Promotion Guidelines
College of Pharmacy
University of South Carolina

for

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Revised and approved by the College of Pharmacy Tenure and Promotion Committee on September 12, 2006

Promotion Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Appointments
College of Pharmacy
University of South Carolina

Introduction

The College of Pharmacy is an academic unit of the University of South Carolina. As such, the policies and procedures outlined in this document are designed to be consistent with those of the University as published in the Faculty Manual. Throughout this document, "Unit" refers to the College of Pharmacy, and "Unit Chair" refers to the Chair of the College of Pharmacy Tenure and Promotion Committee. Non-tenure track faculty will be eligible for promotion by following the College of Pharmacy Promotion Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Appointments. The faculty member will be reviewed by the unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, the department chair, the dean, and the provost; but not the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, the University President, or the Board of Trustees.

Promotion is a process that serves both university and individual. The university is committed to the conduct of research and dissemination of knowledge, the imparting of knowledge through teaching, and service to community, state, and nation through the contribution of faculty time and expertise. The process of promotion ensures that the university, through its faculty, will perform in these areas at the highest level. It is a system of accountability that assures quality research, teaching and service. The individual benefits by having the procedures and criteria for promotion stated clearly. The university's response to faculty performance will be based on the degree to which performance meets criteria, with decisions for promotion being made without regard to age, sex, race/ethnicity, creed, or religion.

Eligibility for promotion

To be eligible for promotion, the candidate must have his or her primary appointment within the College of Pharmacy. Faculty who hold the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor normally will not be recommended for promotion until they are at least in their fourth year as Clinical Assistant Professor at USC. Faculty who hold the rank of Clinical Associate Professor normally will not be recommended for promotion until they are at least in their third year as Clinical Associate Professor.

The File
The candidate's promotion file constitutes the evidence provided by the candidate to support the claim that the record satisfies the criteria. It is the responsibility of the candidate to develop and maintain his or her promotion file, and to submit it to the Unit Tenure and Promotion Chairman according to the published University timetable when being considered for promotion. This includes maintaining an accurate record of teaching responsibilities and evaluations, research and scholarly activities, and service

functions. The entirety of the candidate's file should be considered in any promotion decision. However, greater emphasis should be placed on activity reported in the file from last appointment or promotion to the present. The file will be comprised of a primary file that includes the designated university form for promotion, and a secondary file that includes copies of materials that the candidate wishes to provide to support the candidacy.

A *teaching portfolio* may be submitted by any faculty member. Details of a teaching portfolio are provided on page 7.

Committee on Tenure and Promotion

Composition
The College of Pharmacy Committee on Tenure and Promotion will be comprised of all tenured faculty within the College. The Chair must be a tenured faculty member holding the rank of Professor, and may not concurrently hold an administrative position, such as Dean, Assistant or Associate Dean, Provost, or Department Chair.

Voting Privilege
Only tenured faculty may vote on tenure or promotion decisions at the unit level. Only faculty of higher rank may vote on a candidate for promotion. Emeriti professors are not eligible to vote. Faculty on leave, e.g., sabbatical, may vote only if written notification of the desire to vote is provided to the Dean or Unit Chair prior to the beginning of the leave. Faculty who have an opportunity to vote separate from the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, e.g., Department Chair and Dean, have restrictions placed on their voting privilege at the promotion committee level, although they can participate in the discussion of the candidate prior to the vote. Deans are precluded from voting at the promotion committee level on all candidates; Department Chair are precluded from voting at the promotion committee level only for those candidates within their departments for whom they will vote in their capacity as Department Chair.

