work. This rating of “excellent” must be obtained in his/her primary area of academic responsibility (teaching or research/creative work) as defined by his/her faculty Distribution of Effort agreements and/or agreed upon by the department chair and the candidate. Tenure 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 tenure is initiated by the department chair and conducted by the ARPT Evaluation Committee. The criteria for awarding tenure are those that warrant promotion to the rank of associate professor (tenure track).

As with decisions regarding appointment, reappointment, or promotion, the ARPT Evaluation Committee may also take into account other factors which are deemed to have a material bearing on decisions regarding whether or not the candidate has successfully met established criteria for the awarding of tenure. The merit of the candidate shall be the only consideration in recommendations for award of tenure; program requirements of the DOCP may not be considered.

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.

8. 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 DOCP 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 DOCP 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 DOCP chair.

Prior to submission of dossiers for evaluation of candidates for appointment, promotion, and/or tenure, the DOCP chair should provide, or make available, templates or models of good dossiers in order to guide candidates in preparation of their dossiers.

9. 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 ARPT Evaluation Committee however, there is no external review.

Upon completion, the ARPT 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 ARPT 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>

10. Process

10.1 Reappointment

Evaluation for reappointment by the ARPT Committee usually takes place during the fourth year of the initial appointment. A comprehensive review, including external evaluation, is performed and upon completion a recommendation is forwarded to the department chair.

10.2 Promotion to the rank of associate professor concurrent with the awarding of tenure.

Promotion to the rank of associate professor concurrent with the awarding of tenure normally occurs at the end of the seventh year of appointment at the rank of assistant professor. The comprehensive internal and external review for promotion is initiated by the department chair and conducted by the DOCP ARPT Evaluation Committee. Upon completion of their review, the ARPT Committee sends its assessment and a recommendation to the department chair.

10.3 Promotion to the rank of associate professor (clinical-teaching track).

Promotion to the rank of associate professor normally occurs at the end of the seventh year of appointment at the rank of assistant professor. The comprehensive review for promotion is initiated by the department chair and conducted by the DOCP ARPT Evaluation 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.

10.4 Promotion to the rank of professor.

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 the DOCP ARPT Evaluation Committee.

10.5 Post tenure review

Post tenure review will follow the same process outlined in Appendix B with the exception that external reviews are not required. Post tenure review is initiated by the department chair and conducted by the DOCP ARPT Evaluation Committee.

10.6 Process guidelines.

Appendix B describes in detail the process that will be followed for the review of candidates for initial appointment, interim review, and comprehensive review. This process includes the timeline that is to be followed, the responsibilities of the candidate and the various individuals involved in the review, and the checklist of required documents.

10.7 ARPT Evaluation Committee

In all cases of reappointment, promotion with or without tenure, and post tenure review, it is the responsibility of the department ARPT Evaluation Committee to conduct the evaluation of each individual faculty member and submit a formal written recommendation to the department chair.

Appendix A ^(1,2)

Scholarship Definitions

Scholarship of Discovery: The creation of new knowledge, rooted in the conviction that disciplined investigative efforts with the academy are strengthened.

Scholarship of Integration: Giving meaning to isolated facts and putting them into perspective. This form of scholarship also means interpretation, fitting one's research, and/or the research of others, into larger intellectual patterns.

Scholarship of Application: This form of scholarship begs the questions, "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can this knowledge be used to individuals as well as institutions?" To be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity.

Scholarship of Teaching: Pedagogical creativity, innovation, and research that culminates in student learning.

References

1. Popovich NG, Abel SR. The need for a broadened definition of faculty scholarship and creativity. *Am J Pharm Educ* 2002; 66:59-65.
2. Boyer EL. *Scholarship reconsidered. Priorities of the professoriate.* The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Princeton NJ (1990).

