

College of Pharmacy Tenure and Promotion Plan

1. Introductory Statement

This document describes in detail the tenure and/or promotion indices and standards that will be used to determine whether candidates meet the criteria in Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) sections 6C1-7.003, 6C1-7.010, 6C1-7.013, and 6C1-7.019. For a complete perspective, the reader is advised to review these sections; (1) the University Constitution, Article V, Section 5; and (2) the Office of Academic Affairs' Annual Memorandum on Tenure, Permanent Status, and Promotion Nominations.

2. College's Mission Statement

The College's statement concerning Tenure and Promotion is to be viewed in the context of the College's mission statement and its value system. The goals and objectives of the College are broadly stated in the Mission Statement. Both the College's mission statement and goals and objectives are subject to change and the faculty should review the most current documents annually.

3. Definitions

- a. Tenure is a status granted by the Board of Trustees to faculty and must be granted by the end of the seventh year of tenure earning service. Tenure guarantees a faculty member's annual reappointment until she or he voluntarily resigns or retires, is terminated for just cause, is discontinued because of a layoff, is deemed to have abandoned his or her position, or dies. Tenure is effective at the beginning of the fiscal year. The status of tenure does not extend to administrative appointments.

The letter of appointment shall specify the date of the completion of the first year of service to enable the faculty member in determining the critical dates in which the preliminary tenure review and full tenure review consideration will be under-taken. The process for full tenure review normally begins during the fall term of the seventh year of service. A faculty member may request earlier consideration or deferral of consideration to the seventh year, with the concurrence of the appropriate administrator. In the case of a deferral, the agreement shall be in writing by the appropriate administrator.

- b. Promotion is the assignment of a faculty member to a higher academic rank. Faculty promotions are effective at the beginning of the academic year.
- c. A semester (or a 19.5 week period for a 12 month faculty) in which a faculty member is on leave of absence shall not be considered academic service for the purpose of awarding tenure.

65

- d. The university now has a "Tenure Clock Stopping" policy that shall be granted for a one-year extension of the maximum probationary period for tenure under the certain prescribed circumstances. (For complete description of this policy see www.senate.ufl.edu/reports/tenure/20041019tenureReport.pdf)
- e. Only employees classified as faculty members of the University, who are in continuous full-time or part-time tenure-accruing positions and hold the rank of assistant professor or above are eligible for nomination for tenure. Refer to rule 6C1-7.003, F.A.C.

4. Brief Summary of the College and University Procedures for Submitting Tenure and/or Promotion Nominations for Faculty Classified as full-time or part-time with the Rank of Assistant Professor or Higher and who are Employed in a Tenure Earning Position

- a. **Preliminary review:** The Department and the College of Pharmacy's Tenure and Promotion Committee **must** conduct a preliminary review of each tenure track assistant professor at the completion of the third year of employment. The intent of this policy is to provide every candidate for tenure the opportunity to receive a realistic assessment of the likelihood of achieving tenure. **This preliminary re-view is similar in all respects to the regular tenure and review process, except that no outside letters of support are utilized.** In cases in which a faculty member elects to be considered for tenure "when ready" (i.e. prior to the seventh year of service, with consultation with department chair and the dean), the faculty member is responsible for making arrangements for a preliminary review to take place prior to final consideration for tenure. In cases where a candidate has been hired with substantial experience and elects to be considered for tenure, arrangements for a preliminary review should preferably be made at least 2 years prior to consideration for tenure, with consultation with their chair and the dean. This does not preclude any faculty from submitting an application for tenure and promotion sooner than two years after an interim review. **Faculty who are hired at the Associate Professor level or higher and who already have substantial teaching and research experience may waive this interim review upon approval of the department chair and dean. Faculty who choose to waive an interim review do so at their own risk as the interim review is a considerable benefit to the applicants.** To facilitate the review process, and minimize effort by the candidate, it is the chair's responsibility to insure that an identified individual staff member will help prepare the packet, particularly the collection of documents archived by the college (i.e. teaching evaluations [for faculty, course, department, college], annual assignments, evaluations, etc.). The dean's office should have a person identified to act as a liaison for the departments. This staff member(s) should be required to attend the yearly presentations on Tenure and Promotion in order to maintain competence on the rules and regulations for the Tenure and Promotion packet.

A similar review process for any tenure track faculty member in line for promotion should take place if deemed necessary by the candidate's chair and the Dean of the College. The timing of this review should be determined in consultation with the chair and the candidate. This review would take place by the full professors serving on the T & P committee (sustained performance committee).

- b. **Departmental Review for tenure and/or promotion:** The department chair or appropriate administrator normally is responsible for initiating the tenure and/or promotion process although a faculty member may request that a nomination for tenure and/or promotion be done at any time. In the case of the promotion to a Distinguished Professor, the departmental faculty and/or chair is responsible for initiating the process.

All tenured members of the academic department in which the faculty member is being considered for tenure must review the nomination and indicate their recommendations by secret ballot. In the case of promotion, all members of the department or unit holding rank above the candidate will review the nomination, and, by means of a secret vote held 24 hours after a closed door meeting, indicate their recommendations. Irrespective of the results of either the polled faculty or the chair, the packet must be forwarded to the college level for further consideration. The chair must write a letter to the collegewide Tenure and Promotion Committee providing the consensus of the department and including both positive and negative comments as appropriate. The department chair or director fills in all four blanks listed for votes (i.e., for, against, abstaining and absent) for each level at which votes are taken. The number of faculty voting should sum to the total faculty eligible to vote. The department chair's or director's letter must explain the vote whenever 20% or more of the votes are recorded as negative, abstaining or absent.

A copy of the chair's letter must be received by the candidate within five days of the letter being written. The candidate then has ten calendar days thereafter to request a meeting with the department chair/director and/or to submit a written response. The packet cannot be forwarded to the next step until the candidate either submits a response, indicates in writing that s/he will not respond or 10 days have passed, whichever is first. If there is a response it shall be placed in the packet.

Joint Appointments Tenure and/or promotion of faculty with a primary appointment in the College of Pharmacy and a secondary appointment elsewhere in the University shall be reviewed in the same manner as a full-time appointment in the College of Pharmacy with the additional provision that the recommendation to the college-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee include relevant information on performance from the department chair in which the secondary appointment is held.

- c. **College Level Review:** The College's Tenure and Promotion Committee reviews the nomination of faculty. The Tenure and Promotion Committee, meeting as a whole, considers all the material submitted by each candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The tenure and promotion committee will make individual assessments as part of its fact finding and consultative role. A "best practice" for re-view of an individual faculty member would be to NOT have the T and P member from the home department of the candidate present the packet to the committee for discussion. Following a candid discussion, an individual assessment shall consist of a committee member's indicating whether or not the candidate meets the standards for tenure within the college. This assessment is conducted by a secret ballot. **All tenured members of the College's Tenure and Promotion Committee will be eligible to vote for any application for tenure. All members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee holding rank superior to that of the applicant shall be eligible to vote for promotion.**

Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee may, at the request of the dean, consult with the Dean regarding each candidate. The Dean's signature is required before the nomination is forwarded to the Senior Vice President for Health Affairs for review before the nomination is submitted to the University's Academic Personnel Board. The Dean writes a letter for the candidate. The dean's letter must explain the individual assessments whenever 20% or more are recorded as negative. This letter becomes a part of the tenure packet and a copy of the dean's letter must be received by the candidate and the respective department chair/director within 5 working days of the letter being written. The candidate then has ten calendar days thereafter to request a meeting with the dean and/or to submit a written response. Any response shall be included in the packet. The dossier cannot be forwarded to the next step until the candidate either submits a response to the dean's letter, indicates in writing that s/he will not respond, or 10 days have passed, whichever is first.