Notification and Schedule

Each year, in accordance with the USC Faculty Manual, all faculty below the rank of Clinical Professor are eligible for promotion consideration. Based on the published university schedule, the Dean of the College of Pharmacy will notify each eligible faculty of the option for promotion during the following academic year. Faculty who wish to be considered must notify the Department Chair and Dean in writing of their intention by the date listed in the university schedule, typically about seven days after the Dean's notification. Faculty who wish not to be considered for promotion must notify their Department Chair and Dean in writing of their intention following the same schedule. Names of faculty who have indicated in writing their intention to be considered for promotion the following year will be forwarded by the Dean to the Chair of the Unit

Tenure and Promotion Committee by the date included in the university schedule, typically about seven days after receipt of names by the Dean

The Provost's Office publishes a schedule, including deadlines, for the promotion process each year. The Chair of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide that timetable to all faculty who wish to be considered for promotion. Candidates are responsible for meeting those deadlines on matters over which they have control, e.g., submission of file, and submission of names of potential outside reviewers. The Unit Chair has responsibility in meeting deadlines in all other matters.

Soliciting Letters from External Reviewers

For all decisions of promotion, a candidate's file should include five letters from outside reviewers. Names of prospective reviewers will come from the following sources: 1) the candidate; 2) a senior member of department; and 3) the department chair. The candidate must provide five names prioritized by preference to the Unit Chair, who will request and obtain letters from two of the five people indicated on the list. A senior member of the department at or above the candidate's rank must provide three names prioritized by preference to the Unit Chair, who will request and obtain letters from two of the three people indicated on the list. The Department Chair must provide three names prioritized by preference to the Unit Chair, who will request and a obtain letter from one of the three people indicated on the list. External reviewers should not include anyone whose objectivity might be questioned, e.g., dissertation advisors, former professors, co-authors, etc. External reviewers from academic settings must have achieved a rank at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. External reviewers from nonacademic settings, e.g., government, industry or associations, must be in a position considered commensurate with academic rank to which the candidate aspires. External reviewers should disclose their relationship if any to the candidate and also provide a brief CV or biography.

The Unit Chair will send a packet to individuals who have agreed to serve as external reviewers. The packet should include the following: 1) letter requesting evaluation of the candidate's research/scholarship, teaching/clinical activities and service; 2) relevant Unit Promotion Criteria; 3) candidate's primary file; 4) selection of five samples of research/scholarship selected by the candidate (articles, book chapters, grant proposals, etc.); and 5) Teaching and Practice Portfolios, where applicable. The letter should not include a request that the reviewer determine if the candidate should be promoted. The purpose of the external review is to obtain an assessment of the candidate's research, teaching and service based on unit criteria. It is the responsibility of the Unit Chair to follow the university schedule in securing the letters from external reviewers, and placing the obtained letters in the candidate's primary file.

<u>Meeting and Voting Procedure</u>

Minimum Needed to Vote
The unit vote on a candidate's promotion must be made by at least five tenured faculty. If the unit does not have five eligible faculty for the vote, the unit must submit to the UCTP for approval a policy to establish a five-member committee, using faculty of eligible rank from other academic units. If the unit has at least five eligible faculty, it is the Chair's responsibility to ensure that at least five eligible faculty participate in the unit vote.

Meeting Participation
Meetings at which candidates are considered for promotion are closed to everyone except members of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the candidate's department is not represented on the Unit committee, the Unit Chair will invite the candidate's department chair. In the event the Chair cannot attend, he or she may send a representative from the department. The representative should be at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. In addition, by motion, the meeting may be opened to anyone other than the candidate the body wishes to have present. The invited department chair, or any other invited individual, will participate in the discussion of the candidate for which he or she was invited, and will be excused for any other discussion. The invited person will not vote.

Voting Procedure
Unit committee votes concerning promotion must be based on the evidence presented in the promotion file and the relevant criteria for that candidate. All votes on candidates' promotion will be conducted by secret ballot. All votes must be accompanied by a written justification of the vote. The justification must be either written on the ballot itself or written on a separate paper affixed to the ballot. Ballots need not be signed, although faculty are not prohibited from doing so. Each ballot will provide opportunity for committee members to vote in one of three ways: 1) Yes; 2) No; or 3) Abstain. Justification must accompany all ballots, regardless of vote cast. The unit chair will inform all voting committee members of the date that all votes must be submitted.