Appendix B

Process Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, Tenure or Post-Tenure Review of Faculty

A. Review for appointment:

Candidates being considered for faculty appointment in the DOCP at or above the rank of Associate Professor will submit a dossier to the DOCP ARPT Evaluation Committee. In their assessment of the candidate, the ARPT Evaluation Committee will utilize the criteria described in the DOCP Promotion and Tenure guidelines. Following this review, the chair of the ARPT Evaluation Committee will submit a recommendation to the DOCP chair, which will be forwarded to the Dean with the candidate's complete dossier.

B. Interim (reappointment), comprehensive (promotion with tenure or without), and post-tenure review:

1. Timeline for review and decision:

- **July-August:** candidate meets with DOCP chair to discuss initiation of review process
- **September 1:** submission of complete dossier by candidate to the ARPT Evaluation Committee. The dossier should include a list of 6-8 potential external reviewers¹
- **October 1:** candidate's dossier is sent for external review. For supplemental information to be included in the external review, it must be sent to the ARPT chair via email BEFORE October 1st. Supplemental information must be in the form of a letter to the ARPT chair and revised CV. Supplemental information may be submitted by the candidate to the committee at any time during the appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure process. However, supplemental information received after October 1st will not be sent to external reviewers. In the event that supplemental information is submitted to the ARPT Evaluation Committee after that committee's letter of recommendation has already been sent to the DOCP chair, the additional information will also be provided to the DOCP chair and other higher levels of review as necessary to ensure that this information is appropriately considered in subsequent appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.
- **December 1:** receipt of external letters including unsolicited letters from DOCP faculty colleagues; these and the candidate's dossier are sent to the DOCP chair
- **February 1:** the ARPT Evaluation Committee letter of recommendation is sent to the DOCP chair
- **March 1:** the DOCP chair completes his/her letter of recommendation regarding the ARPT action and then forwards the candidate's complete dossier that includes the letter of recommendation from the ARPT Evaluation Committee to the Dean. The DOCP chair meets with the candidate, and also provides copies of letters from the ARPT Evaluation Committee as well as his/her own letter of recommendation to the candidate.
- **early March:** Dean's Review Committee convenes²

¹ except for post-tenure review

- **early April:** Dean's Review Committee submits their recommendation to the Dean
- **early April:** Dean submits recommendation to the Vice Chancellor's Advisory Committee (VCAC) and the provost
- **early May:** the candidate is informed in writing of the Dean's decision. For clinical/teaching track promotions, the VCAC and Provost's recommendation is submitted to the Chancellor for approval. For tenure decisions, the VCAC and Provost's recommendation is simultaneously submitted to the Chancellor and the President's Office and the Board of Regents for approval at their June meeting
- **July 1:** decision of the Chancellor/Board of Regents becomes effective

2. Department Chair's responsibilities:

- submit a letter to the Evaluation Committee chair requesting that the candidate be considered for promotion or promotion with tenure. This letter should include a summation of the candidate's distribution of effort (DOE). Interim and post-tenure reviews are initiated by the Dean's office.
- the DOCP chair may elect to meet with the ARPT Evaluation Committee
- subsequent to the ARPT Evaluation Committee's review, the DOCP chair will have access to the dossier that includes the external letters of review. The chair will write an opinion letter regarding the candidate's promotion that is submitted to the Dean
- meet with the candidate to discuss the recommendation of the ARPT Evaluation committee prior to the submission of the recommendation to the Dean. At this time, the candidate will receive copies of both the letter of recommendation from the ARPT Evaluation Committee as well as the letter of recommendation from the DOCP chair.

