I. INTRODUCTION

A. The Faculty within the College of Pharmacy (COP) are evaluated for Tenure and/or Promotion at three levels within the College: the College Promotion and Tenure committee; their Departmental Chair; and the Dean of the College. The evaluation follows the policies defined within the ISU Faculty Staff Handbook and the College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. The Purpose of this document is to describe the process by which these policies are implemented. An overview of the process can be found in Appendix F.

B. The College Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) functions as the College Promotion and Tenure committee in conjunction with the College of Pharmacy Constitution and Bylaws.

1. The FAC, in carrying out its responsibilities, provides for application of the College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure as outlined in this process document.

1. To build faculty trust and confidence that tenure and promotion recommendations originating from the FAC will be fairly and equitably applied, the FAC is committed to documenting the evaluation process it uses for tenure and promotion recommendations. All FAC processes and procedures are in accordance with the COP Bylaws and the ISU Faculty/Staff Handbook, or, where these documents are silent, have been approved by a majority vote of the FAC. The FAC processes and procedures will be communicated to the COP faculty via written document and will remain in effect until a revised policy and procedures document is distributed to the Faculty.

C. The Process Overview:

1. A Cover Letter submitted by the candidate to their Departmental Chair, the Dean and the FAC initiates the process. This cover letter should clearly indicate what the candidate is applying for (promotion to what rank, tenure, early tenure, etc.) and briefly document why they are ready for tenure and/or promotion. This letter must include concise narratives serving as a self-evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments in the areas of instruction, scholarship, service, clinical practice when appropriate, and any other areas of merit. The FAC will consider any evidence for career growth in rank. Note that at the deadline for the letter of intent, the candidate should also have available their updated Curriculum Vitae, summary table of professional activities, summary of teaching evaluations and list of suggested reviewers (see ISU College of Pharmacy Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure VIII.A.1-5)

2. The candidate then prepares a 3 binder portfolio according to the Guidelines and submits it to their Departmental Chair (electronic and hard copy) and the FAC (electronic) which begins two independent phases of review and recommendation.
3. The Department Chair supplements the portfolio (putting items in the appropriate binder as described in the Guidelines) with required materials and uses the completed portfolio to generate a letter of recommendation submitted to the Dean of the College.

4. The FAC reviews the candidate’s initial portfolio for completeness (may request candidate provide additional material within 3 weeks) and also initiates four additional processes: collegiality vote by College faculty, Departmental faculty review, peer evaluation of instruction, and student evaluations.

5. The FAC uses the collegiality vote threshold, departmental review votes, peer evaluation of instruction reports, student evaluation reports and the completed portfolio forwarded by the Departmental Chair (excluding the Chair’s recommendation letter), and the FAC votes to generate a recommendation report which is submitted to the Dean of the College.

6. The Dean of the College utilizes the candidate’s completed portfolio and the recommendation letters from the Dept. Chair and FAC to evaluate the candidate and submits a letter of recommendation to the Associate Academic Vice President and Executive Dean of the Division of Health Sciences who then forwards a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

II. Portfolio Requirements and Process

A. Candidate

1. A candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure must submit, to their Department Chair and FAC, by the dates specified by the Dean, the following: The Cover Letter to the appropriate department chair, with a copy to the dean (usually due mid-September). Included with this letter should be a list of up to four potential outside reviewers.

2. A candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure must submit, by the dates specified by the Dean, one printed and one electronic copy of the candidate’s portfolio materials (usually due mid-October) to the Chair and forward the electronic copy to the FAC. 3- binder Portfolio materials submitted by the candidate should include the following:

   a. Completed ISU Tenure and/or Promotion Application Form: The candidate must complete the form and supply the required documents. Note that the requirements include a summary of teaching evaluations.

   b. Cover Letter: The candidate should include a letter briefly documenting why they are ready for tenure and/or promotion. This letter must include concise narratives serving as a self-evaluation of the candidate’s accomplishments in the areas of instruction, research, service, clinical practice when appropriate, and any other areas of merit. A list of at least 4 potential external reviewers must also be provided.

   c. Curriculum Vita: This should be a current and complete academic CV as described in the Guidelines and the ISU Application.
d. Summary Table of Professional Activities: The candidate should provide a summary table of their activities in instruction, scholarship and research, clinical practice if applicable, and professional service. A suggested template/format for the summary table is in the Appendix B of the Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure posted on the College of Pharmacy web site.

e. Publications: The candidates should provide copies of up to five publications that they consider their most significant work.

3. Documentation of Instruction, Scholarship, Pharmacy Practice and Service: It is the responsibility of the candidate to maintain adequate documentation to substantiate the accomplishments claimed in the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure portfolio.

4. The candidate has the right to review all materials submitted by his/her Department to his/her portfolio and may provide an addendum letter if so warranted (to comment on the materials and/or provide additional materials) which will be included in binder #1.

5. The hard copy materials must be provided in 3 binders where binder #1 contains items 2a-d, binder #2 contains items 3 (related to instruction and service), and binder #3 contains items 2.e and 3 (related to scholarship and clinical practice) as described in the ISU Tenure and/or Promotions Application Form and Policy.