Vote and Recommendation by Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee
Votes will be counted by the Unit Chair and the College Dean. The College Associate Dean or Assistant Dean may serve in the Dean's absence. Abstention votes are not counted. The committee's vote will be considered supportive of promotion if "yes" votes comprise at least two-thirds (2/3) of all votes counted, i.e., the sum of all "yes" and "no" votes (i.e., abstentions are not included in the denominator). The committee's vote will be considered not supportive of promotion if the yes votes comprise less than two-thirds (2/3) of all votes counted, i.e., the sum of all "yes" and "no" votes.

Notification of Committee's Vote
The Unit chair will notify all candidates in writing as to whether the Unit tenure and promotion committee supported or did not support their application for promotion. The Unit Chair will also provide written notification to the Dean and all Tenure and

Promotion committee members of the committee's decision to support or not support the candidate's application. Under no circumstance should the numerical vote count be divulged to candidates or committee members.

> *Positive decision:* If the Unit Committee vote yields a positive recommendation, i.e., "yes" votes comprised at least two-thirds (2/3) of "yes" and "no" votes cast, the Unit Chair supervises the insertion of votes and justifications into the candidates file. The entire file, including primary file, secondary file, and teaching portfolio (if applicable), is hand-delivered by the Unit Chair to the candidate's Department Chair according to the timetable established in the University tenure and promotion calendar. The Department Chair will read the file in its entirety, vote "yes" or "no", and justify the vote decision with a letter. The ballot and letter will be placed in the candidate's file by the Department Chair, who will then hand-deliver the entire file to the Dean of the College. Likewise, the Dean will read the file in its entirety, vote "yes" or "no", and justify the vote decision with a letter. The ballot and letter will be placed in the candidate's file by the Dean, who will then forward the entire file to the Provost according to the timetable established in the University tenure and promotion calendar.

> *Negative Decision:* If the Unit Committee vote yields a negative recommendation, i.e., "yes" votes comprised less than at least two-thirds (2/3) of "yes" and "no" votes cast, the file will not be considered further by the Department Chair or Dean unless the candidate provides written notification of <u>intent to appeal</u> to the Unit Chair within the timetable established by the University tenure and promotion calendar. If such a letter is received by the Unit Chair within the appropriate time period, the Unit Chair will invite written comments from all faculty concerning the candidacy. Faculty letters should be sent directly to the Unit Chair who will insert them into the file. The file will then proceed as described above, moving to Department Chair, Dean, and Provost.

<u>Criteria</u>

The College of Pharmacy recognizes that non-tenured faculty activity typically falls under one of four categories, namely, research or scholarship, teaching, clinical practice activities, and service. Each of these activities is multi-faceted. Evaluation of performance will necessarily rely on various types of evidence. Valid assessment should not depend on any one type. It is more the preponderance of evidence that supports or does not support a particular rating in each of these areas. *Regarding research/scholarship, while a quantitative assessment provides one indication of productivity, the requirement for a specific number of activities can be offset by work of exceptional quality*. Regarding teaching, while student and peer assessments are important, quality teaching can co-exist with less than exceptional assessment due to class size, the elective or required nature of the course, the degree of challenge inherent in the course, and others. Regarding service, passive participation on multiple

committees is not the same as active participation and leadership on fewer. In all instances, an appropriate assessment requires that the file be considered in its entirety, with each component contributing to an overall assessment.

Criteria for ratings of excellent and good in research/scholarship, teaching, clinical practice activities, and service depend on the rank to which a person aspires.

Non-Tenure Track

It is the expectation of the College of Pharmacy that faculty in the non-tenure track participate in the four activities of research/scholarship, teaching, clinical practice activities, and service, with some exceptions based on requirements of the position. Most non-tenure track faculty provide clinical instruction to students while developing and maintaining a practice site.

Some non-tenure track faculty provide instruction while maintaining *administrative positions*. To be eligible for promotion, faculty with administrative positions must be rated as excellent in either service or teaching/clinical activities, good in the other (where applicable), with diminished expectation in research/scholarship, commensurate with percent effort allocated to this area.

Some non-tenure track faculty hold the rank *of research assistant professor or research associate professor*. To be eligible for promotion, these faculty must be rated as excellent in research/scholarship, good in teaching/clinical activities (where applicable), with diminished expectation in service, commensurate with percent effort allocated to this area. For these individuals, expectation of performance in research/scholarship would follow that of faculty in the tenure track. For all non-tenure-track faculty, ratings will take into consideration faculty rank.

