

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

FOREWORD

This document sets forth the criteria and procedures for awarding promotions and/or tenure to the tenure track faculty in the College of Pharmacy. This document is approved by the Dean of the College and the Provost of the University and is effective as of April 2020.

Departmental guidelines and policies are subject to policies promulgated at the college and university levels. In the case of promotion and tenure, guidelines provided by the Office of the Provost form the basis of all promotion and tenure decisions. While a college or department may choose to implement more rigorous standards than those detailed in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines, a college or department may not implement policies that result implicitly or explicitly in the application of less rigorous standards than detailed in the university-level promotion and tenure guidelines. It is the obligation of the chair of the department to make all new tenured or tenure-track faculty members aware in writing of not only the university-level promotion beyond tenure guidelines but also any college or departmental level policies or procedures that may impact their tenure and/or promotion.

These guidelines for professional evaluation of tenured and tenure-track members of the University of Houston's College of Pharmacy are prepared as a general document without reference to particular individuals or configurations of accomplishment. They do not prescribe a uniform roster of accomplishments that must be achieved by all candidates for tenure or promotion. Rather, they suggest ways of evaluating accomplishments in research, teaching, and service by allowing flexibility in assigning relative weights to these three activities.

Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee are peers who are expected to be knowledgeable regarding the individual's discipline and make their recommendations with assistance of other internal and external experts in the same field. Because of the centrality of peer review to these processes, faculty vested with the responsibility of providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in the review processes, to exercise the standards established in the Faculty Handbook, and the College policies, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

The following guidelines have been prepared by the College of Pharmacy Promotion and Tenure Policy Committee as directed in the most current version of the By-Laws of the College of Pharmacy, University of Houston. The guidelines consist of three sections. Section A describes general procedures that will apply to newly appointed tenure-track faculty during the probationary period. Section B deals with specific procedures for applying for promotions with or without tenure and describes the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor. Section C provides guidelines and suggestion for preparing a comprehensive portfolio. Should the candidate(s) have any questions or need clarification of the policies and procedures, they are to consult with the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the College.

SECTION A

The recommendations contained in Section A and B should be considered in conjunction with the procedures, criteria and standards for promotion and tenure stated in the most recent edition of the Faculty Handbook and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the University of Houston. Special attention should be given to various deadlines, which are indicated in the University guidelines and these dates may vary from year to year.

Faculty Handbook also describes various critical policies such as:

- a. Circumstances where early promotion with tenure may be granted;
- b. Grievance procedures for situations when promotion or promotion with tenure are denied;
- c. Termination of the appointment;
- d. Probationary period before considered for tenure and circumstance for extension of the probationary period;
- e. Time-frame for Notice of Nonrenewable contract of a Faculty member.

General procedures that will apply for tenure track faculty

- a. Evaluation by the Chair: It is recommended that tenure track faculty members should be reviewed annually by the department chair who notifies the faculty member in writing of their progress or lack thereof. More frequent reviews by the chair may be conducted if the situation dictates. During the third probationary year, the faculty member must undergo a complete departmental review. Termination procedures may result from any of these reviews.
- b. Third Year Review: the review involves an in-depth, critical analysis of progress toward achieving promotion and tenure. A negative recommendation may result in a one year non-renewable appointment or the candidate may be requested to undergo a fourth year review. The review is internal to the University of Houston and will be conducted at the departmental level. The departmental committee will be composed of at least one member from outside the department but from within the College of Pharmacy and another from outside the College of Pharmacy. If a recommendation for reappointment is made, it should state when the next mandatory review is to be held. The assessment and recommendation must be forwarded to the Departmental Chair and to the Dean of the College.

The Dean should in case of a negative recommendation for reappointment, inform the individual and the department as to any mandatory reviews prior to the sixth year review. The Dean should also communicate to the individual that such a review may be specific to a particular criterion or overall criteria that the candidate must meet for consideration for Promotion with Tenure.

- c. Fourth or Fifth Year Review: A fourth year review will be mandated if the results of the third year review are judged to be less than exemplary. Similarly, a fifth year review will be mandated if the results of the fourth year review are judged to be less than exemplary. Both reviews will be conducted at the department level and follow the procedures indicated in the section describing the third year review, the outcomes will be clearly communicated to the Departmental Chair and the Dean of the College. The Dean of the College will communicate the outcomes to the candidate. A negative recommendation may result in a recommendation to terminate appointment.
- d. Tenure Review: Department chairs are responsible for reviewing all persons applying for tenure and promotion in the department and for writing a recommendation letter. The letter must address the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and justify the recommendation. Justification for each recommendation should be clearly and fully stated.