6. A copy of the FAC recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate to allow the candidate the opportunity to provide a rebuttal to the FAC recommendations. Such rebuttal must be provided to the Dean in writing within five working days. These documents will be included in binder #1 of the portfolio.

NOTE:
As the candidates portfolio will continue to the Division and University level reviews it must be in the format and meet the requirements specified by those entities.

Candidate Submission of Additional Material: any material submitted by a candidate after the submission date will be date-stamped and accumulated in the appropriate binder of the portfolio.

B. Department Chair
1. Teaching (Instruction) Evaluations: The candidate’s department will supply from its files the teaching evaluations for all courses. The FAC is not concerned with receiving copies of all teaching evaluations, but rather seeing evaluations from the same course over time if possible. Priority should be given to required courses for professional students and graduate courses if applicable. These documents will be included in binder #2 of the portfolio.
2. **Annual Reviews**: The Department will provide all copies of the candidate’s annual performance reviews to the FAC. These documents will be included in binder #1 of the portfolio.

3. **Third-Year Review**: The Department will provide the FAC with a copy of the Third-Year Performance Review if available. The FAC Guidelines requires that all tenure-track, research, and clinical faculty be reviewed in the third year of appointment by a department peer review committee. A copy of this committee’s written report should be included in the candidate’s Promotion/Tenure portfolio. In addition, the candidate should include a description of the steps taken to address any deficiencies identified in the committee’s report. This document will be included in binder #1 of the portfolio.

4. **External Review Letters**: The Department will provide the FAC with approximately four external review letters solicited from reviewers chosen by the Chair and the Candidate (a minimum of 2 from the candidate’s list of recommended reviewers). A copy of all written communications to and from outside reviewers will be added to the candidate’s portfolio and will be included as a part of the Committee’s evaluation of each candidate. Additional information may be requested by the FAC if the letters solicited are ambiguous and/or provide conflicting recommendations. These documents will be included in binder #1 of the portfolio.

5. **Departmental Workload Policy**: The department will provide the FAC with a copy of the Departmental Workload Policy. This document will be included in binder #1 of the portfolio.

6. **Candidate’s Job Description and/or Job Category**: The department will provide the FAC with a copy of the candidate’s job description and job category that includes an indication of their workload distribution over the areas of instruction, service, scholarly activities and/or clinical practice. This document will be included in binder #1 of the portfolio.

7. Responsibility for providing these materials to the FAC by the published deadline on the College and University calendar will reside with the Department Chair.

C. FAC / P&T voting committee (FAC members plus Candidates Advocate/Representative)

1. Every member of the FAC Committee must review all materials submitted in a candidate’s tenure/promotion portfolio as stipulated in this process review document.

2. The FAC will meet initially to do a pre-review of applications. Requests for additional material, if they occur, will come from this meeting. The candidate will have approximately 3 weeks to provide the FAC with the material prior to the meeting where tenure and/or promotion recommendations are finalized. The FAC may request further documentation of information presented in any of the submitted material described in section II.A. Such requests may include but are not limited to: course syllabi, course objectives, samples of handouts and examinations, written evidence of submission/funding of grant proposals and contracts, and programs indicating presentations at professional
meetings. The candidate will be expected to possess documentation for any activities cited for tenure and/or promotion review; however, the candidate is advised not to formally assemble any of this material unless requested for clarification.

3. FAC Committee members will access the portfolio online. Any review of the candidate’s hard copy portfolio will be undertaken within the Dean’s Office suite. To facilitate online review through password-protected access (for Departmental Faculty review and/or FAC committee members), it is requested that as much of the portfolio that is feasible be submitted electronically to the FAC Chair and any non-electronic materials will be scanned.

4. Input from the Department Chairperson: The FAC Committee views its recommendation on a candidate’s tenure and/or promotion as separate from the Department Chairperson’s and, therefore, will not consider the Chairperson’s recommendation in making the Committee’s decisions.

III. FAC Review Material Collection Process

A. Portfolio:
   As described in section II, the candidate submits an electronic copy of the 3-binder portfolio to the FAC at the same time it is submitted to the Departmental Chair. The FAC will review this material and if additional material is needed to clarify or complete the portfolio the FAC will request the material be provided within 3 weeks. The Departmental Chair submits the hard copy portfolio with the additional material, described in section II.B. to the FAC by the first week of December.

B. Collegiality:
   1. Peer assessment of collegiality is an important element of the review process. The FAC will solicit input from faculty regarding the candidate’s professionalism, collegiality or other factors that faculty believe the FAC should consider regarding the candidate’s suitability for promotion and/or tenure.
   2. The FAC secretary will distribute ballots to all College faculty with FTE faculty appointments greater than 0.25 FTE. The ballots will request that faculty communicate their perception of the collegiality of the candidate and the candidate’s suitability for tenure and/or promotion. Each voting faculty member may define collegiality as they deem appropriate, but faculty questioning a candidate’s collegiality or suitability for tenure and/or promotion must provide specific examples documenting any perceived lack. Ballots will be returned to the FAC secretary, who will maintain them in a file for committee review at the time the FAC meets to evaluate the candidate.