Teaching Portfolio
An optional teaching portfolio includes materials and documents that form the evidence supporting the quality of one's teaching, and a reflective narrative written by the candidate to provide context for the evidence. A portfolio recognizes the complexity of teaching, emphasizes the role of the teacher in shaping the teaching experience for both teacher and student, and encourages assessment and efforts to improve teaching.

Candidates who choose to submit a teaching portfolio are free to include any elements they deem appropriate. At a minimum, the portfolio should include the following:
1. Syllabi and examinations for courses taught
2. Peer and student evaluations for courses taught
3. Evidence of the currency of one's course
4 Candidate narrative, including documentation of efforts to improve teaching
5 Student advisement and/or interaction outside class
6. Any honors or awards related to teaching

Teaching portfolios should be considered a working document that serves as both an assessment and mentoring tool. The candidate, along with the Department Chair and the Chair of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, will provide guidance and direction to the candidate in developing the portfolio.

Practice Portfolio

A Practice Portfolio includes materials and documents that form the evidence supporting the full range of activities associated with his or her clinical practice, and especially the candidate's effectiveness in that role. Developing and maintaining a practice site is a time-consuming activity that affords the clinician faculty the opportunity to participate in the clinical care of patients, and the system of care within one's clinical site. For this reason, the practice portfolio might include documentation of effectiveness at various levels, e.g., direct patient care, administration and management of the system of care, involvement with pharmacy and medicine practice residents, and research based on one's practice.

Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

To be promoted from the rank of Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate Professor, the candidate must receive an evaluation of excellent in either Research/Scholarship, Teaching, or Clinical Practice Activities and at least good in all other criteria.

Research/Scholarship

A. Good

The candidate must demonstrate consistent activity in the area of research/scholarship that contributes to one's discipline, profession or clinical practice site. Generally, the candidate's record should include the following: 1) at least 3 Category II activities or above per year, of which, at least 1.5 will be published works; and 2) at least one Category I activity every two years.

B. Excellent

The candidate must demonstrate consistent activity in the area of research/scholarship that contributes to one's discipline, profession, or clinical practice site. Generally, the candidate's record should include the following: 1) at least 3 Category II activities or above per year, of which, at least 1.5 will be published works; and 2) consistent production of Category I activities with on average at least one Category I activity per year, which must include at least one refereed publication every two years. It is expected that publications will be of high quality and in reputable journals with a substantial portion in the candidate's area of expertise.

Teaching

A. Good

The candidate must demonstrate effective teaching, evidenced by positive peer and student teaching evaluations, both quantitative and narrative assessments. Quantitative assessment via student evaluations should be either 1) at least "4.0" on a 1-5 scale; or 2) at or above the College mean. Additional activities listed under Evidence (Teaching) would support the file.

B. Excellent

The candidate must demonstrate effective teaching, evidenced by positive peer and student teaching evaluations, including both quantitative and narrative assessments. Quantitative assessment via student evaluations should correspond to "4.0" on a 1-5 scale and at or above the College mean. Teaching load should be at or above the department average. Additional activities listed under Evidence (Teaching) would support the file. A teaching portfolio is recommended though not required of non-tenure track faculty who wish to be considered for promotion based on excellence in teaching. The teaching portfolio should demonstrate currency of teaching and tangible commitment to continuous quality improvement.

Clinical Practice Activities

A. Good

Where applicable, clinical activities should be examined. The candidate should present a record of competence and effectiveness in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Evidence of competence and effectiveness should include activities listed below under "Evidence of Practice Effectiveness." Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of competence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical competence and effectiveness.

B. Excellent
The candidate should present a record of excellence in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Furthermore, the candidate should also present evidence of a state or regional reputation as a clinician. Evidence of excellence should include activities listed below under "Evidence of Practice Effectiveness." Evidence of a state or regional reputation as a clinician would come from clinical colleagues, consensus opinion of outside reviewers, and activities listed under "Evidence of Practice Effectiveness". Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of excellence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice

effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical excellence.