In the event of an initial negative recommendation, candidates may ask for reconsideration in writing of the chair's decision to rebut statements made or to offer new information for the review. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the chair. After the reconsideration, the chair shall respond in writing to the candidate. The chair may choose to comment on any new evidence offered, but is not required to do so. If the recommendation after reconsideration remains unchanged, the chair need not prepare any further justification and may stand by their initial justification.

The chair is responsible for ensuring that the chair's decision, and any reconsideration letters are included in the candidate's electronic folder prior to college-level review. University policy mandates that no extraneous materials be included in the candidate's electronic folder prior to college-level review. Examples

of extraneous materials include letters of support solicited by the candidate and information in the candidate's personnel file.

The Promotion and Tenure committee (P&T) of the College of Pharmacy is responsible for reviewing all persons applying for promotion and tenure within the College and for writing a recommendation letter. The letter must address the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and justify the recommendation. The P&T committee is responsible for correcting any errors in the evaluation that were caused by procedural problems during the chair's review. The committee's findings are shared in writing with the applicant and the Dean.

The Dean, in consultation with the college P&T committee, is responsible for reviewing all persons applying for tenure and promotion in the college and for writing a recommendation letter. The letter must address the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and justify the recommendation. Justification for each recommendation should be clearly and fully stated. Moreover, justifications should address the merits of each individual case and should not be mere summaries or restatements of earlier assessments. The Dean is responsible for conducting an independent review that corrects any errors in the evaluation that were caused by procedural problems during previous reviews.

In the event of an initial negative recommendation, candidates may request, in writing reconsideration of the committee's and/or Dean's decisions. This process is designed for faculty members to rebut statements made or to offer new information. The reconsideration may not question the professional judgment of the reviewer or review body. After the reconsideration, the reviewer or review body shall respond in writing to the candidate. The reviewer or review body may choose to comment on any new evidence offered, but is not required to do so. If the recommendation after reconsideration remains unchanged, the reviewer or review body need not prepare any further justification and may stand by their initial justification.

The Dean is responsible for ensuring that the committee's votes and their justification, the Dean's Decision, and any rehearing letters are included in the candidate's electronic folder prior to university-level review, by the last class day of the fall semester. University policy mandates that no extraneous materials be included in the candidate's electronic folder prior to the university review. Examples of extraneous materials include letters of support solicited by the candidate, information in the candidate's personnel file, letters from committee members expressing individual or minority opinions, etc. (Guidelines for the appointment of members of this committee are stated in College By-Laws).

Candidates may update their portfolios before the materials are sent to the next level.

After the Provost's final decision, applicants may initiate a grievance within 30 calendar days of receipt of the Provost's letter.

A department has the option to develop departmental review policies for the final tenure review. However, the College policies take precedence over departmental policies, as stated in the University guidelines.

SECTION B

Procedure for Applying for Promotion with Tenure and/or Promotion

1. In addition to reviewing the following document, the candidates are strongly advised to consult with his or her departmental Chair and/or the Chair of the P&T Committee before proceeding with the application.
 - a. College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
 - b. The Faculty Handbook (latest edition)
 - c. Promotion and Tenure policies and Instructions provided annually by the Provost to the Deans, Directors, and Departmental Chairs.
2. The FORMAT and the order of the candidate's portfolio to be uploaded into the University Promotion and Tenure SharePoint site (consistent with university guidelines) will be as follows:

- a. Face Sheet
 - b. Transmittal Letters (to be inserted by the P&T Committee)
 - i. Dean to the Provost
 - ii. College Committee to the Dean
 - iii. Departmental Chair to the Dean (Chair's evaluation of the credentials of the candidates and recommendations)
 - iv. Departmental committee to the chair of the department (Departmental Option)
 - c. Curriculum Vitae
 - d. External Review letters (to be inserted by the Chair of the department)
 - e. Other information
 - i. Teaching Support Documents
 - ii. Research Support Documents
 - iii. Service Support Documents
 - iv. Other Supporting Documents
 - v. Appendix
3. External Reviewers and Concise Portfolio:
- a. The candidate and the departmental Chair will each recommend to the P&T Committee the names, addresses (including E-Mail), phone and fax numbers of five potential arm's length external reviewers. These reviewers should be individuals with outstanding national and/or international reputations and at the forefront of the candidate's discipline. The suggested reviewers must be at, or above, the rank for which the applicant is applying for promotion. This means for promotion from assistant to associate professor, both associate and full professors can be listed, but for promotion from associate to full professor, only full professors can be suggested. The external reviewers should be selected from departments similar or higher in rank to the corresponding UHCOP Department. The P&T Committee will select six to eight reviewers from this list. A minimum of four external letters are required for promotion to either associate professor or full professor. The chair of the department is responsible for soliciting letters from the list submitted by the P&T Committee. If four external letters cannot be obtained from the list, the chair of the department will request more names of potential external reviewers from the chair of the P&T Committee. However, all letters that are received from external reviewers must be included in the candidate's portfolio.
- The candidate, in addition, will electronically send to the Chair, a Concise Portfolio consisting of all pertinent information and documentation requested by the P&T committee that are necessary for an external reviewer to make a just evaluation. The Concise Portfolio must be sent to the Chair no later than the first day of the month of July. These documents in general include:
- i. Statement by the candidate describing his/her long term academic goals during the post tenure period; (limited to three double space typed pages)
 - ii. Curriculum Vitae;
 - iii. Copies of the most recent and important publications (no more than six) of the candidate;
 - iv. Any other materials, requested by the P&T Committee or as deemed necessary by the candidate.
- It is recommended that the candidate, prior to compiling the Concise Portfolio, consult the University of Houston Faculty Handbook to review the questions that the external reviewers will be asked to address.
- b. The names, departments and telephone numbers of two faculty members of the University Houston, from outside the College of Pharmacy, who are deemed suitable to act as external members of the P&T Committee. The candidate and Departmental Chair should each submit one name. The Committee will usually select one of the individuals, but has the right to choose different individuals than those nominated. In such case, both the candidate and chair of the department will be notified. If the candidate objects to