C. Peer Evaluation of Instruction: In evaluating a candidate’s teaching for purposes of tenure and/or promotion, the FAC committee will appoint a subcommittee composed of a minimum of two faculty members of FAC, one from each department if possible.
   1. Candidates should be aware that the sub-committee's direct observational time is limited. It is incumbent on the candidate to document in their portfolio the dates available for
evaluation of their didactic and APPE (Advance Pharmacy Practice Experience) during the Fall semester in which they apply. Therefore, the candidate will be asked to supply a list of dates they have students.

During the sub-committee's visit, candidates with clinical APPE (Advance Pharmacy Practice Experience) sites should make every attempt to demonstrate as many different teaching exercises as possible without causing undo disruption to the practice site. Peer evaluation of teaching should be based on review of live student-teacher interactions. Experience demonstrates that review of videotaped lectures does not provide an accurate evaluation of teaching. Only in extreme circumstances, should teaching be evaluated by reviewing videotaped lectures.

The teaching observation will be used to specifically evaluate communication skills, organization (e.g., is there appropriate use of classroom time?, are lecture objectives clear? and content (e.g., the knowledge/information imparted by the teaching). In addition, faculty will be evaluated for their ability to model professionalism, stimulate critical thinking in their students and in the case of Pharmacy Practice faculty, motivate students to achieve a higher level of pharmaceutical care. (See Appendix A-1 and Appendix A-2)

2. The candidate may be requested to supply the faculty subcommittee with the course syllabi, and examples of grading instruments and educational materials used in teaching, including those used in graduate student mentoring. The subcommittee will use the supplied material to evaluate the quality, utility and appropriateness of the grading instruments, educational materials (handouts), the course management as exemplified by the course syllabi, and the extent to which course materials & objectives are consistent with the overall goals of the curriculum.

3. The faculty subcommittee report to the FAC Committee will include:
   a) Observations on candidate’s classroom teaching: communication skills, organization and content;
   b) Observations on candidate’s clinical teaching during the Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience;
   b) An assessment of the candidate’s ability to model professionalism, stimulate critical thinking in their students, and in the case of clinical practice faculty, motivate students to achieve a higher level of pharmaceutical care;
   c) Assessment of the quality, utility and appropriateness of course syllabi, grading instruments and educational materials used in teaching;
   d) Evaluation of course management (where appropriate); and
   e) A determination of the extent to which course materials and objectives are consistent with the overall goals of the curriculum.

D. Departmental Faculty Review
1. Departmental level peer review is a valuable element of the review process. The FAC will solicit input from the candidate’s departmental faculty regarding the candidate's qualification per teaching, scholarly activity, clinical practice and service, as appropriate for each candidate. This review shall take place prior to the formal FAC
P&T Evaluation Meeting. A FAC member of the candidate’s department will schedule the review session. Each department faculty member must review the candidate’s portfolio prior to the meeting. The portfolio will be available online and password protected to view the following documents: cover letter, CV, summary table, publications and student evaluations, departmental workload policy and job description/category.

2. The department faculty members, excluding the candidate and Chair, will meet to discuss the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure per the guidelines. Department FAC members, and the candidate’s advocate are to attend the review meeting but not submit ballot(s).

3. There will be a confidential ballot(s) following the department-level review of the candidate’s application for promotion and/or tenure. The FAC secretary will distribute ballots (Appendix D and/or E of the Process document) to all departmental faculty with FTE faculty appointments greater than 0.25, excluding the candidate, advocate, Chair, and FAC members. The ballot(s) will ask each faculty member to rank the candidate per the criteria outlined in the evaluation instrument.

4. Ballots will be returned to the FAC secretary within 7 days after the departmental-level review meeting. The secretary will maintain the unopened ballots for FAC review at the time the committee meets to conduct the College-level promotion and/or tenure review of the candidate.

E. Student Evaluation of Instruction: The FAC will instruct the student subcommittee about the importance of tenure policy & procedure, and will explain to students, their roles and responsibilities.

1. The student subcommittee is charged with determining from other students, both current and past, who have been taught by the candidate, a consensus view regarding the candidate’s ability to: (See Appendices B and C)
   a. Effectively interact with students. For example, by asking the following questions.
      i) Does the instructor clearly define expectations and rules?
      ii) Does the instructor encourage student participation and interest?
   
   b. Provide intellectual stimulation. For example, by asking the following questions.
      i) Does the instructor demonstrate enthusiasm for subject material and display a command of the subject material?
      ii) Does the instructor use effective examples to clarify abstract or difficult ideas?
      iii) Does the instructor recognize when students do and do not have the necessary background to understand the lecture material?
   
   c) Accomplish the outlined course objectives. For example, by asking the following question: From a student perspective, is material arranged and presented in a systematic and organized fashion
d) Maintain continuity during teaching. For example, by asking the following questions:
   i) Does the instructor provide and maintain a framework within which the presented information fits?
   ii) Is the relationship of material within and between lectures clear?
   iii) Is the relationship between lectures and course objectives clear?