Service

A. Good

The candidate must demonstrate constructive participation in service activities at the college level, as well as active participation in service activities at either the university, state, national, or professional level.

B. Excellent

 The candidate must demonstrate leadership in service to the College. Most importantly, this would include demonstrated effectiveness of the administrative position for which they have been hired or appointed. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate active participation in service activities at the college level, as well as active participation in service activities at either the university, state, national, or professional level.

Promotion to Clinical Professor

To be promoted from the rank of Clinical Associate to Clinical Professor, the candidate must receive an evaluation of excellent in Research/Scholarship and at least good in all other criteria.

Research/Scholarship

A. Good
The candidate must demonstrate consistent activity in the area of research/scholarship that contributes to one's discipline, profession, or clinical practice site. The record should show growth in quantity and quality since promotion or appointment to Clinical Associate Professor. Generally, the candidate's record should exceed the criteria for promotion or appointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor.

B. Excellent

The candidate must demonstrate consistent activity in the area of research/scholarship that contributes to one's discipline, profession, or clinical practice site. The record should show growth that exceeds the criteria for excellence for promotion or appointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor. The candidate's work should be of high quality, evidenced by journal reputation, level and type of funding, and outside reviewers' comments.   The candidate's record should provide evidence of external funding for their research.

<u>Teaching</u>

A. Good
The candidate must demonstrate effective teaching, evidenced by positive peer and student teaching evaluations, both quantitative and narrative. Quantitative assessment via student evaluations should be at least "4.0" on a 1-5 scale, <u>or</u> at or above the College mean. Additional activities listed under Evidence (Teaching) would support the file, though not serve as a substitute for the activities listed above.

B. Excellent
The candidate must demonstrate outstanding teaching, evidenced by positive peer and student teaching evaluations, including both quantitative and narrative. Quantitative assessment via student evaluations should be considered above the "4.0" designation on a 1-5 scale, <u>and</u> above the College mean. Additional activities listed under Evidence (Teaching) would support the file. Teaching load should be at or above the department average. A teaching portfolio is recommended though not required of non-tenure track faculty who wish to be considered for promotion based on excellence in teaching. The teaching portfolio should demonstrate currency of teaching and tangible commitment to continuous quality improvement.

<u>Clinical Practice Activities</u>

A. Good
Where applicable, clinical activities should be examined. The candidate should present a record of competence and effectiveness in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Evidence of competence and effectiveness should include activities listed below under "Evidence of Practice Effectiveness." Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of competence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical competence and effectiveness.

B. Excellent
The candidate should present a record of excellence in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Furthermore, the candidate should also present evidence of a national reputation as a clinician.   Evidence of excellence should include activities listed below under "Evidence of Practice Effectiveness." Evidence of a national reputation as a clinician would come from clinical colleagues, consensus opinion of outside reviewers, and activities listed under "Evidence of Practice Effectiveness." Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of excellence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical excellence.

Service

A. Good
The candidate should demonstrate leadership in the service provided to the College and to either the state, University, national or professional organizations. This may take many forms, including chairmanship of College committees, and positions of influence and responsibility at the university, state, national, or professional level related to the service provided

B. Excellent
Only candidates who are non-tenure track faculty with either administrative or service unit responsibilities are required to achieve excellence in service. To be rated as excellent, candidates must demonstrate the following: 1) effectiveness in the functioning of the administrative or service unit for which they are responsible, 2) clear evidence of growth in either quality of quantity of the administrative or service unit, and 3) recognition at a state or national level. This may take the form of awards, citations, state or national office, or presentations/publications that focus on the service provided.

Definition of Terms

Consistent: Refers to the description of one's research and/or scholarship. A record of research that shows some activity each year would be considered consistent. A record of research that shows occasional gaps over time would still be considered consistent, given inevitable variability caused by activities with extended timeframes. A record of research that shows large gaps in which no or little activity is demonstrated, followed by flourishes of activity surrounding promotion decision times, would be considered "not consistent".