- d. **University Academic Personnel Board Review:** The University Academic Personnel Board shall review and consider all nominations received and shall submit its recommendations to the President. The University Academic Personnel Board consists of five tenured, non-administrative faculty members in the rank of full professor or above who are elected by the University Senate. Ex-officio members are the Dean of the Graduate school, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice Provost, and the Vice President for Research. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs acts as the Chair, and the Vice Provost acts as the secretary (non-voting). The duties of the Academic Personnel Board are to advise the President on promotion and tenure nominations and on related policy matters. The Academic Personnel Board shall have the sole responsibility for taking a University-wide view and concerning itself with the adequacy of the University-wide tenure and promotion criteria. It shall also have the final responsibility for advising the president on such matters before the President

submits the University's recommendation on tenure to the Board of Trustees, or issues a final decision regarding promotion.

- e. **Presidential Review:** The Vice President for Health Affairs and/or the Dean and/or designee shall have the opportunity to meet with the President and the Academic Personnel Board to review the Board's negative recommendations before the President makes a final decision or, in the case of tenure, submits a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.
- f. **Final University Action:** A decision regarding a denial can occur at any stage of the University's tenure and promotion process. The faculty member shall be notified in writing by the appropriate administrative official within 10 days, or as soon thereafter as possible, of the final action taken on the nomination. If the faculty member is denied tenure and/or promotion, the notice shall include a statement of reason(s) for the denial. Tenure is granted upon nomination by the President, review by the Chancellor of the State University System, and approval by the Board of Trustees. Promotion is granted by the President.

5. Brief Summary of the College and University Procedures for Submitting *Promotion Nominations for Faculty Classified as full-time or part-time with the Rank of Assistant Professor or above and who are Employed in a Non-Tenure Earning Position*

The process follows those steps described in Section 4 above. Since many faculty who are non-tenure earning are expected to be strong in either instruction, research, or service and because only one of these areas often reflects all of a faculty member's assignment, emphasis in promotion decisions will be based on performance in that area of assignment alone. Examples include non-tenured faculty who hold a teaching, clinical or research track. Where a recommendation is made primarily on a record in research, teaching, or service, the evidence must show clearly that the candidate has performed with distinction (see Section 8 for definition of distinction). In cases in which a non-tenured faculty member elects to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must make arrangements for a preliminary review by the department and the Tenure and Promotion committee at least three years prior to consideration for promotion. Faculty who have assignments in two of the three areas will be evaluated on the basis of their performance in each area based on their percentage of assignment to each area.

6. Brief Summary of the College Procedures for Considering Nominations for *Promotion for Faculty Classified as Non-Salaried Affiliate or Non-Salaried Affiliate Clinical Faculty (non-compensated)*

Promotions are recommended to the dean by departmental faculty. The department chair forwards to the dean a copy of the candidate's CV along with a letter describing the academic credentials, achievements and contributions of the candidate in the college's teaching, research, and/or service programs. Requests for promotion shall be submitted, after Dean's approval, to the University of Florida, Office of Academic Affairs for review and approval.

7. Mentoring Program within the College

The College of Pharmacy shall have a mentoring program for all new assistant professors. This mentoring process will be modeled after our current formative teaching evaluation. A mentoring group will be established for each new faculty as part of orientation. The group will be composed of 2-3 faculty members at the level of associate professor or higher. The department chair, in consultation with the candidate and dean, will assign appropriate faculty to serve as mentors. The department chair, the mentoring group, and the individual faculty member will meet soon after the start of employment

to establish expectations. A faculty member designated as a mentor will have this duty reflected in both quarterly and annual assignments. The group need not be composed of faculty exclusively from the college of pharmacy, although the majority of the members should preferably be from the faculty's department. The composition of the group can change at any time with input from the chair and the candidate. The leader of the group will either be selected by the chair of the department or chosen by the group. The group will meet with the candidate at least twice yearly, and provide the faculty member with a verbal assessment of their progress towards tenure at least annually. Evaluation of each faculty mentor will be included in the annual evaluation conducted by his/her department chair. A similar program may be utilized for associate professors.

8. A. **Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for Tenure Track Faculty**

The University's criteria for these decisions are described in 6C1-7.019(3), F.A.C. These criteria recognize three broad categories of academic service: instruction, research, and service. In most cases, promotion and tenure requires distinction in at least two of the categories, one of which should be in the area of primary responsibility, though merit should certainly be regarded as more important than the quantity of activities. The College's view is that the overriding criteria for awarding tenure are that of demonstrated professional excellence and a clear expectation of continued significant value to the University.

"Distinction" is defined as performance that is nationally and/or internationally recognized and contributes to a record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise (promotion to Associate Professor) or performance that is nationally and/or internationally recognized and contributes to a sustained record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise (promotion to Full Professor).

Outside Letters: In addition to any internal letters solicited at the discretion of the department chair, at least five letters of evaluation from academic peers outside the university who are at a higher academic rank than the candidate. "*Outside the university*" means individuals not employed either currently or in the past ten years by the University of Florida. It is encouraged that solicited outside letters should be sought from individuals who do not have a personal relationship with the candidate. The letters of evaluation should offer evidence of recognized contributions and not simply be letters of support. Letters from faculty who are at the top of the candidate's field and at the very best institutions are particularly valued. The emphasis should not be on the number of letters solicited, but on the quality of the review.

If more than six letters are received, the department chair must include all the letters, along with an explanation of why additional letter(s) exists. **All solicited letters that have been received must be included in the packet.**

The identification of individuals, both internal and external, from whom letters of evaluation are sought, is the joint responsibility of the nominee and the department chair. The candidate should consult her or his mentor and generate a list of no more than seven names as potential reviewers. The candidate should give the list to her/his department chair, who shall be responsible for choosing the individuals who will be asked to submit letters of evaluation. At least one-half of the selected evaluators must come from the candidate's list. If an insufficient number of individuals agree to serve as evaluators, the candidate should submit additional names, as necessary, until at least five individuals have agreed to serve. The chair shall send the same standard solicitation letter to the qualified scholars as necessary until no fewer than five have agreed to evaluate the candidate's research/scholarship/creative activities.

The letter should not be leading in its request for an evaluation. The letter shall append the department's written discipline-specific clarifications of the University criteria and shall ask the evaluator to assess the candidate's research performance in order to determine whether it:

- a. satisfies the University criteria for tenure as clarified in writing by the candidate's department;
- b. represents a significant contribution to the field; and
- c. is comparable to the research performance of successful tenure candidates at the same stage in their careers at comparable public research universities.

Included in the letter of solicitation should be the candidate's percentage effort in each of the assigned duties.

A copy of a typical letter requesting the letters of evaluation should appear before the actual letters of evaluation in the packet. A brief, objective narrative summary indicating the credentials/qualifications of each individual providing a letter of evaluation also must be included in the tenure or promotion packet.

Those from whom the letters of evaluation are solicited must be notified of the possibility that the letters will be read by the faculty member unless s/he executes a written waiver before the letters are requested. If a letter of evaluation has been faxed, please use reproduced copies of this letter in all copies of the packet, including the original.