2. FAC/P&T Committee Student representation

   a. The committee evaluating each candidate will contain two representatives; in a given academic year, the same students will sit on the committees of all candidates requesting promotion and/or tenure.

   b. The FAC will instruct students about the importance of tenure policy & procedure, and will explain to students, their roles and responsibilities.

   c. Student representatives are expected to discuss the student body evaluation of each candidate’s teaching and teaching-related activities among themselves before presenting their report to the P&T committee. On advice of the University Attorney, this solicitation of student views does not fall under the purview of the University Human Subjects Review Committee.

   e. Students will present their report of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at the beginning of the FAC/P&T Committee meeting for each candidate. One student may write the report on a given candidate, but all representatives must concur on the substance of the report, which must reflect the view of the student body on each candidate’s strengths and weaknesses related to teaching. Students will then be excused from the remainder of the review process.

3. The student subcommittees will submit a written report of their findings to the FAC committee. The report must identify what data were used and how they were collected. The student report should include numbers of students interviewed in didactic, APPE and graduate categories and alumni. This report will be added to the Candidate’s portfolio. The FAC committee will incorporate key elements of the subcommittee report in the final recommendation, and will also provide an overview summary of both the candidate’s teaching quality and quantity and a consensus rating of overall teaching activities based on both quality and quantity factors. Teaching quantity will be assessed relative to total workload.

1. F. In the case the FAC facilitates a candidate’s 3rd Year Review or Five-Year Periodic Performance Review (see the COP P & T Guidelines for details), the Performance Review ballots may be used for peer evaluation. Faculty responding to a Five-Year Periodic Performance Review shall have up to 10 business days to respond to any College of Pharmacy level review letter. All ballots will be maintained in a confidential file for a period of 1 year from when they are opened, and then destroyed. Except where a committee recommendation is subject to legal challenge, ballots may only be
reviewed by faculty members of the specific Review Committee. The document communicating the FAC committee recommendation on tenure and/or promotion will serve as record of the departmental recommendations.

IV  FAC Evaluation Process

A. Qualifications:
   Candidate qualifications for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated in accordance with the ISU Faculty Staff Handbook and the COP College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure. In addition, the candidates job description (tenure/non-tenure, percentage effort/area) and departmental workload policy will be used to determine the weighting for evaluating a candidate in any given area (for example if the job description includes no service requirement then the candidate will not be evaluated/scored in that area).

B. Collegiality
   2. Ballots will be opened when the FAC meets to conduct the College-level tenure and/or promotion review of the candidate. Only signed ballots will be reviewed. All ballots will be maintained in a confidential file for a period of 1 year, and then destroyed. Except where a committee recommendation is subject to legal challenge, ballots may only be reviewed by faculty members of the specific FAC committee. With the exception of The document communicating the FAC committee recommendation on tenure and/or promotion will serve as record of the faculty vote on collegiality will be maintained.

   3. Collegiality will be evaluated as a threshold condition. Candidates failing to pass the threshold will not be considered for tenure or promotion. However, the decision that a candidate fails the test of collegiality will only be made in the face of clear and compelling written evidence substantiated by specific examples, that a significant number of the faculty find that the candidate fails the test of collegiality. Candidates that pass the test of collegiality must demonstrate appropriate quality and quantity of teaching, scholarly activity, service and, where appropriate, pharmaceutical care, in order to receive a Committee recommendation for tenure and/or promotion.

C. Instruction
   1. Teaching quantity will be assessed relative to total workload.
   2. Students will present their report of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at the beginning of the P&T Committee meeting for each candidate. Students will then be excused from the remainder of the review process
   3. A score of two or higher requires that the candidate be evaluated as competent in teaching by both the faculty and student subcommittees (see Evaluative Instrument) and the portfolio contents. Determination of a candidate’s specific score in this area is not solely dependent on evidence of effort, but rather on both the quantity and quality of evidence submitted that support competency in teaching.

D. Research and Scholarly Activities
1. Efforts by faculty to engage in research and scholarly activity shall be viewed as an important component of the faculty member’s commitment to the mission of this institution.

2. Evaluation of performance in this area shall be based primarily upon evidence of continuing scholarly development in the faculty member’s area of expertise.

3. A score of 2 or higher requires that a candidate demonstrate competence in the five areas described in the *College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* for Research and Scholarly Activities. Determination of a candidate’s specific score in this area is not solely dependent on evidence of effort, but rather on both the quality and productivity of research and scholarly activity.

E. Clinical Practice

1. A score of two or higher requires that the candidate demonstrates competence in at least two of the 6 criteria, described in the *College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure* and at least one of the criteria must be item a, b or c (see Evaluative Instrument). Determination of a candidate’s specific score in this area is not solely dependent on evidence of effort, but rather on both the quantity and quality of evidence submitted that support competency in clinical practice.