Important: Refers to a description of one's research and/or scholarship. Research and/or scholarship that addresses issues discussed and debated in the literature would be considered important. Importance can also be inferred in a number of ways, e.g., the quality of journals that publish one's work, acquisition of external funding to support one's work, invitation to present one's work to outside groups, external reviewers describe it as important, etc. In the absence of this supportive evidence, the candidate is encouraged to use the candidate's narrative section in the promotion file to make the case for the importance of one's work.

Substantial: Refers to a description of one's research and/or scholarship. Work can be assessed as substantial in a number of ways, e.g., it is found in the leading journals in the discipline or field, it is supported by multiple publications on the same topic, the author is considered a major contributor in the field of research by virtue of his or her work, the works are cited frequently, outside reviewer describe it as substantial, etc. Generally, several of the criteria for a national reputation could be used to support one's work being substantial.

Coherent: Refers to a description of one's research program. Coherence can be demonstrated a variety of ways, e.g., consistency of topic examined, application of similar methods across difference areas, logical growth and direction of research, etc. Coherence of research program should be evident in the file, or should be explicitly addressed by the candidate in the narrative statement.

Quality improvement: Refers to a description of one's teaching, reported in the teaching portfolio. Evidence of efforts at quality improvement could include participation in teaching seminars, tangible evidence of efforts to address concerns about teaching expressed in previous years' student or peer teaching evaluations, narrative comments in student or peer teaching evaluations concerning teaching improvement, improvement in peer or student teaching evaluations.

Currency of teaching: Refers to a description of one's teaching. Course syllabi, found in the teaching portfolio, should include evidence that recent developments in one's field have been incorporated.

Clinical Excellence: Refers to a description of one's clinical activities. Documentation of excellence would be found in the candidate's practice portfolio, and include some, but not all activities listed under Practice Effectiveness. Excellence is distinguished from competence and effectiveness by evidence of growth in the quantity or quality of clinical service provided and documented leadership within the clinical site.

National reputation: Examples of evidence to support a national reputation are provided below. The list should not be considered exhaustive. There is no expectation that candidates will show activity in all areas.

    a. Quality of letters from external reviewers
    b. Membership on grant review panels
    c. Participation on abstract review panels for professional meetings
    d. Manuscript reviewer for journals
    e. Membership on journal editorial advisory board
    f. Membership on organizational advisory board
    g. Election to national office within professional organization
    h. Chairing paper or panel discussion sessions at national meetings
    i. Invited testimony at governmental, scientific, or legal proceedings
    j. Invited presentations at national meetings
    k. Work listed in national or international compendium
    l. Awards given by national organizations or associations
    m. Election as Fellow in professional organizations
    n. Editorship of scientific or professional journal
    o. National certifications
    p. Appointment as visiting professor at another university
    q. Appointment as visiting scientist at a research-based organization
    r. Reviewer for universities' promotion files

Teaching Portfolio: The teaching portfolio is a text developed by the candidate intended to document the full range of activities related to the candidate's teaching. It should include at least three components: 1) materials and processes that the candidate produces, e.g., course syllabi, examinations, course reading lists and packets, student mentoring and advisement, seminars attended or given 2) materials that others produce that assist in evaluation, e.g., peer and student evaluations, honors and recognitions, letters or other narratives, evidence of student successes, and 3) reflective statements concerning goals, assumptions, and methods. The reflective statement should also include documentation of efforts by the candidate to continually reevaluate the courses taught, maintaining currency in both content and method, e.g., attendance or participation in teaching seminars, publication concerning teaching, updating course material.

The teaching portfolio provides the opportunity for teaching effectiveness to be assessed from multiple perspectives. Reliance on any one type of evaluation can produce a biased or slanted assessment of the candidate's effectiveness. For example, the candidate who requires students to be active learners in class may receive poor evaluations from students who might view this approach as disorganized. However, faculty have the opportunity, within the reflective statement, to explain this approach and give it appropriate context. In effect, the teaching portfolio allows a fuller and richer assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Practice Portfolio: The Practice Portfolio is a text developed by the candidate intended to document the full range of activities associated with his or her clinical practice, and especially the candidate's effectiveness in that role. Developing and maintaining a practice site is a time-consuming activity that affords the clinician faculty the opportunity to participate in the clinical care of patients, and the system of care within one's clinical site. For this reason, the practice portfolio might include documentation of effectiveness at various levels, e.g., direct patient care, administration and management of the system of care, involvement with pharmacy and medicine practice residents, and research based on one's practice.

