

Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences

College of Pharmacy

Promotion, Tenure, and Review Guidelines

Preamble

The vision of the Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences department is to be internationally-recognized scholars demonstrating excellence in research and education in our respective disciplines. This vision will be achieved through student-centric instruction and research in a basic and translational science. Our research spans the breadth of the foundational sciences in pharmacy and includes pharmacology, physiology, pharmaceuticals, drug metabolism, pharmacokinetics, medicinal chemistry, biochemistry, and drug discovery. The diverse nature of the faculty, their research projects, and teaching expertise, are the greatest assets of the department. As such, this document is structured to accommodate the breath of the scholarship and teaching displayed by the faculty.

PTU Specific Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences (the PTU) will carefully adhere to the University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University's Guidelines. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this document and the University Guidelines. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the University's Guidelines will supersede this document.

All faculty considered for promotion and/or tenure in the Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences will demonstrate effective teaching of professional, graduate, and/or undergraduate students, produce significant scholarly accomplishments in research, and contribute to the betterment of the Department, College, University, Professions, and society through dedicated service activities as outlined in the University Guidelines and further extended in the PTU discipline-specific criteria that follow.

To fulfill the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, an Assistant Professor must satisfy the guidelines defined by the University that the candidate shows clear and

convincing evidence for an emerging stature as a regional and national authority. Based on the EFT distribution and assigned duties, an Assistant Professor will demonstrate effective teaching, develop an independent scholarly program or unique expertise supported by competitive extramural funding, and contribute to service duties at the Department, College, University and/or professional level as extended in the PTU discipline-specific criteria below.

To fulfill the criteria for promotion to Professor, an Associate Professor must satisfy the guidelines defined by the University that the candidate show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in their work and demonstrate an established national or international recognition and the likelihood of maintaining this. Based on the EFT distribution and assigned duties, the Associate Professor will have demonstrated effective teaching, maintained an independent scholarly program or unique expertise supported by competitive extramural funding, and contribute to service duties at the Department, College, University and/or professional level as extended in the PTU discipline-specific criteria below.

To attain tenure, the candidate must have a record of exemplary performance in their responsibilities, be able to meet continuing and long range needs of the University, and demonstrate the likeliness that the candidate will continue to be an active and productive scholar over the long period time that tenure supposes as defined in the University Guidelines.

The Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences discipline-specific criteria for promotion and tenure are:

A. Contributions To Teaching And Other Instructional Activities

Effectiveness in teaching will be assessed by the following measures. It is not necessary that faculty complete or excel in all measures. Deficiencies in one measure may be compensated by excellence in other categories.

1. Student evaluations that include quantitative assessment questionnaires and representative written student comments.
2. Peer-review that documents teaching effectiveness.
3. Development of new courses, in particular where integration of scientific research and discoveries are incorporated into the teaching and/or new pedagogical methods are introduced.

4. Mentoring professional (Pharm.D.), graduate (Ph.D.) and undergraduate students (B.S.). This includes membership on student committees and support of student's research projects. Documents can include testimonials from former students.
5. Student performance and accomplishments. Examples of this include internal and external awards to mentored students and their success in obtaining positions in desired career-tracks.
6. Development of instructional grants.
7. Scholarship in teaching as evidenced by publications.

B. Contributions to Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activities.

1. The candidate is expected to establish a body of scholarly work or scholarship associated with an area of expertise carried out at UGA or completed at a prior institution when given credit towards promotion or tenure at UGA, science and/or teaching-related, that is documented in peer-reviewed publications or other publically available resources. In collaborative work, the candidate's contributions must be clearly defined, and the works must cumulatively demonstrate an expertise that spans multiple scholarly works. Publications of original work describing novel findings, methods or technologies that advance the field *as senior or corresponding author* are important. The candidate must be the senior or corresponding author on a significant number of the publications published. Over the evaluation time period, the mix of publications must include high quality publications. Indicators of high quality publications may include:
 - publication in one of the top journals in the candidate's discipline (this may be based on Impact Factor from ISI or other similar indicators);
 - high citation numbers of the candidate's publication relative to others in the candidates discipline and considering the publication age;
 - publication in journals identified as having high quality by the external reviewers.
2. Development (Assistant Professor to Associate) and continuation (Associate Professor to Professor) of an independent or collaborative research program funded by external organizations that entail competitive review processes. Appropriate external organizations include, but are not limited to: National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and other national or federal agencies (FDA, EPA, DoD, and DoE), and professional associations (like American Heart Association, Alzheimer's Foundation

and American Cancer Society). Local funds from the Department, College or University are encouraged to be sought, but are not considered for advancement. In collaborative programs, the individual's contributions must be clearly defined and must be based on the candidate's expertise or intellectual contributions.

By the time of review for promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member is expected to have been the recipient of at least one peer-reviewed, multi-year external research award as a Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI/co-investigator if the candidate makes a significant contribution to the grant. The candidate is expected to demonstrate that they can obtain sufficient funding from all external sources to support and maintain their research program at a level that is nationally recognized. For promotion to Professor, the funding level must be adequate to support and maintain the ongoing research program and maintain the national and international reputation into the future. Evidence of an ability to sustain funding over the long term must be demonstrated for promotion to either level.