3. Candidate's responsibilities:

- assemble a dossier utilizing the DOCP ARPT committee dossier checklist. In addition to items 1-6 of the checklist, candidates are entitled to submit any other material or information that he/she believes will be helpful in evaluating his/her reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. After original submission of the dossier, candidates may also provide additional supplemental information. Such supplemental information may be submitted by the candidate to the ARPT Evaluation Committee at any time during the appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure process. However, supplemental information received after October 1st will not be sent to external reviewers.
- provide a list of suggested external reviewers (6-8) who can serve as objective evaluators of academic progress. External reviewers must be at or above the rank which the candidate is being considered and should *not* include SOP or other UC Denver faculty. This list can be developed in consultation with the department chair and/or faculty colleagues. The candidate can solicit letters of support from School of Pharmacy faculty.
- the candidate may also choose to solicit letters of support from other University of Colorado faculty or professional colleagues who can comment on the candidate's contributions to his/her field.

² does not apply for mid-term and post-tenure review

4. DOCP Faculty responsibilities:

- in September, the chair of the ARPT Evaluation Committee will notify the DOCP faculty which faculty are scheduled for review. Any DOCP faculty member may elect to submit an unsolicited letter providing his/her opinion of the candidate to the ARPT Evaluation Committee (by December 1).

5. ARPT Evaluation Committee composition:

A. In July, the full-time DOCP faculty will elect (by anonymous ballot) the members of the ARPT Evaluation committee. The committee will be comprised of **six** DOCP faculty members. The following criteria must be met:

- five associate or full professors
- of these five faculty at least three must be tenured
- the committee must be chaired by a tenured-associate or full professor
- only tenured faculty can vote on the issue of tenure
- only faculty above rank of the candidate's can vote on promotion
- one assistant professor will serve as a non-voting member

B. In the event that there is an insufficient number of DOCP faculty to comprise a committee such that there are a minimum of three committee members eligible to vote on a candidate's promotion, the ARPT Evaluation Committee will identify a sufficient number of additional faculty to serve. The criteria for these appointments are as follows:

- tenured faculty above rank from the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, or
- University of Colorado faculty above the rank of the candidate(s) preferably with knowledge or expertise in the candidates' field;
- non-DOCP appointees will serve a one year term.

C. Each member of the committee will serve a two year term with the exception of the assistant professor who will serve a one year term; the assistant professor cannot serve consecutive terms except in the situation where there is no other faculty at the rank of assistant professor eligible to serve on the committee.

D. All members of the ARPT Evaluation 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 ARPT Evaluation Committee has a real or potential conflict of interest with a candidate being evaluated, members of the ARPT Evaluation 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 DOCP 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 ARPT Evaluation Committee shall notify the DOCP

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 Clinical Pharmacy,
- faculty above rank (and tenured if necessary) from the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 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 ARPT Evaluation Committee member has a conflict.

6. ARPT Evaluation Committee responsibilities:

- upon receipt of a dossier, the external reviewers will be determined
- external reviewers may include individuals not listed by the candidate
- a committee member will be designated to contact the external reviewers to determine availability and willingness to serve
- prepare review materials (the candidate's CV, representative publications, a copy of the DOCP promotion guidelines, and if applicable, a clinical and teaching summary) with a cover letter from the committee chair (see below) to be sent to the external reviewers
- perform a timely review of each candidate in accordance with the DOCP promotion guidelines; all deliberations are considered strictly confidential

7. ARPT Evaluation Committee chair responsibilities:

- schedule the committee meetings to meet the timeline for review
- notify DOCP faculty of the candidates under consideration for mid-term review or promotion
- write a cover letter to the external reviewers summarizing objectively the candidates accomplishments in teaching and clinical practice and his/her DOE
- on behalf of the committee, submit a written formal recommendation to the DOCP chair that details the material the committee reviewed, their assessment of it and the opinions of the external reviewers by February 1. This letter should also document the outcome of the committee's vote on the candidate's reappointment or promotion.
- advise the DOCP chair of the timeline for submission of the ARPT Evaluation Committee's recommendation to the Dean.