Evidence of Research and/or Scholarship

This section describes the evidence presented in the promotion file to be used in assessing the candidate's research and/or scholarship. The following categorization of research and/or scholarship serves several purposes. First, it ranks activities in order of importance. Second, it identifies the level of activity considered appropriate for candidates given their rank and primary responsibility. Third, it provides a framework to evaluate the importance and relative contribution of research and scholarly activities undertaken by the candidate but not listed explicitly below.

Category 1

Published Works
Articles in refereed journals.
Refereed scholarly books
Refereed book chapters
Patents
Editor of book

Grants and Contracts
Acquisition of research grant from sources outside the University or College
Acquisition of competitive training or development grant or contract from sources outside the University or College

Presentations
Presentation of competitively selected research at national or international meeting
Invited research presentations at national or international meetings
Invited research seminars at other institutions, industry, or government

Category 2

Published Works
Publication of article in non-refereed publication
Written reviews of books or articles
Publication of clinical guidelines or critical pathways within one's practice site
Publication of one's work in an in-house publication.

Grants and Contract
Successful completion of contract from sources outside the College or University

Acquisition of research grant from within the University or College

Presentations
Presentation of competitively selected research at state or local meetings
Invited presentation at local or regional meeting
Presentation of research and/or clinical work within one's institution
Seminars at state or local meetings

Other Scholarship
Submission of grant proposals
Manuscripts submitted
Selection as consultant to organizations related to one's discipline
Written reviews of manuscripts or proposals

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Examples of evidence to support a teaching effectiveness are provided below. The list should not be considered exhaustive. There is no expectation that candidates will show activity in all areas.

a. Revision and updating of course material
b. Incorporation of technology to facilitate learning
c. Participation in teaching seminars
d. Leadership within the faculty for curricular development and revision
e. Collaboration with other departments/colleges regarding content or methodology
f. Invitation as guest lecturer outside the College of Pharmacy
g. Peer evaluation by faculty
h. Student evaluation, both numeric and narrative
i. Letters from current and former students attesting to the teacher's effectiveness and course or clerkship value
j. Performance of students on sections of standardized tests
k. Membership on accrediting bodies and commissions related to teaching
l. Participation on panels or review boards related to teaching
m. Presentation, articles, grants or books related to teaching
n. Participation in special topics electives
o. Selection of student work for presentation or publication
p. Honors or recognition related to teaching

Evidence of Practice Effectiveness

Examples of evidence to support practice effectiveness are provided below. The list should not be considered exhaustive. There is no expectation that the candidate will show activity in all areas.

a. Numeric or narrative assessment of care provided by patients
b. Numeric of narrative assessment by administrators or professional colleagues
c. Written reports related to practice authored or co-authored by the candidate (e.g. DUR reports, P&T Monographs, DUE reports)
d. Adoption of pharmacist-developed clinical protocols
e. Development and maintenance of clinical contracts
f. Participation on practice site committees
g. Assuming greater responsibility for patient care or system administration
h. Objective assessment of patient or system well-being that can be attributed to the candidate's practice, e.g., adverse event avoidance, reduced length of stay, reduced cost of operation, patient medication adherence, pharmacy parameters with system report cards, etc.
i. Dissemination and adoption of practice model beyond one's department or institution
j. Requests for collaboration by other clinicians
k. Presentations to colleagues within one's practice site
l. Presentation or publication of work performed at one's practice site
m. Recognition or award for practice excellence
n. Requests for professional consultation at our outside practice site
o. Selection as expert witness in legal matters
p. Grants to support or expand one's clinical practice or conduct research in the practice
q. Election to professional offices or boards related to clinical practice