Faculty Assignment: A faculty member's activities in instruction, research, and service must be considered if the person has been assigned duties or responsibilities in all three areas, no matter how slight. The college-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee will review a faculty member's performance in the context of his or her assignment. Thus, it is essential that the reporting of assignments in the Faculty Activity Reports be accurate. Each faculty member is strongly encouraged to review their semester faculty activity reports at the end of each semester and to report any changes in actual effort to their chair so corrections may be made. In cases in which the assigned activity for a given year reported in the packet does not reflect actual effort, a statement of clarification by the chair should be included in the packet.

A. Instruction

Evidence should be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted an instructional program of high quality. The requisites for effectiveness of a teacher include intellectual competence, integrity, independence, enthusiasm, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a continuous increase in knowledge of the subject taught, an ability to effectively transmit knowledge to students, to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative work. Evaluation of effectiveness of instruction will include classroom performance, curriculum materials, educational development activities, and clerkship student evaluation.

The evaluation of effectiveness of instruction will be based, in part, on the following:

- The candidate's overall teaching ability as perceived by students and documented by their responses on course evaluations in a course in which the candidate is a major instructor and team taught courses;
- The candidate's teaching competence as determined by teaching evaluations by peers based on an examination of course content, command of and currency in field, and presentation methods;

Evaluation of effectiveness of instruction may be based on other evidence, for example:

- The candidate's instructional competence in team-taught courses as determined by evaluations of course coordinators based on ability to work as a team with other course instructors in providing integrated course materials;
- The candidate's instructional ability in direction of graduate students' thesis and dissertations;

- The candidate's ability to supervise graduate teaching assistants;
- Quality of academic advisement;
- The candidate's contributions to pharmacy education as demonstrated by any of the following (these may be described in a narrative):
 - i. Developing a new course or rotation, or revising an existing course.
 - ii. Receiving an educational development grant or directing an experimental educational program.
 - iii. Publishing a review article in a professional journal.
 - iv. Authoring or co-authoring a chapter in pharmacy or other health-related textbook.
 - v. Participating as an invited contributor in a national symposium or workshop on some aspect of pharmacy education.
 - vi. Publishing an article on subjects related to pharmacy education.
 - vii. Developing and/or presenting a continuing education program.
 - viii. Receiving a recognized teaching award or student recognition award.

All of the candidate's contributions listed above must be judged by peer review as scholarly and of high quality and significance if they are to be considered by the college-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee.

B. Research

The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to conduct research that reflects original scholarship, makes a contribution to knowledge and shows the likelihood of continued quality performance. This ability and future promise may be demonstrated in one or more of the following categories: (1) to conduct research with appropriate scientific methods and rigor; (2) to conceptualize and theorize in an original way; with logical and mathematical formulation as appropriate; (3) to synthesize, criticize, and clarify extant knowledge and research; (4) to innovate in the collection and analysis of empirical data; or (5) to relate research to the solution of practical problems of individual groups, organizations, or societies. The candidate will be evaluated to determine if she or he has achieved the following standards:

- a. **Publications:** The candidate is the primary author of original research published in peer-reviewed publications. Primary authorship is defined as the author that is primarily responsible for initiating, conducting and reporting the research. Research publications in which the candidate is an author but not the primary author and other publications such as case reports, drug review or therapeutic review published in peer-reviewed publications will be considered but will not be the sole basis for awarding tenure or promotion. Publications resulting from work as a student or a postdoctoral fellowship and Letters to the Editor will not normally be considered in evaluating the candidate's research productivity, unless they meet the criteria for primary authorship as defined above. In cases in which the candidate is an author but not the primary author, the candidate may wish to provide a narrative describing their contribution to the research effort if they feel their contribution to the work was greater than normally associated with the role of a co-author.
- b. **Research Funding:** The candidate has secured funding from sources outside the University to support his or her independent research efforts. The candidate should demonstrate the ability to obtain research funding from federal agencies, foundations, or private sources which is awarded on a competitive basis.
- c. **Training of Advanced Degree Students/PharmD Students:** The candidate has demonstrated the ability to train advanced degree professionals as evidenced by an ongoing postdoctoral research training program and/or advising of graduate students, and/or PharmD students.

- d. **Peer Recognition:** The candidate has demonstrated that she or he is recognized by peers as making significant contributions to the field. Examples of such evidence include invited presentations in national scientific and professional meetings, receiving recognition awards (e.g., career development, young investigator), serving on review committees and editorial boards and election to prestigious national organizations that recognize excellence in the discipline.
- e. **Quality of Work and Potential for Advancement:** A review of at least three of the candidate's publications and other research efforts by at least five academic peers from outside the university who are at a higher academic rank than the candidate must conclude that the work is scholarly, creative, original, and of high quality and significance. (This evaluation will be part of the outside letters of evaluation described earlier.)
- f. **Other Evidence of Excellence by Peers**

C. Service

To be relevant to tenure and/or promotion decisions, service activities must clearly involve a high level of skill in communicating and applying the knowledge of one's professional competence. Documentation of service must evaluate the quality of such service as well as highlight individual efforts that are especially significant. The discussion should identify the nature of the tasks performed and the particular responsibilities of the candidate. When service is a major aspect of a candidate's responsibilities, letters should be solicited from authorities in the field evaluating the quality and impact of the service and its importance to the university.

Evidence of public service includes:

- Consultations to the community and significant advisory work with government, business, or industry.
- Outreach program planning and development.
- Membership on committees and boards.
- Public lectures and presentations.
- Participation in radio, television, and educational television network (ETN) programs.
- Service in official position of public organizations or agencies.
- Publications for nonprofessionals.
- Testifying at public hearings.
- Preparation of reports.
- Membership on site visit teams.

Evidence of university service includes:

- Major committee assignments in the department or the university.
- Chair or associate chair of a department, or dean or associate dean of a school or college.
- Coordinator of statewide outreach programs.
- Special administrative assignments in a department, college, or university.

Evidence of professional service includes:

- Membership on state, regional, or national review panels, study sections, councils, etc.
- Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities.
- Leadership positions on national or international scientific, professional, and educational organizations.
- Leadership in the development of continuing professional education for personnel in the field.

Specific Standards for Promotion for Various Ranks

Assistant Professor: Promotion to Assistant Professor requires that a candidate has demonstrated a capacity for teaching and independent research and where appropriate, innovative pharmacy practice.

Associate Professor: Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has developed an independent, well-defined program of original research, teaching or service. The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to supervise the training of research investigators and post-graduate degree professionals.

Professor: Promotion to the rank of professor implies advanced academic maturity and requires evidence that the candidate (1) has achieved recognition as a national authority in his or her discipline through the development of an original program of research, teaching, or service; and (2) has conducted scholarly work over a sustained period of time.

Documentation

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide all required information to be included in the tenure/promotion packets, e.g., teaching evaluations (student and peer evaluations), contract and grant activity, updated listing of publications.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to review the performance of each department faculty member annually. An identified staff member within the department will assist the faculty member in gathering the information for the packet and an identified staff member in the dean's office will assist in coordinating the efforts in completing the packet. These staff members should attend the annual workshops given on tenure and promotion to be current with any rule changes.

Prior to the consideration of a faculty member's nomination, he/she shall review the materials to insure that all information pertinent to the nomination is present. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that the tenure and/or promotion materials are complete and factually correct. However, if a faculty member has waived the right to review the letters of recommendation; these may not be reviewed by the faculty member.