Checklist of Documentation Required for Recommendations on Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review

Items 1-6 are to be provided to the ARPT Evaluation Committee by the faculty member by September 1:

1. A current vitae, in SOP Format (see Appendix C)

2. Teaching Portfolio

A. Summary statement (overview of teaching program, 2-3 pages) incorporating the following:

1. Teaching activity from date of last review, including a clear and separate analysis of individualized teaching contributions in the professional program (e.g., independent study and advanced experiential program students) and post-graduate advising (graduate students, residents, fellows, etc.)
2. Teaching philosophy
3. Summary of actions taken to rectify areas in need of improvement as identified in the comprehensive midpoint evaluation, if applicable

B. Documentation

1. Complete record of annual course evaluation scores and clinical teaching evaluations
2. Most recent peer review
3. Examples of course syllabi, handouts, exams
4. Teaching awards

3. Research and Scholarly Activity Portfolio

A. Summary statement (overview of research program, including research philosophy and goals, 2-3 pages)

1. Candidates should include a summary of actions taken to rectify areas in need of improvement as identified in the comprehensive midpoint evaluation, if applicable

B. Documentation

1. Reprints of all the candidate's publications since the initial appointment, or the most recent comprehensive review.
2. Grant activity (please separate according to funded vs. unfunded)
3. Brief description of unfunded research activities (if applicable)

4. Clinical Portfolio

- A. Summary statement (overview of clinical program, 1-2 pages) incorporating the following:
 - 1. Description of clinical practice setting
 - 2. Description of innovation in practice
 - 3. Description of participation in training programs, certification courses, seminars, or other activities for the purpose of enhancing current clinical practice (Please do not list individual CE programs)
 - 4. Summary of actions taken to rectify areas in need of improvement as identified in the comprehensive midpoint evaluation, if applicable

- B. Documentation
 - 1. Assessment of practice from attending physicians, medical residents, pharmacy students, pharmacy residents, patients, or peers

5. Professional Service Portfolio

- A. Summary statement (overview of service activities, 1-2 pages) incorporating the following:
 - 1. Committee assignments (both SOP and CU Denver), including a description of attendance, responsibilities and special projects undertaken
 - 2. Student group advising responsibilities
 - 3. Memberships in professional organizations, including participation in special interest groups or practice networks, offices held, special projects undertaken
 - 4. Summary of actions taken to rectify areas in need of improvement as identified in the comprehensive midpoint evaluation, if applicable

- B. Documentation
 - 1. Letters from SOP/CU Denver peers or committee chairs, and letters from external, non-CU Denver committee chairs in support of your contributions regarding professional service

6. Copies of Past Annual Performance Evaluations

7. List of Potential External Reviewers

For review for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, candidates shall submit a list of six to eight names of individuals who have full-time academic appointments and are above your current rank, who could serve as outside evaluators. Include addresses, phone numbers and e-mail addresses. Candidates should provide a short statement to the qualifications of the external reviewer, and should disclose any past or current relationship with the reviewer. The candidate should *not* contact their named external reviewers regarding their willingness to serve. Candidates also have the opportunity to suggest specific individuals who should be excluded as external reviewers because their evaluations might be prejudiced against the candidate.

8. External Letters of Evaluation

A minimum of six external (non SOP/CU Denver) letters of evaluation is required for comprehensive reviews for reappointment, promotion or promotion and tenure. The ARPT Evaluation Committee will contact potential external reviewers to determine availability and willingness to serve, and will be responsible for the final selection of external reviewers. Ideally, two to three letters should come from individuals suggested by the candidate and the remainder from qualified individuals not personally familiar with the candidate. All letters that are received from external reviewers must be included in the candidate's dossier. These letters shall be treated as confidential and will not be shared with the candidate.

A. Include copies of letters soliciting the evaluations (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.

B. For each evaluator, the ARPT Evaluation Committee should include a statement on the evaluator's stature in the field. A Curriculum Vitae of each evaluator should be included.