F. Service

1. Three components of service will be evaluated:
   a. Service to the institution:
      1) Service to the department
      2) Service to the college
      3) Service to the university
   b. Student service:
      1) Advisor to student organizations
      2) Advising/counseling students on career-related issues
      3) Interviewing students for admission into health care related fields such as pharmacy
      4) Participation in student-sponsored activities or events
   c. Other service to related organizations that utilize the candidate’s professional expertise, including:
      1) Hospital or clinic committee service
      2) Health-related service to the lay (non-health science) community
         3) Local or regional
         4) National or international
      5) Other service offered because of the candidate’s area of professional expertise or qualifications

1. Invited review of scholarly activity of other professionals (e.g., grants, manuscripts) is considered service and will be placed in the appropriate category.
2. A score of 2 or higher requires that the candidate documents competence in 2 of the major areas (a-c), one of which must be service to the institution (see Evaluative Instrument). Determination of a candidate’s specific score in this area is not solely dependent on evidence of effort, but rather on both the quantity and quality of evidence submitted that support competence in service.

G. Departmental Faculty Recommendation
   1. This review will follow review of the collegiality ballots
   2. Ballots will be opened when the FAC meets to conduct the College-level tenure and/or promotion review of the candidate. Only signed ballots will be reviewed. FAC members reserve the right to disqualify ballots, which indicate that the voting faculty member did not review the candidate.
   4. The department faculty members’ recommendations will be summarized in the letter from the College FAC/P&T committee to the Dean. All ballots will be maintained in a confidential file for a period of 1 year from when they are opened, and then destroyed. Except where a committee recommendation is subject to legal challenge, ballots may only be reviewed by faculty members of the specific FAC committee. The document communicating the FAC committee recommendation on tenure and/or promotion will serve as record of the departmental recommendations.

V. FAC Recommendation Report Process
   A. Overview:
      The FAC/P&T Committee (FAC members and candidates advocate/representative) will meet and review the five areas of evaluation (Collegiality, Peer evaluation of instruction, student subcommittee evaluation of instruction, Departmental peer evaluation, and Completed Portfolio). In accordance with the evaluative instrument, each FAC/P&T Committee member will rank the candidate in each area on the ballot for tenure and/or the ballot for promotion as applicable. Once the voting is completed and tallied the FAC/P&T Committee will generate a written report of the evaluation of the candidate and recommendation(s) of the committee. The report will be forwarded to the Dean and copied to the Candidate. If a minority report is generated it will be completed on the same day, submitted to the FAC/P&T Committee and forwarded with the committee’s recommendation letter.

   B. Evaluative Instrument
      1. Candidates will be evaluated in terms of the quality and quantity of instruction, scholarly activity, service and pharmacy practice (where appropriate) and also in terms of collegiality. In addition, the candidate’s job description/job category and department workload policy will guide FAC in its evaluation.

   2. Evaluation of Quantity: The sum total contributions of instruction, service (including pharmacy practice where appropriate) and scholarship will be evaluated with regard to job description, job category and Department/University workload policies.
a. For clinical faculty, the evaluated categories will be clinical practice/service, teaching in the professional program, scholarship and service. For basic science faculty, the categories will be teaching in the professional and graduate programs, scholarship and service.

b. Faculty are expected to document all relevant activity in each category and activity in each category is expected to meet or exceed threshold values.

1. Evaluation of Quality and Quantity

a. Each candidate will be rated on a 4-point scale (1-4) for each of the following categories of activities: instruction, scholarship, service and, for pharmacy practice faculty only, pharmaceutical care.

b. The scale to be used is:
   1 = has not demonstrated competence in this area
   2 = is competent in this area; meets the minimum expected performance
   3 = is consistently strong in this area; this rating represents a sustained performance beyond the minimum expected.
   4 = is exceptionally strong in this area; this rating is characterized by a sustained performance beyond level 3.

c. Ratings will be assigned by considering both the quality of the work and the quantity of accomplishments in each category.

d. The minimum requirement to be eligible for promotion and/or tenure is that, in each category, a majority of voting P&T committee members rate the candidate at or above 2. In addition, depending upon whether promotion or tenure is requested, the following criteria must be met:

1) Promotion from instructor to assistant professor: a majority of ratings \( \geq 2 \) for each category;

2) Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: a majority of ratings \( \geq 3 \) in at least one of the following categories: teaching, scholarship or clinical practice/service;

3) Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor and/or a recommendation for early tenure: a majority of ratings \( \geq 3 \) in at least two of the following categories: teaching, scholarship, service or clinical practice/service; at least one of which must be either teaching or scholarship;

4) A recommendation of tenure: Since tenure is essentially a lifetime commitment by the College of Pharmacy, a higher level of attainment is required for tenure than for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to meeting the minimum requirement for promotion to Associate professor, there must be evidence of the promise of long
term contributions to ISU and the profession. Therefore, tenure and promotion recommendations will be voted separately.

C. Voting
1. FAC committee members must physically participate to vote on a candidate’s P&T recommendation. *In absentia* voting is not allowable. However, good faith efforts will be made to schedule meetings at times when all members of the FAC Committee can be present.
2. The vote on a candidate’s FAC recommendation will be by secret, written, anonymous ballot. Ballots will be retained for 1 year in a confidential file, and then destroyed.
3. In the absence of a majority negative vote or in the event of a tie in any category for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate will be given the affirmative decision.