If new materials or information (e.g., the chairs letter, notes, etc.) are added to the tenure and/or promotion packet after the commencement of consideration, copies of the new materials must be sent to the faculty member who may, within five days, attach a brief response to the materials.

Withdrawal Procedures and Appeal and Grievance Procedure

Withdrawal Procedures: Faculty members being considered for tenure prior to the seventh year may withdraw, without prejudice, from the review process on or before March 15th of an academic year if no official action is taken on the nomination, i.e., written communication regarding the denial. The withdrawal requires written mutual agreement between the faculty member and the chair.

Informal Appeal and Grievance Procedures: A statement regarding appeal and grievance procedures must be given to any faculty denied tenure and/or promotion (see F.A.C. - 6C1-7.042). If a faculty member who has been denied at any level believes that the university has failed to comply with the university's criteria for tenure or promotion procedures, they may appeal the action. The appeal should begin at the level at which the nomination was denied. Relevant documentation should be included with the appeal. If dissatisfied with the results of the appeal, the faculty member may proceed to the next administrative level.

8. B. Criteria for Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The University's criteria for these decisions are described in 6C1-7.019(3), F.A.C. These criteria recognize three broad categories of academic service: instruction, research, and service. Promotion requires a sustained and significant record of distinction in the area of primary

responsibility (instruction, research, or clinical practice), to which the faculty member is assigned annually, as well as 1-2 indicators of scholarship per year and service.

Merit should certainly be regarded as more important than the quantity of activities. The College's view is that the overriding criteria for awarding promotion is that of demonstrated professional excellence and a clear expectation of continued significant value to the University.

“Distinction” is defined as performance that makes a significant contribution to knowledge and/or practice.

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical/Research Associate Professor or Associate Scholar:

Distinction is recognized and contributes to a record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise. Participation in scholarly activity is essential and the candidate should demonstrate an emerging reputation at a regional and/or national scope

Criteria for Promotion to Clinical/Research Professor or Scholar:

All of the criteria for Associate Professor plus evidence of national or international recognition is achieved and there is a sustained record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise. Leadership in professional societies and/or extraordinary service to the College of Pharmacy are also expected.

Outside Letters:

In addition to any internal letters solicited at the discretion of the department chair, at least five letters of evaluation from academic peers outside the university who are at a higher academic rank than the candidate. *“Outside the university”* means individuals not employed either currently or in the past ten years by the University of Florida. It is encouraged that solicited outside letters should be sought from individuals who do not have a personal relationship with the candidate. The letters of evaluation should offer evidence of recognized contributions and not simply be letters of support. Letters from faculty who are at the top of the candidate's field and at the very best institutions are particularly valued. The emphasis should not be on the number of letters solicited, but on the quality of the review.

If more than six letters are received, the department chair must include all the letters, along with an explanation of why additional letter(s) exists. **All solicited letters that have been received must be included in the packet.**

The identification of individuals, both internal and external, from whom letters of evaluation are sought, is the joint responsibility of the nominee and the department chair. The candidate should consult her or his mentor and generate a list of no more than seven names as potential reviewers. The candidate should give the list to her/his department chair, who shall be responsible for choosing the individuals who will be asked to submit letters of evaluation. At least one-half of the selected evaluators must come from the candidate's list. If an insufficient number of individuals agree to serve as evaluators, the candidate should submit additional names, as necessary, until at least five individuals have agreed to serve. The chair shall send the same standard solicitation letter to the qualified scholars as necessary until no fewer than five have agreed to evaluate the candidate's research/scholarship/creative activities.

The letter should not be leading in its request for an evaluation. The letter shall append the department's written discipline-specific clarifications of the University criteria and shall ask the evaluator to assess the candidate's performance in order to determine whether it:

- a. satisfies the University criteria for promotion as clarified in writing by the candidate's department;
- b. represents a significant contribution to the field; and
- c. is comparable to the research performance of successful candidates at the same stage in their careers at comparable public research universities.

Included in the letter of solicitation should be the candidate's percentage effort in each of the assigned duties.

A copy of a typical letter requesting the letters of evaluation should appear before the actual letters of evaluation in the packet. A brief, objective narrative summary indicating the credentials/qualifications of each individual providing a letter of evaluation also must be included in the tenure or promotion packet.

Those from whom the letters of evaluation are solicited must be notified of the possibility that the letters will be read by the faculty member unless s/he executes a written waiver before the letters are requested. If a letter of evaluation has been faxed, please use reproduced copies of this letter in all copies of the packet, including the original.

Faculty Assignment: A faculty member's activities in instruction, research, patient care (clinical), and service must be considered if the person has been assigned duties or responsibilities in multiple areas, no matter how slight. The college-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee will review a faculty member's performance in the context of his or her assignment. Thus, it is essential that the reporting of assignments in the Faculty Activity Reports be accurate. Each faculty member is strongly encouraged to review their semester faculty activity reports at the end of each semester and to report any changes in actual effort to their chair so corrections may be made. In cases in which the assigned activity for a given year reported in the packet does not reflect actual effort, a statement of clarification by the chair should be included in the packet.

A. Instruction

Evidence should be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted an instructional program of high quality. The requisites for effectiveness of a teacher include intellectual competence, integrity, independence, enthusiasm, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a continuous increase in knowledge of the subject taught, an ability to effectively transmit knowledge to students, to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students to creative work. Evaluation of effectiveness of instruction will include classroom performance, curriculum materials, educational development activities, and clerkship student evaluation.

The evaluation of effectiveness of instruction will be based, in part, on the following:

- The candidate's overall teaching ability as perceived by students and documented by their responses on course evaluations in a course in which the candidate is a major instructor and team taught courses;
- The candidate's teaching competence as determined by teaching evaluations by peers based on an examination of course content, command of and currency in field, and presentation methods;

Evaluation of effectiveness of instruction may be based on other evidence, for example:

- The candidates instructional competence in team-taught courses as determined by evaluations of course coordinators based on ability to work as a team with other course instructors in providing integrated course materials;
- The candidate's instructional ability in direction of graduate students' thesis and dissertations;
- The candidate's ability to supervise graduate teaching assistants;
- Quality of academic advisement;
- The candidate's contributions to pharmacy education as demonstrated by any of the following (these may be described in a narrative):
 - i. Developing a new course or rotation, or revising an existing course.
 - ii. Receiving an educational development grant or directing an experimental educational program.
 - iii. Publishing a review article in a professional journal.
 - iv. Authoring or co-authoring a chapter in pharmacy or other health-related textbook.
 - v. Participating as an invited contributor in a national symposium or workshop on some aspect of pharmacy education.

- vi. Publishing an article on subjects related to pharmacy education.
- vii. Developing and/or presenting a continuing education program.
- viii. Receiving a recognized teaching award or student recognition award.

Clinical faculty who provide students of the college with experiential education or other assigned activities will be evaluated on their ability to fulfill their assigned activities. The candidate must demonstrate distinction and special competence in a specific field. The candidate's professional activities should be scrutinized for evidence of achievement, leadership, and the development or utilization of new approaches and techniques for the solution of professional problems or other creative activities.

Evaluation of the clinical competence of the candidate should be made by clinical practitioners. This evaluation should include the candidate's contributions in the following areas:

- i. Innovative pharmacy practice.
- ii. Clinical competence in the prevention, detection, assessment, and resolution of pharmaceutical care problems.
- iii. Provision of quality patient care services.
- iv. Other documentary evidence of achievement of a professional nature as provided by the candidate.