9. School of Pharmacy Faculty's Letters of Evaluation.

Review for promotion or tenure may include:

A. Letters of evaluation from each faculty member in the candidate's department at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion. The ARPT Evaluation Committee chair solicits these letters; and

B. Letters of evaluation from SOP/CU Denver faculty that are solicited by the candidate

10. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Evaluation 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 ARPT Evaluation 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 audit will supplement not replace student evaluations. Consider both undergraduate and graduate teaching. Include with the student evaluations some discussion of the meaning of the student data.

B. Research and Scholarly Work:

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, or
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. Institutional and Professional Service:

Include an assessment of the candidate's service contributions to the university, to his or her profession and to the public at large.

D. Clinical Practice (if applicable):

Include a description of the candidate's clinical practice, and an assessment of practice development, innovation and other indicators that the practice provides high quality, patient-specific pharmaceutical care, which promotes safe, effective and economical pharmacotherapy in patients.

E. Findings of External Reviewers:

A comprehensive summary of letters from external reviewers shall be included in the ARPT Evaluation Committee's letter. This summary should include information sufficient to provide candidates with a fully balanced and representative sense of the overall assessments of external reviewers, both positive and negative. Such information may consist of specific statements or excerpts from the letters, if desired, taking care to protect the confidential nature of the letters.

The ARPT Evaluation Committee's letter should provide a statement describing step-by-step the procedures followed and actions taken by the ARPT Evaluation Committee making the recommendation. The ARPT Evaluation Committee shall conduct a separate vote 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. Reasons for the final recommendation of the Committee and any dissenting statements from the recommendation should be provided. A copy of the ARPT Evaluation Committee's letter will be provided to the candidate by the department chair. Finally, the ARPT Evaluation Committee should provide a list of faculty members outside the School of Pharmacy who are suggested for service on the Dean's review committee (promotion or promotion and tenure reviews only).

11. Department Chair's Letter of Evaluation.

A copy of this letter will be provided to the candidate by the department chair.

12. Dean's Review Committee Statement.

As briefly as possible, summarize the committee's evaluation and recommendation, giving the specific tally on votes and explaining the basis for differences, if any.

(Not required for interim reviews)

13. Dean's Recommendation.

Where differences of opinion between the ARPT Evaluation Committee, Department Chair, 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.

14. Dean's Letter and Request for Chancellor/Regent Action.

(Not required for interim reviews)

Appendix C

Department of Clinical Pharmacy/School of Pharmacy Format for Curriculum Vitae

A. General/Personal Information

B. Education

C. Professional Credentials

1. Licensure
2. Certifications
3. Fellowship Status
4. Other

D. Professional Experience

E. Academic Appointments

F. Grant/Research Activity

- List funded and unfunded (submitted but not funded) grants and contracts in NIH format: Grant title, Funding agency, Role of investigator (provide brief description), Percent Effort and percent salary offset (if applicable), Direct Costs, Score, Funded (Y/N), Funding Period
- List unfunded active and completed projects

G. Publications

- Designate role as senior and/or corresponding author where applicable (e.g., (senior author) or (corresponding author))
- Include articles that have been submitted (include journal name) and accepted for publication. Do not list those that are “in preparation”
- Copies of “in press” articles should be included in the dossier as should the letter of acceptance for “in press” articles

1. Refereed Journals
2. Non-refereed journals
3. Review articles
4. Book chapters
5. Abstracts/Presentations
6. Book reviews/letters
7. Other publications

H. Teaching Activity

1. Pharm.D./Graduate Courses
2. Continuing Education
3. Residency/Fellowship Programs

I. Clinical Activity

- List clinical service contracts- include a brief description of the service and the percent effort and salary provided

J. Honors/Awards

K. Speaking engagements

1. Local/State
2. National
3. International

L. Administrative Activity and University Service

M. Professional Activity and Public Service

1. Membership and service in professional organizations
2. Review panels
3. Journal Referee
4. Editorial board
5. Other

N. Advising Activity (e.g. student organizations, seminars, etc)

O. Special Assignments (e.g. administrative assignments, etc)

P. Other creative activities