D. Recommendation Letter
1. The results from the Collegiality vote, Departmental peer vote, and FAC/P&T Committee vote will be used to determine the final recommendation. The final recommendation will indicate where the candidate has met the threshold for collegiality and will include justification for the evaluation of the candidate in each area (instruction, research and scholarly activities, service, and clinical practice) including summaries of the Departmental peer review, the peer review of instruction, the student subcommittee report, and the external reviews.

2. All faculty members of the FAC/P&T committee will be asked to sign the consensus tenure and/or promotion recommendation (which should include a justification for the Committee recommendation) that will be forwarded to the Dean. Any committee member(s) refusing to sign the consensus recommendation must submit a written, signed minority recommendation to the Dean. The entire FAC committee, however, will have the opportunity to review and respond to any minority opinions submitted to the Dean.

3. Copies of all recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean simultaneously with copies to the candidate to allow the candidate the opportunity to provide rebuttal to the committee recommendations. The candidate has five working days to provide written response to the committee’s letter. With the exception of the recommendation documents, no permanent record of the committee vote, will be maintained.

4. The proceedings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are confidential. The discussion, content and results of promotion and/or tenure deliberations shall not be disclosed to anyone by any member of the Committee, except in the manner proscribed for forwarding recommendations from the Committee to the Dean, or as necessary to comply with the requirements of a formal grievance process as proscribed in the ISU *Faculty-Staff Handbook*.

5. The University has an established appeals procedure for use by full-time faculty members in such matters as recommendations concerning tenure and promotion (Part 4.V.D. of the *Faculty/Staff Handbook*).

6. The FAC Committee recommendation on tenure/promotion and the Committee’s peer and student reports of teaching will be placed in the candidate’s portfolio with a copy of the FAC
Committee recommendations on promotion and/or tenure forwarded to the Dean and the candidate.

Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee 5-15-98;
Revisions Approved: 5-14-99, 5-12-00, 5-3-01, 4-3-02, 5-12-04, 4-7-05, 4-20-06, 4-9-07, 5-9-08, 5-8-09 and 5-7-10, 5-6-2011, 4-25-2012, 5-8-13
PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Instructor: __________________ Evaluator: __________________

Course & Lecture Topic: ___________________ Date: ________________

A. Presentation Quality

B. Appropriateness of use of Classroom Time

C. Intellectual Stimulation

D. Interpersonal Rapport

E. Professionalism- Does the candidate portray high standards of professionalism and does he/she expect the same from the students?

F. Overall Quality of Lecture Observed
PEER EVALUATION OF CLINICAL INSTRUCTION

Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience Site

Instructor: ____________  Evaluator: ________________  Time spent observing ____

Advanced Pharmacy Practice Experience Site: ______________________

A. APPE Site Quality – structure of the clinic site – objectives for APPE, evaluation of the syllabus, and the appropriateness of student assignments, location

B. Quality of Patient Review – is the patient review time structured and relevant – did the instructor provide adequate, directed feedback to the student?

C. Intellectual Stimulation – Did the candidate promote the student’s learning?

D. Interpersonal Rapport – How does the candidate interact with students? Patients?

E. Professionalism- Does the candidate portray high standards of professionalism and does he/she expect the same from the student?

F. Overall Quality of APPE Observed

G. Areas of Strength and Weakness in the APPE Site.
# PROMOTION & TENURE

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOR Candidate’s Name ______________________

Candidate’s Name is being considered for promotion to _________. One aspect of his/her portfolio is evaluation of his/her teaching abilities by the student body (present and past students he/she has instructed). Please indicate your assessment of his/her competence related to teaching, in each of the following areas, using the scale below:

0 = cannot evaluate performance in this area
1 = performance is deficient in this area, compared to other instructors in the College
2 = performance is below average in this area, compared to other instructors in the College
3 = performance in this area is comparable to other instructors in the College
4 = performance is consistently above average in this area, compared to other instructors in the College
5 = performance is outstanding in this area, compared to other instructors in the College

Circle the appropriate number on the scale for each competency

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>d)</td>
<td>e)</td>
<td>f)</td>
<td>g)</td>
<td>h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>j)</td>
<td>k)</td>
<td>l)</td>
<td>m)</td>
<td>n)</td>
<td>o)</td>
<td>p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q)</td>
<td>r)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter.
b) Demonstrates effective communication skills.
c) Interacts effectively with students.
d) Clearly defines expectations and rules.
e) Encourages student participation.
f) Stimulates critical thinking.
g) Presents information that is current and relevant to the subject area.
h) Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching the subject material.
i) Uses effective examples to clarify abstract or difficult ideas.
j) Demonstrates effective organizational skills.
k) Demonstrates effective course management.
l) Accomplishes the outlined course objectives.
m) Utilizes class time effectively.
n) Maintains continuity during teaching.
o) Models professionalism.
p) Have you ever tried to contact this instructor outside class time for help, advice, or questions?
q) If so, was the instructor available during office hours?
r) Was the instructor available during non-office hours?
s) How responsive was the instructor to your concerns?
t) How satisfied were you with the instructors response and/or recommendations.