Clinical Emphasis (e.g. Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor)

Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to clinical practice-based instruction (clinical clerkships), other instruction, and/or clinical service. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor will be based on documentation of distinction in teaching and practice as evidenced by student and peer evaluations, and evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of clinical practice on patient care. The impact on patient care will be documented in part by input from other healthcare professional colleagues. Board certification is a way to document clinical expertise and in most cases is expected for promotion to the Clinical Associate Professor level. Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required for documentation of promise of sustained and continued scholarly activity.

Instructional Emphasis (e.g. Clinical Associate, Clinical Professor, Associate Scholar, Scholar)

Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to instruction. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor will be based on documentation of distinction in classroom teaching as evidenced by student and peer evaluations and evidence demonstrating the quality of teaching and/or program supervision and its impact on student learning. Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required with documentation of sustained and continued promise of scholarly activity. These scholarly activities may be focused in the area of the faculty member's choosing, consistent with their expertise.

All of the candidate's contributions listed above must be judged by peer review as scholarly and of high quality and significance if they are to be considered by the college-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee.

B. Research

The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to work in collaboration with other investigators on research that makes a contribution to knowledge and have indicated the likelihood of continued quality performance. The candidate will be evaluated to determine if she or he has achieved the following standards:

- a. **Publications:** The candidate is the primary author or co-author of original research published in peer-reviewed publications. Other publications such as case reports, drug reviews, or therapeutic reviews published in peer-reviewed venues will also be

considered. In cases in which the candidate is an author but not the primary author, the candidate may wish to provide a narrative describing their contribution to the research effort if they feel their contribution to the work was greater than normally associated with the role of co-author.

- b. **Research Funding:** The candidate has worked as part of a research team to secure funding from sources outside the University including federal agencies, foundations, or private sources to support a research program.
- c. **Peer Recognition:** The candidate has demonstrated that she or he is recognized by peers as making significant contributions to the field. Examples of such evidence include invited presentations in national scientific and professional meetings, receiving recognition awards and reviewing manuscripts for professional journals.
- d. **Quality of Work and Potential for Advancement:** A review of at least three of the candidate's publications and other research efforts by at least five academic peers from outside the university who are at a higher academic rank than the candidate must conclude that the work is of high quality. (This evaluation will be part of the outside letters of evaluation described earlier.)
- e. **Other Evidence of Excellence by Peers**

Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required for documentation of promise of sustained and continued scholarly activity.

Examples of scholarly activities include, but are not limited to:

- a. Publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, research reports, drug utilization reviews, teaching materials, assessment tools, faculty development resources, and case reports that are published in peer-reviewed venues.
- b. Collaboration in basic, educational, translational, and/or clinical research.
- c. Evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of clinical practice on patient care.

C. Service

To be relevant to promotion decisions, service activities must clearly involve a high level of skill in communicating and applying the knowledge of one's professional competence. Documentation of service must evaluate the quality of such service as well as highlight individual efforts that are especially significant. The discussion should identify the nature of the tasks performed and the particular responsibilities of the candidate. When service is a major aspect of a candidate's responsibilities, letters should be solicited from authorities in the field evaluating the quality and impact of the service and its importance to the university.

Evidence of public service includes:

- Consultations to the community and significant advisory work with government, business, or industry.
- Outreach program planning and development.
- Membership on committees and boards.
- Public lectures and presentations.
- Participation in radio, television, and educational television network (ETN) programs.
- Service in official position of public organizations or agencies.
- Publications for nonprofessionals.
 - Testifying at public hearings.
 - Preparation of reports.
 - Membership on site visit teams.

Evidence of university service includes:

- Major committee assignments in the department or the university.
- Chair or associate chair of a department, or dean or associate dean of a school or college.
- Coordinator of statewide outreach programs.
- Special administrative assignments in a department, college, or university.

Evidence of professional service includes:

- Membership on state, regional, or national review panels, study sections, councils, etc.
- Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities.
- Leadership positions on national or international scientific, professional, and educational organizations.
- Leadership in the development of continuing professional education for personnel in the field.

Evidence of clinical service for non-tenure track faculty includes:

- The impact on patient care as documented in part by input from other healthcare professional colleagues.
- Board certification is expected for promotion to the Clinical Associate Professor level.
- Invited presentations in area of clinical expertise.

Specific Standards for Promotion for Various Ranks

Clinical Emphasis (e.g. Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor): Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to clinical practice-based instruction (clinical clerkships), other instruction, and/or clinical service. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor will be based on documentation of distinction in teaching and practice as evidenced by student and peer evaluations, and evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of clinical practice on patient care. The impact on patient care will be documented in part by input from other healthcare professional colleagues. Board certification is a way to document clinical expertise and in most cases is expected for promotion to the Clinical Associate Professor level. Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required for documentation of promise of sustained and continued scholarly activity.

Instructional Emphasis (e.g. Clinical Associate, Clinical Professor, Associate Scholar, Scholar): Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to instruction. Promotion will be based on documentation of distinction in classroom teaching as evidenced by student and peer evaluations and evidence demonstrating the quality of teaching and/or program supervision and its impact on student learning. Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required with documentation of sustained and continued promise of scholarly activity. These scholarly activities may be focused in the area of the faculty member's choosing, consistent with their expertise.

Research Emphasis (e.g. Research Associate Professor or Research Professor): Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to research. It is recognized that faculty members in this track will not usually have an independent research program, but will be key investigators in a research group. Promotion will be based on research productivity commensurate with their effort in research, peer-reviewed publications and extramural research funding as well as peer recognition.

Documentation

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide all required information to be included in the tenure/promotion packets, e.g., teaching evaluations (student and peer evaluations), contract and grant activity, updated listing of publications.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to review the performance of each department faculty member annually. An identified staff member within the department will assist the faculty member in gathering the information for the packet and an identified staff member in the dean's office will assist in coordinating the efforts in completing the packet. These staff members should attend the annual workshops given on tenure and promotion to be current with any rule changes.

Prior to the consideration of a faculty member's nomination, he/she shall review the materials to insure that all information pertinent to the nomination is present. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to see that the tenure and/or promotion materials are complete and factually correct. However, if a faculty member has waived the right to review the letters of recommendation; these may not be reviewed by the faculty member.

If new materials or information (e.g., the chairs letter, notes, etc.) are added to the tenure and/or promotion packet after the commencement of consideration, copies of the new materials must be sent to the faculty member who may, within five days, attach a brief response to the materials.

Withdrawal Procedures and Appeal and Grievance Procedure

- a **Withdrawal Procedures:** Faculty members being considered for tenure prior to the seventh year may withdraw, without prejudice, from the review process on or before March 15th of an academic year if no official action is taken on the nomination, i.e., written communication regarding the denial. The withdrawal requires written mutual agreement between the faculty member and the chair.

- b. **Informal Appeal and Grievance Procedures:** A statement regarding appeal and grievance procedures must be given to any faculty denied tenure and/or promotion (see F.A.C. - 6C1-7.042). If a faculty member who has been denied at any level believes that the university has failed to comply with the university's criteria for tenure or promotion procedures, they may appeal the action. The appeal should begin at the level at which the nomination was denied. Relevant documentation should be included with the appeal. If dissatisfied with the results of the appeal, the faculty member may proceed to the next administrative level.