the choice of an external members, he/she must provide written justification to the chair of the committee.

4. The electronic Complete Portfolio prepared by the candidate will be submitted online to the Promotion and Tenure SharePoint Site by mid-August. The Departmental Chair and/or the department committee (optional) will evaluate the portfolio along with the external reviewers' recommendations, and will inform the candidate of recommendations in writing. The Departmental Chair will communicate these recommendations to the Dean of the College in the form of a letter together with any rebuttal letters of the candidate. These letters and the candidate's portfolio will be forwarded to the Chair of the P&T Committee.

Criteria for Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

Performance of the candidate in all three categories, namely, Teaching, Research/Scholarship and Service, will be evaluated. The candidate will have contributed significantly, demonstrated excellence in these categories and show potential for continued success during the post-tenured period.

1. **Teaching:** A record of accomplishment in teaching at the professional and graduate level, which include formal class room and/or laboratory instruction and graduate research instruction; the magnitude, quality, of the candidates teaching, level of difficulty of the course content and innovation in teaching methods will be considered. Documentation should be vigorous and comparable to that required to substantiate excellence in research

Documentation for Excellence in Teaching:

- a. Courses taught (year, number of students, number of lecture and/or laboratory hours, time spent in experiential teaching).
 - b. Teaching Evaluations: students as well as peer-level evaluations (which may include that of physicians from clinical service teams).
 - c. Copies of Course syllabi and examinations.
 - d. Pre and post-doctoral students and/or fellows and or residents trained and in training.
 - e. Evidence for dissemination of teaching (e.g. authorship of book or chapters in book).
 - f. Awards, publications and invited presentations dealing with teaching skills.
 - g. Grants received for teaching developments/innovations.
 - h. Contributions to curriculum development.
 - i. Workshops participated/conducted at local and national level.
 - j.
2. **Research and scholarship:** A record of scholarly accomplishment in research independent of the candidate's mentors recognized at the national level. Factors will include but not be limited to the ability to secure competitive and reviewed funding from sources such as the National Institutes of Health, Department of Defense, National Science Foundation, and other extramural peer reviewed funding sources. Importantly, the extramural funding must result in publications in high quality peer reviewed journals. The number and quality of publications is expected to be commensurate with peers at similar career stages and from departments ranked similar or higher in rank to the corresponding UHCOP department. The topical nature of the research work and letters of reference from acknowledged experts in the candidate's field are essential factors in the assessment of the candidate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to submit appropriate documentation.

Documentation for Excellence in Research:

- a. Publications
- b. Citations
- c. Patents
- d. Research grant
- e. Contract support: Research and education
- f. Non-funded applications for Research grants and contract support
- g. Invited lectures
- h. Research collaborations

3. **Service:** The candidate is expected to demonstrate good citizenship in the member of various committees, dealing with the College and University governance, and academic activities in the recruitment of professional and graduate students and participation in faculty meeting, student associations and activities and ceremonial activities such as Commencement exercises. The fact that a faculty member during the probationary period may not be assigned extensive committee duties will be taken into consideration. However, it should be noted that good citizenship includes several other activities that are unrelated to committee duties. Candidates with significant patient care responsibilities should demonstrate excellence as clinical pharmacists and serve as role models to trainees and peers.