Please provide an overall statement regarding this instructor’s teaching style and feel free to provide any additional specific comments and/or examples that substantiate your assessment.
Candidate’s Name is being considered for tenure. One aspect of his/her portfolio is evaluation of his/her teaching abilities by the student body (present and past students he/she has instructed). Please indicate your assessment of his/her competence related to teaching, in each of the following areas, using the scale below:

- 0 = cannot evaluate performance in this area
- 1 = performance is deficient in this area, compared to other instructors in the College
- 2 = performance is below average in this area, compared to other instructors in the College
- 3 = performance in this area is comparable to other instructors in the College
- 4 = performance is consistently above average in this area, compared to other instructors in the College
- 5 = performance is outstanding in this area, compared to other instructors in the College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Scale</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Demonstrates effective communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Interacts effectively with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Clearly defines expectations and rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Encourages student participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Stimulates critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Presents information that is current and relevant to the subject area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Presents material in a way that is intellectually stimulating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching the subject material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Uses effective examples to clarify abstract or difficult ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Recognizes when students do not have the necessary background to understand the lecture material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Demonstrates effective organizational skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Demonstrates effective course management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n)</td>
<td>Accomplishes the outlined course objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OVER
0 1 2 3 4 5  n) Utilizes class time effectively.
0 1 2 3 4 5  o) Material is arranged and presented in a systematic and organized fashion.
0 1 2 3 4 5  p) Maintains continuity during teaching.
0 1 2 3 4 5  q) Provides and maintains a framework for the presented information.
0 1 2 3 4 5  r) The relationship is clear between lecture material and homework/assignments.
0 1 2 3 4 5  s) The relationship between lectures and course objectives is clear.
0 1 2 3 4 5  t) Models professionalism.
Yes No  u) Have you ever tried to contact this instructor outside class time for help, advice, or questions?
Yes No  v) If so, was the instructor available during office hours?
Yes No  w) Was the instructor available during non-office hours?
0 1 2 3 4 5  x) How responsive was the instructor to your concerns?
0 1 2 3 4 5  y) How satisfied were you with the instructor's response and/or recommendations.

Please provide an overall statement regarding this instructor’s teaching style and feel free to provide any additional specific comments and/or examples that substantiate your assessment.

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

Now that you have been working as a pharmacist, do you feel that the knowledge you gained in this instructor’s class has been beneficial? If so, in which aspect?
PROMOTION BALLOT

Based on the College of Pharmacy Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Process Documents

DEPARTMENT LEVEL REVIEW for ___________________________________________

(candidate’s name)

PART 1

Recommendation for: (insert promotion to what level or tenure)

I have reviewed (candidates name)’s portfolio □ YES □ NO

In what capacity and for how long have you known the candidate?

________________________________________________________________________ How long? _________

PART 2

Rate the candidate on the following scale for each category of activity:

1 = has not demonstrated competence in this area
2 = is competent in this area; meets the minimum expected performance
3 = is consistently strong in this area; this rating represents a sustained performance beyond the minimum expected
4 = is exceptionally strong in this area; this rating is characterized by a sustained performance beyond level 3
NA/NO = not applicable/no opportunity (candidate has no responsibilities in this area or you have not had opportunity to evaluate this area)

INSTRUCTION **
I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional settings, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s instruction in: didactics, laboratory settings, Case Studies, professional settings, practice settings, other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Instruction (circle one):  1  2  3  4  NA

SCHOLARSHIP **
I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional settings, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s scholarship in: collaborative settings, laboratory settings, teaching settings, professional settings, written works, practice settings, other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:
Rating of Scholarship (circle one):  1  2  3  4  NA

CLINICAL PRACTICE (only if applicable) **
I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate in clinical practice in: professional settings, community settings, personal interactions, written works (please describe), other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Clinical Practice (circle one):  1  2  3  4  NA

SERVICE **
I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s service in committee settings, administrative settings, consultation services, student advising or interviews, other (please briefly describe). Please indicate what levels your observations were at: departmental, college, university, regional, national, or international.

COMMENTS:

Rating of Service (circle one):  1  2  3  4  NA

PART 3

“Promotion is an acknowledgement of consistently strong performance in some combination of the areas of teaching, scholarship, clinical practice, and service.”