9. Critical dates

Critical dates of the Tenure and Promotion reviews are outlined in the following Table and are subject to change on an annual basis.

Level	Item	Date
College of Pharmacy	T &P Packet to Individual	June 1 preceding Academic year
	T&P Packet to Departmental Administrators to schedule review by	July 15 of Academic year
Review by Janet Malphurs, Assistant Director/HR Academic Personnel	T&P Packet reviewed in meeting with Candidate, Departmental Administrator, and Janet Malphurs	Week of July 15 of Academic year
	T&P Packet to Chair of Department to be sent (paper copy) to external reviewers	August 1 of Academic year
	T&P Packet reviewed by Department	September 15 of Academic year
	T&P Packet to T&P Committee	October 1 of Academic year
	T&P Packet to Dean	December 1 of Academic year
Vice President for Health Affairs	T&P Packet with Dean's letter	January of Academic year
University(Academic Personnel)	T&P packet with College and HSC letter	January of Academic year

Critical dates of tenure and promotion committee to perform the preliminary review will vary with the appointment date of the candidate. The review will take place within three months of the completion of the first three years of employment if new faculty. In cases where faculty are hired with previous experience, arrangements for review will take place early in the fall term 2 years prior to the candidates application for tenure.

10. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to be included in Tenure Track Faculty Packets

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION:

- A. The criteria for promotion or for granting of tenure shall be relevant to the performance of the work which the faculty member has been assigned to do and to the faculty member's duties and responsibilities as a member of the University community. These criteria recognize three (3) broad categories of academic service as follows:
- Instruction, including regular classroom teaching, direction of theses and dissertations, academic advisement, extension programs, and all preparation for this work including study to keep abreast of one's field.
 - Research or other creative activity including scholarly, peer-reviewed publications.
 - Professional and public service.
- B. Extension service may be inclusive of the three broad categories of academic service described above. Refer to paragraph 6C1-7.010(2)(b) for a detailed description of the duties and responsibilities specifically assigned to extension faculty.
- C. The work for which a faculty member is responsible, as well as the expectation that he or she will abide by the rules and regulations of the University and the laws of the State and the nation, should be made clear to the faculty member at the time of employment and shall be reviewed at subsequent intervals at least annually, since the faculty member's assignment may vary with the passage of time.
- D. The assignment shall also be specified at the time of recommendation for promotion and tenure on the University's tenure and/or promotion nomination packet of information which the faculty member prepares. A copy of the University's Guidelines and Information regarding the Tenure, Permanent Status and Promotion Process, which includes the nomination packet format and which is incorporated herein by reference, may be obtained in the Chairperson's, Dean's or Director's Office or from the Office of the Provost. In most cases, all three types of activities listed in paragraph (A) above will be expected, although the ratios required may vary widely. By way of illustration, a faculty member assigned mostly teaching responsibilities will in most cases be expected to do some research and/or service work. On the other hand, there will be some research personnel who will be assigned no teaching. In most cases, promotion and tenure should require distinction in at least two of the three categories, one of which should be that of the faculty member's primary responsibility, although merit should certainly be regarded as more important than variety of activity. "Distinction" in the categories listed in paragraph (A) shall be defined by each college. Each college shall disseminate annually in writing its criteria for tenure and promotion to all faculty members. The criteria also shall be available from the dean's office in each college. Reviews of nominations for promotion and tenure shall include evidence that review letters from outside the University have been sought for the evaluation of research and creative or extension service activities. In the case of tenure nominations at least five review letters from outside the university must be presented.

TENURE TRACK

The University's criteria for these decisions are described in 6C1-7.019(3), F.A.C. These criteria recognize three broad categories of academic service: instruction, research, and service.

In most cases, promotion and tenure requires distinction in at least two of the categories, one of which should be in the area of primary responsibility, though merit should certainly be regarded as more important than the quantity of activities. The College's view is that the overriding criteria for awarding tenure is that of demonstrated professional excellence and a clear expectation of continued significant value to the University.

"Distinction" is defined as performance that is nationally and/or internationally recognized and contributes to a record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise (promotion to Associate Professor) or performance that is nationally and/or internationally recognized and contributes to a sustained record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise (promotion to Full Professor).

Instruction: Evidence should be presented that the candidate has developed and conducted an instructional program of high quality. Instruction, including regular classroom and/or clinical teaching, direction of research (theses and dissertations), academic advisement, extension programs, and all preparation for this work including study to keep abreast of one's field. Evaluation of effectiveness of instruction will include classroom performance, curriculum materials, which may include educational development activities, and clerkship student evaluation and peer review of teaching.

Research and Other Scholarly Activities: The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to conduct research that reflects original scholarship, makes a contribution to knowledge and shows the likelihood of continued quality performance. These are evidenced by obtaining external funding and peer reviewed publications and other scholarly work.

Service: This could include academic, clinical, and/or professional service. To be relevant to tenure and/or promotion decisions, service activities must clearly involve a high level of skill in communicating and applying the knowledge of one's professional competence. When service is a major aspect of a candidate's assigned responsibilities, evidence should be provided demonstrating the quality and impact of the service.

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor: Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires clear and demonstrable evidence that the candidate has achieved distinction and has developed an independent, well-defined program in at least two of the categories (original research, teaching or service).

Criteria for Promotion to Professor: Promotion to the rank of Professor includes all of the criteria for Associate Professor and requires evidence that the candidate has achieved recognition as a national authority in his or her assigned primary responsibility and has conducted sustained scholarly activity.

11. Criteria for Promotion to be included in Non-Tenure Track Faculty Packets

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION:

A. The criteria for promotion or for granting of tenure shall be relevant to the performance of the work which the faculty member has been assigned to do and to the faculty member's duties and responsibilities as a member of the University community. These criteria recognize three (3) broad categories of academic service as follows:

- Instruction, including regular classroom teaching, direction of theses and dissertations, academic advisement, extension programs, and all preparation for this work including study to keep abreast of one's field.
- Research or other creative activity including scholarly, peer-reviewed publications.
- Professional and public service.

- B. Extension service may be inclusive of the three broad categories of academic service described above. Refer to paragraph 6C1-7.010(2)(b) for a detailed description of the duties and responsibilities specifically assigned to extension faculty.
- C. The work for which a faculty member is responsible, as well as the expectation that he or she will abide by the rules and regulations of the University and the laws of the State and the nation, should be made clear to the faculty member at the time of employment and shall be reviewed at subsequent intervals at least annually, since the faculty member's assignment may vary with the passage of time.
- D. The assignment shall also be specified at the time of recommendation for promotion and tenure on the University's tenure and/or promotion nomination packet of information which the faculty member prepares. A copy of the University's Guidelines and Information regarding the Tenure, Permanent Status and Promotion Process, which includes the nomination packet format and which is incorporated herein by reference, may be obtained in the Chairperson's, Dean's or Director's Office or from the Office of the Provost. In most cases, all three types of activities listed in paragraph (A) above will be expected, although the ratios required may vary widely. By way of illustration, a faculty member assigned mostly teaching responsibilities will in most cases be expected to do some research and/or service work. On the other hand, there will be some research personnel who will be assigned no teaching. In most cases, promotion and tenure should require distinction in at least two of the three categories, one of which should be that of the faculty member's primary responsibility, although merit should certainly be regarded as more important than variety of activity. "Distinction" in the categories listed in paragraph (A) shall be defined by each college. Each college shall disseminate annually in writing its criteria for tenure and promotion to all faculty members. The criteria also shall be available from the dean's office in each college. Reviews of nominations for promotion and tenure shall include evidence that review letters from outside the University have been sought for the evaluation of research and creative or extension service activities. In the case of tenure nominations at least five review letters from outside the university must be presented.