3. Invited scholarly presentations at other institutions and symposia or chairing of scholarly sessions at regional, national or international meetings. Local talks will have significantly lower weights in consideration than national and international meetings. For promotion to Associate Professor, invited seminars or meeting presentations on the candidate's research are expected, some of which must be national or international in scope. For promotion to Full Professor, adequate numbers of seminars or meeting presentations are expected that demonstrate that a national and international reputation has been achieved.

Additional measures of scholarship may include:

4. Other evidence of research accomplishments or productivity (technology transfer, patents). Pending patent applications are considered positively, but will have significantly lower weights in consideration for advancement than issued patents. Issued patents will be considered equivalent to high quality journal publications.
5. Publication of book chapters and books in the candidate's discipline.
6. Membership on editorial boards of society journals in the candidate's area of expertise or discipline. Editorial contributions (*i.e.* Associate or Editor) of a journal that is well-respected in the candidate's discipline are highly regarded.

7. Development or continuation of externally-funded training programs.
8. Prestigious national or international awards or honors for research, innovations or scholarly contributions.
9. Expert review of scholarly manuscripts.

Criteria used to establish national/international stature:

Criteria 1 through 3 above are most critical for demonstrating that a candidate is suitable for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor as they establish that recognition is emerging at the regional and national levels (Associate) or achieved at an international level (Professor). High quality articles and scholarly presentations establish and define the reputation of candidates. Funding is critical to support the long-term research programs that are necessary for maintaining the productivity associated with a national and/or international standing. Comments within the letters of reference from external authorities also play a vital role in defining the candidate's reputation for consideration of promotion and tenure.

C. Contributions to Service.

All faculty are expected to serve as active, effective, and collegial members on the committees and taskforces that are part of the day-to-day operation of the Department, College of Pharmacy, and the University- whether or not stated explicitly in their job description or offer letter. Additional contributions to service may include:

1. Leadership positions in committees and professional organizations. For promotion to Professor, the candidate should have chaired a committee or taskforce within the University. Assistant Professors are not expected to chair committees, but doing so is considered positively toward promotion.
2. Leadership positions in the candidate's discipline.
3. Service on professional, society, and governmental committees.
4. Service on student committees.
5. Community service related to the profession.

PTU Specific Criteria for Third-Year Review of Tenure-track Faculty

In all matters related to the third-year review, the Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences will carefully adhere to the University of Georgia Guidelines for the third-year review process. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to clarify, supplement and/or extend the University's Guidelines.

In the spring of the third year of appointment, with a deadline of April 15, each Assistant Professor will submit a dossier following University guidelines (sections 4 and 5 in Appendix C, 25 page limit). The dossier will detail the candidate's achievements and performance in their responsibilities. The Department Head or other senior faculty mentor will advise the candidate on developing the dossier and help ensure its accuracy. In addition to the documents specified by the University guidelines, the committee, at its discretion, may ask the candidate for additional documentation. As part of the dossier, the following items are expected to be appended to the dossier as appendices and excluded from the page limit:

1. Courses and lectures taught, including summaries of teaching evaluations.
2. Representative copies of scholarship, such as but not exclusively, published research or pedagogy papers, in press or submitted.
3. Summary of grant applications submitted and funding status.
4. Representative instructional materials, such as course syllabi.

The Department Head, in consultation with the Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences executive committee and the candidate, will appoint a committee of at least three tenured PTU faculty to review the faculty member's dossier and performance using the University criteria as well as the PTU discipline-specific criteria as applied to promotion and tenure. The committee will review all aspects of the candidate's performance as documented in the dossier and then present their evaluations to the rest of the eligible faculty including the Department Head at the third year review meeting.

The PTU review of the candidate, to be completed by May 15, will be substantive and formative, with the goal of providing the faculty member with critical feedback about the candidate's progress. Presentation of this review will be followed by a general discussion by the tenured faculty.

The reviewing faculty will then vote "Yes" or "No" on the following question:

"[Candidate's Name] has made sufficient progress toward promotion and/or tenure."

The committee will then forward its report containing the recommendations and the vote to the Department Head. The Department Head will summarize the results of the vote, the discussion, and the findings of the third year review committee in a letter to the faculty member being reviewed. The Department Head will consult members of the review committee to ensure that the text of the letter accurately reflects their evaluations and the general discussion. The letter is then delivered to the person being reviewed within 10 working days and its contents discussed with the Department Head.

The faculty member being reviewed may then write a response letter, addressed to the Department Head, within 30 days. Both the third-year review letter from the Department Head, and the response letter, will be sent to the Dean of the College of Pharmacy, and a copy maintained in the Department's faculty personnel files. These letters will be included in the dossier used for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure when that document is developed.

Criteria for third year review:

The candidate must show strong evidence that they are on track for fulfilling the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. As such, by the time of the third-year review, an Assistant Professor must demonstrate that there is a strong likelihood that the expectations for promotion as outlined in the University Guidelines and the discipline-specific criteria for the PTU will be achieved.

Annual Performance Evaluations of Faculty

Annual performance reviews will be conducted according to the University Guidelines and will include the Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences discipline-specific criteria for promotion and tenure. In the written annual evaluation, the Department Head will provide formative feedback to faculty below the rank of professor that contains guidance as to what the faculty member must emphasize in teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank and/or tenure.

Amendments and Approval Process

New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, Dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

This document and its discipline-specific criteria was

- approved by the faculty within the Department of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Science on May 11, 2015
- approved by the Dean of College of Pharmacy on May 11, 2015 and
- approved by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, June 11, 2015