Provide a summary statement to support/justify your overall recommendation**

I recommend (candidate’s name) for (promotion to) □YES □ NO

Signature_________________________________ Date____________________________

**Basis for critique (observations, comments, etc) is required for ballots to be considered valid.
Appendix E

TENURE BALLOT
Based on the College of Pharmacy Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Process Documents

DEPARTMENT LEVEL REVIEW for _____________________________________________
(candidate’s name)

PART 1
Recommendation for: (insert promotion to what level or tenure)
I have reviewed (candidate name)’s portfolio □ YES □ NO

In what capacity and for how long have you known the candidate?
_______________________________________________________ How long? _________

PART 2
Rate the candidate on the following scale for each category of activity:
1 = has not demonstrated competence or development in this area
2 = is competent or developing adequately in this area; meets the minimum expected performance
3 = is consistently strong in this area; this rating represents a sustained competence beyond the minimum expected
4 = is exceptionally strong in this area; this rating is characterized by a sustained performance beyond level 3
NA/NO = not applicable/no opportunity (candidate has no responsibilities in this area or you have not had opportunity to evaluate this area)

INSTRUCTION **
I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s instruction in: didactics, laboratory settings, Case Studies, professional settings, practice settings, other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Instruction (circle one): 1 2 3 4 NA

SCHOLARSHIP **
I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)
I have observed the candidate’s scholarship in: collaborative settings, laboratory settings, teaching settings, professional settings, written works, practice settings, other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Scholarship (circle one):  1   2   3   4   NA

CLINICAL PRACTICE (only if applicable) **

I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate clinical practice in: professional settings, community settings, personal interactions, written works (please describe), other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Clinical Practice (circle one):  1   2   3   4   NA

SERVICE **

I base my rating on: portfolio contents, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s service in: committee settings, administrative settings, consultation services, student advising or interviews, other (please briefly describe). Please indicate what levels your observations were at: departmental, college, university, regional, national, or international.

COMMENTS:

Rating of Service (circle one):  1   2   3   4   NA

PART 3

“Tenure is granted as a result of demonstrated competence, sustained contribution and strong commitment to serve the College.” “Since tenure is essentially a lifetime commitment by the College of Pharmacy a different level of attainment is required for tenure than for promotion and there must be a promise of long-term contributions to ISU.”

Provide a summary statement to support/justify your overall recommendation**

I recommend (candidate’s name) for tenure □ YES □ NO

Signature ______________________________ Date ______________________________

**Basis for critique (observations, comments, etc) is required for ballots to be considered valid.
Appendix F

Performance Review Ballot (3rd Year Review or Five-Year Periodic Performance Review)
Based on the College of Pharmacy Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Process Documents

DEPARTMENT LEVEL REVIEW for _____________________________________________
(candidate’s name)

PART 1

Recommendation for: {insert 3rd year Review or 5yr Periodic Performance Review}

I have reviewed {candidate name} (check all that apply) CV Summary self-assessment narratives Summary Table Other (please describe)

In what capacity and for how long have you known the candidate?
___________________________________________ How long? _________

PART 2

Rate the candidate on the following scale for each category of activity:
1 = has not demonstrated competence in this area
2 = is competent or developing adequately in this area; meets the minimum expected performance
3 = is consistently strong in this area; this rating represents a sustained performance at or beyond the minimum expected
NA/NO = not applicable/no opportunity (candidate has no responsibilities in this area or you have not had opportunity to evaluate this area)

Rating Notes:

For 3rd year Review, the purpose of rating the candidate is to evaluate their progress toward promotion and/or tenure based on the criteria outlined in the Guidelines and to provide an opportunity for formal evaluation and individual mentoring so that any deficiencies noted can be adequately addressed prior to a candidate’s review by the College P&T Committee.

For 5yr PPR, the purpose of rating the candidate is evaluate their sustained productivity in the areas of instruction, scholarship, service, clinical practice and other assigned duties. The review should consider the entire breadth of a faculty member’s contributions, while paying attention to the most recent five-year period. The goals are to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development; to assist a faculty member to enhance professional skills and goals; to refocus academic and professional efforts; and to assure that faculty members are meeting their academic responsibilities.
INSTRUCTION **
I base my rating on (circle): provided materials, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s instruction in (circle): didactics, laboratory settings, Case Studies, professional settings, practice settings, other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Instruction (circle one): 1 2 3 NA/NO

SCHOLARSHIP **
I base my rating on (circle): provided materials, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s scholarship in (circle): collaborative settings, laboratory settings, teaching settings, professional settings, written works, practice settings, community engagement, other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Scholarship (circle one): 1 2 3 NA/NO

CLINICAL PRACTICE (only if applicable) **
I base my rating on (circle): provided materials, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate clinical practice in (circle): professional settings, community settings, personal interactions, written works (please describe), other (please briefly describe)

COMMENTS:

Rating of Clinical Practice (circle one): 1 2 3 NA/NO

SERVICE **
I base my rating on (circle): provided materials, direct observations, personal interactions, professional interactions, comments (briefly describe source), other (please briefly describe)

I have observed the candidate’s service in (circle): committee settings, administrative settings, consultations, student advising or interviews, other (please briefly describe). Please indicate what levels your observations were at: departmental, college, university, regional, national, or international.

COMMENTS:

Rating of Service (circle one): 1 2 3 NA/NO
PART 3

Provide a summary statement to support/justify your overall recommendation of (please select category appropriate for the candidate): **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 year PPR</th>
<th>3rd year Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Satisfactory performance</td>
<td>□ Satisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Marginal performance</td>
<td>□ Marginal progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Unsatisfactory performance</td>
<td>□ Unsatisfactory progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary for my recommendation:

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date

**Basis for critique (observations, comments, etc) is required for ballots to be considered valid.