NON-TENURE TRACK

The University's criteria for these decisions are described in 6C1-7.019(3), F.A.C. These criteria recognize three broad categories of academic service: instruction, research, and service. Promotion requires a sustained and significant record of distinction in the area of primary responsibility (instruction, research, or clinical practice), to which the faculty member is assigned annually as well as 1-2 indicators of scholarship per year and service.

Merit will be regarded as more important than the quantity of activities. The College's view is that the overriding criterion for awarding promotion is that of demonstrated professional distinction and a clear expectation of continued significant value to the University.

"Distinction" is defined as performance that makes a significant contribution to knowledge and/or practice.

Criteria: Promotion to Clinical/Research Associate Professor or Associate Scholar Distinction is recognized and contributes to a record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise. Participation in scholarly activity is essential and the candidate should demonstrate an emerging reputation at a regional and/or national scope

Criteria: Promotion to Clinical/Research Professor or Scholar All of the criteria for Associate Professor plus evidence of national or international recognition is achieved and there is a sustained record of excellence in the faculty candidate's field of expertise. Leadership in professional societies and/or extraordinary service to the College of Pharmacy are also expected.

Examples of Scholarship includes, but are not limited to:

- Publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, research reports, drug utilization reviews, teaching materials, assessment tools, faculty development resources, and case reports that are published in peer-reviewed venues.
- Collaboration in basic, educational, translational, and/or clinical research.

Clinical Emphasis (e.g. Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor): Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to clinical practice-based instruction (clinical clerkships), other instruction, and/or clinical service. Promotion will be based on documentation of distinction in teaching and practice as evidenced by student and peer evaluations, and evidence demonstrating the quality and impact of clinical practice on patient care. The impact on patient care will be documented in part by input from other healthcare professional colleagues. Board certification is a way to document clinical expertise and in most cases is expected for promotion. Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required for documentation of promise of sustained and continued scholarly activity.

Instructional Emphasis (e.g. Clinical Associate, Clinical Professor, Associate Scholar, Scholar): Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to instruction. Promotion will be based on documentation of distinction in classroom teaching as evidenced by student and peer evaluations and evidence demonstrating the quality of teaching and/or program supervision and its impact on student learning. Additionally, 1-2 scholarly activities per year are required with documentation of sustained and continued promise of scholarly activity. These scholarly activities may be focused in the area of the faculty member's choosing, consistent with their expertise.

Research Emphasis (e.g. Research Associate Professor or Research Professor): Faculty members on this track have a majority of their effort devoted to research. It is recognized that faculty members in this track will not usually have an independent research program, but will be key investigators in a research group. Promotion will be based on research productivity commensurate with their effort in research, peer-reviewed publications and extramural research funding as well as peer recognition.

College of Pharmacy Sustained Performance Evaluation Plan

1. Announcement and Description of the Program

In 1998 the University of Florida initiated a Sustained Performance Evaluation Program (Post Tenure Review) to formally document sustained performance of a tenured faculty member during the previous six years of assigned duties and to encourage continued professional growth and development. The University guidelines for this program can be found at: <http://regulations.ufl.edu/chapter7/7019.pdf>; page 21-22.

Currently faculty members are evaluated annually by their respective supervisor. The University guidelines have stated that each academic unit is charged with developing and implementing a plan for sustained performance peer review of all faculty in the unit at least once every seven years. The review process should focus on the quality of performance by faculty members on the assigned responsibilities, which usually includes teaching, scholarship, and service. The goal of the review process is to encourage continued professional growth and development and to identify faculty members whose sustained performance is: 1) generally satisfactory; or 2) consistently below satisfactory in one or more areas of responsibility. A performance improvement plan shall be developed for faculty member whose performance evaluation is identified as being consistently below satisfactory in one or more areas of the assigned responsibilities. The purpose of the improvement plan should be one that will result in enhancing the performance of the faculty member so that

subsequent evaluations are satisfactory and will assist and encourage continual professional development.

The following will outline the selection of the evaluating committee, the criteria used to select faculty members to be evaluated, the materials used in the evaluation, the procedures to follow in the review process, and the mechanism by which the faculty member can participate in the review process.

2. Selection of the Evaluating Committee

The members of the committee will consist of all the full professors who serve on the College of Pharmacy tenure and promotion committee. These members will serve as reviewers for the same two-year term as the tenure and promotion committee. The members will choose a chair of the sustained evaluation committee. The chair of the sustained performance evaluation group need not be the chair of the full tenure and promotion committee.

If any member on the committee is being reviewed, they cannot participate on the committee during review of their own performance. If this individual is the chair of the committee, another chair will be selected from the remaining faculty.

If a faculty member is to be reviewed and there is no member of the review committee from that faculty member's home department, the chair of the department will select a full professor from the department to serve as an *ad hoc* member of the sustained performance evaluation committee. In all reviews at least three of the members must be in attendance. Persons with a conflict of interest or apparent conflict of interest should be excluded from the committee during deliberations involving the faculty member with whom there is a conflict.

3. Faculty to Be Evaluated

All faculty members must be evaluated every year by their respective department chair and then, at least, every seven years, under the provisions of the post tenure review statutes. Individuals who serve in administrative capacity will be reviewed for their teaching and research activities by the same procedures, if 50% or less of their assignment is in administration. The seven-year period will begin after the last full evaluation (promotion) by the tenure and promotion committee or after hiring the individual. Faculty members, who have submitted a letter indicating retirement within one year of the seven-year evaluation period, will not be included in the review process. Any faculty member who is selected as a recipient of the State recognized PEP (Professorial Excellence Program) Award or the Professor Pay Plan (Step Plan) will be considered as achieving a satisfactory evaluation, as long as the Chair, Dean and faculty member are in agreement. This is due to the fact that the same committee (full professor subcommittee of the college elected Tenure and Promotion Committee) will evaluate the PEP candidate. The faculty member's seven-year period will begin at the time the award is made.

The individual faculty member under review is responsible for examining all the material in his/her personnel file. The faculty member may request to see the content of the evaluation file that serves as the basis for the annual review and access will be provided. The material in the file should include, but is not restricted to, annual letters of evaluation and individual annual faculty percent effort reports since the last review, and an updated CV. Included with this information should be a summary, term by term, of the faculty member's annual assignment. Also included should be a summary of the faculty member's teaching evaluation, including a summative peer teaching evaluation, and the yearly goals and objectives if these materials were used in the annual evaluations. A summative peer evaluation is a retrospective process that examines a professor's teaching over time and it summarizes the individual's competence as a teacher. A summative peer evaluation is done by faculty, for administration as outlined under official College of Pharmacy policies. Evidence of professional development should be added if appropriate. Copies of publications, grants and patents should

be on hand if requested by the committee. **Items for evaluation can only include information that was used as part of the normal annual review process.**

4. **Review Procedure**

Upon completion of the review, the committee, which is advisory to the chair, will record its finding in writing and provide a copy to the chair for his/her review. In those instances when a faculty member is evaluated as "consistently below satisfactory", the committee shall enumerate the strengths of the candidate and highlight the areas where improvement is necessary and report its findings to the responsible chairman for consideration. The committee can only advise the chair on the development of a performance plan. The faculty member will receive copies of all materials, as will the Dean of the college.

If the faculty member receives a "consistently below satisfactory" rating then a performance improvement plan must be constructed. This plan shall be constructed by the faculty member and the immediate supervisor with recommendations by the reviewing committee and approved by the chair or dean. Specific resources must be identified and the plan must include specific performance targets and time periods for achieving the targets. The chair, in consultation with the dean, shall discuss the improvement plan with the faculty member who is designated as needing improvement. If the plan is not followed, or improvement is not made, then the chair is responsible for taking the appropriate action under provisions 6C1-7.048 of the University rules.

Some level of performance improvement is encouraged for every reviewed faculty member. The purpose of this improvement plan should be one that will result in enhancing the performance of the faculty member in general.

5. **Procedures to Follow**

A list of all faculty eligible for the sustained performance evaluation will be compiled with the number of years since their last evaluation. Faculty will be notified at the beginning of the academic year (July-August) in which they will be reviewed. The criteria for the review process will be provided to the faculty member with a summary of the material that needs to be provided to the committee. **The faculty member will review all materials in the personnel file before it is forwarded to the committee chair by the first of April.** The committee will meet and send their report to the faculty member and respective departmental chair with a copy also going to the Dean. The faculty member will have one month to respond. The chair will likewise have a month to respond. The final report will be completed no later than June. A listing of the faculty identified as unsatisfactory and needing improvement shall be submitted to the Provost and to the Vice President for Health Affairs, with a brief statement about the evaluation plan on or before the end of July. The results of the Chairperson's review of the faculty member's sustained performance can be included in the annual letter of evaluation to the faculty member. In some instances, although the candidate is considered satisfactory, there may be some suggestions for improvement transmitted to the appropriate supervisor.

6. **Mechanism by Which the Faculty Member can Respond to the Review**

If the faculty member disagrees with the chair's assessment or the proposed improvement plan, s/he may appeal. The appeal of the chair's assessment or the performance plan stays within the college with the Dean's decision being final.

7. Critical Dates

Level	Item	Date
College of Pharmacy	Sustained Performance packet to Faculty	July/August of an academic year
	Sustained Performance review to T&P Comm.	April 1 of an academic year
Vice President for Health Affairs	Sustained Performance review to VP	June 30 of an academic year
University (Academic Personnel)	Sustained Performance review to Provost	June 30 of an academic year

Critical Dates of Sustained Performance Evaluations are outlined in the following table and are subject to change on an annual basis.

Salary Adjustment Program for Faculty after Seven Years in Rank as Full Professor- Professor Pay Plan

1. Announcement and Description of the Program

In the Fall 2000 semester the University of Florida implemented a Salary Adjustment Program for tenured full professors – Professor Pay Plan. Under this program, professors are eligible for a nine percent pay increase, based on the performance standards for promotion to professor. **The Pay increase is for the state portion of the contract.** Professors, including Distinguished Professors, Eminent Scholars, Graduate Research Professors, Distinguished Service Professors, Curators, Librarians, and Extension Agents IV, are eligible for this program after seven years from the time of their initial appointment to this title or rank.

To qualify, a professor's record should provide clear evidence that s/he has been highly productive in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service during the previous seven years. A record of distinction in each of these areas is preferable to a significant contribution in only one area. **The salary adjustment is meant for those who have contributed to the full life of the university,** consistent with the faculty member's assignment.

Faculty members who do not receive this salary adjustment, or those that were eligible and elected not to apply, are eligible for (re)consideration three years later. The continuation of the program will be contingent on adequate funding for the University of Florida, so that it can meet its educational obligations as well as fund this program. The President and Provost will determine the university's ability to continue this program.

Once this review process is complete for the eligible faculty, the university will provide salary adjustments for the successful candidates. Faculty who do not receive this salary adjustment after seven years will be eligible for consideration again after their tenth year. If unsuccessful after the tenth year, a faculty member must wait until the completion of the fourteenth year before being eligible again. If a faculty member is unsuccessful after fourteen years, s/he will be considered again after his/her seventeenth year.

2. Process for Evaluating Full Professors for the Salary Adjustment Program

In the first year of this program, all full professors (including Distinguished Professors, Eminent Scholars, Graduate Research Professors, Distinguished Service Professors, Curators, Librarians, and Extension Agents IV) who have completed seven years of service or longer in their current position are to be evaluated by departments and colleges.

The Provost's office will send a list of all eligible professors to the colleges in September and will also give the colleges an approximate number of professors who will receive the salary increase in the current year. It should be expected that some of those recommended will not be funded.

The process for selecting faculty for this pay adjustment will parallel the University's tenure and promotion process. Candidates should submit a full tenure and promotion packet (**excluding** outside letters) that conform to those for normal tenure and promotion, highlighting particularly their activities since the date of their promotion to full professor or the date of their most recent promotion (e.g. to Distinguished Professor). No external or internal letters are necessary for consideration in this process.

All eligible candidates will be evaluated initially in their departments and programs by chairs and program/center directors, with the assistance of the tenure and promotion committee (s) where possible (and using departmental promotion criteria where available). If all full professors are eligible for this award in a department or program, then only the chair or program/center director will review the eligible candidates. Chairs, program/center directors, and committees should review a faculty member's T & P packet, focusing especially on the faculty member's activities during the seven years preceding consideration for this salary adjustment. The chair and/or program/center director should also submit a letter ranking all the candidates and a statement explaining the ranking of each candidate that is no longer than one-half page, single-spaced. If the chair or program/center director is eligible for the salary increase, the dean will rank that person separately. Assistant and associate deans who are eligible will be evaluated within their departments. Chairs and assistant/associate deans will be evaluated on the basis of their teaching, research, and administrative service.

The recommendations of the departments and programs/centers will be reviewed by the Deans of the Colleges, with the assistance of their College Tenure and Promotion committees. If all full professors or a significant majority of full professors on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee are eligible for the nine percent salary adjustment, the Dean may appoint other full professors to advise him/her. The Deans will be expected to rank the candidates. This ranking may be done individually by rank order or by deciles (depending on the size of the college), indicating first which faculty members are the most qualified, with a brief statement explaining why. The Deans and Program Directors will make their recommendations to the Provost (in the Health Science Center and WAS, the Vice Presidents will also make recommendations).

The names of all eligible professors, whether recommended or not by the Deans, shall be sent forward to the Provost. Only those recommended by the Dean for the special pay increase will be reviewed by the Academic Personnel Board. Eligible faculty will be notified as to their recommendation status when the information is provided to the provost. The final decision on these pay raises shall be made by the President and the Provost. The salary adjustments will be retroactive to the beginning of the contract year.

3. Critical Dates

Critical Dates of the Salary Adjustment Program for tenured full professors – Professor Pay Plan are outlined in the following table and are subject to change on an annual basis.

Level	Item	Date
College of Pharmacy	Prof. Pay Plan Packets to Faculty	July/August of an academic year
	Prof. Pay Plan Packet to T&P Comm. & Dean	October 1 of an academic year
Vice President for Health Affairs	Prof. Pay Plan Packet review to VP	November 1 of an academic year
University (Academic Personnel)	Prof. Pay Plan Packet review to Provost	November 15 of an academic year

Dates are subject to change by the Provost.