Documentation required for Service (where applicable):

- a. Participation in the committees, relative importance of the committee(s)
- b. Task forces
- c. Reviewing grant proposal (local and national), manuscripts and published books
- d. Service to professional societies and to local, state and federal institutions
- e. Serving on editorial board of professional journals
- f. Community service to religious and civic groups
- g. Participation in College and University activities, such as convocations, commencements
- h. Letters of evaluation from peers and/or supervisors of the Supervising Department in the medical Section/Institution where patient care activities are performed.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

There is no probationary period for consideration of a tenured Associate Professor for promotion to Full Professor under Category I.

- I. The candidate will demonstrate excellence in all the three categories, namely, teaching, research/scholarship and service. The candidate will have contributed a significant body of original and innovative scholarship to the field and will be an acknowledged expert in his/her discipline as evidenced by invited participation in national and international symposia, study sections.
- II. Recruiting a faculty member as a Full Professor:
A candidate who has been a Tenured Associate Professor at some other institution cannot be appointed as a Full Professor in the College of Pharmacy at the time of his appointment until the Promotion & Tenure Committee conducts an expedited review of his/her credentials and advises the Dean that they meet the criteria of the college as stated under I above.

SECTION C

Guidelines for the preparation of Portfolio

The Promotion and Tenure Policy Committee offers the following suggestions and guidelines for completing an appropriate portfolio. The candidate; however, may provide any additional documentation which may support his/her accomplishments. The candidate is also urged to make a statement describing self-evaluation of his/her achievements in each of the three categories and any explanations for deficiencies.

1. TEACHING

In order to receive merit for excellence in teaching, the following documentation is essential.

- a) List all courses taught or team taught. Give your percentage involvement in each course and if you were or are the course coordinator. Distinguish between laboratory courses, tutorials and lecture courses.
- b) Teaching Evaluations may be summarized in single form which should be documented by the scores of all the courses participated in during the period of Assistant Professors and Associate Professors hired without tenure. Associate Professors with tenure will summarize

documentation of the scores of all courses participated in since the last promotion. Submit a copy of the teaching evaluation form and an explanation of how it was used and scored. Submit the recorded scores based on number of students and response rate (%), comparative scoring in team taught courses and comparative rank in the department. For clinical faculty, documentation of teaching effectiveness by the attending physician(s) should be provided.

- c) Teaching Awards and/or Nomination for Awards.
- d) Development of course content and/or new courses including innovations in teaching techniques, audio visual materials, etc.
- e) Other: Documentation requirements for some of the sub-categories listed under “Research & Scholarly Activities” would also apply to demonstrate excellence in “Teaching”. These categories include, grant support received, publications, presentations, etc.

2. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

- a) Area of Interest. Area of
Give a summary of your area or areas of research interest and expertise, including a brief summary of your future research goals.
- b) Financial Support.
 - i. External Sponsored Support
List all applications for grants and/or contracts submitted to external funding agencies. Divide the applications into three groups: funded, non-funded and pending. For each application, state your role in the project (e.g., Principal Investigator, Co-Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, Consultant, Collaborator, etc.). If the application is a Program Project or Group submission, give percent involvement. Give names of funding agencies, full titles of applications, dates submitted, amount of dollars funded/requested, and duration of the projects. Provide the priority number obtained on N.I.H grants which were not funded and include the critique. It is realized that many applications which are approved are highly meritorious but are not funded because of an insufficiency of agency funds. (Such documentation may be placed in the appendix).
 - ii. Internally Sponsored Support.
Please provide the same information as requested in (bi) above and include the dollar support obtained and identify the source (department, college, university).
- c) Publications
 - i. Refereed Publications
 - (i) Papers
 - (ii) Review articles
 - (iii) Monographs or chapters in books
 - (iv) Authorship of books
 - (v) Other
Give the authors’ names as they appear on the publication, the complete title of the work, the full name of the periodical, the volume, inclusive pagination and year of publication (If the contribution of the candidate in a major publication is not readily obvious, provide an indication as to your role or extent of involvement in the publication).
 - ii. Non-refereed Publications (At the level of the University, non-refereed publications are generally considered to represent service rather than research and scholarly activities).
 - (i) Papers
 - (ii) Review articles
 - (iii) Monographs or chapters in books

- (iv) Authorship of books
- (v) Other
- d) Seminars and Presentations
 - i. At the University of Houston
 - ii. At other institutions
 - iii. At professional meetings (Refereed or Non-refereed; invited or voluntary: provide titles and dates)
- e) Served as Major Advisor
 - i. M.S. Students
 - ii. Ph.D. Students
 - iii. Postdoctoral Residents

List full name of students, title of project, dissertation or thesis and dates. End the list with students currently under your direction.
- f) Awards for Research/Scholarly Activity.
List and give details.
- g) Other

3. SERVICE

- a) Professional activities associated with the University of Houston
 - i. Committees and/or Board
 - ii. Task forces
 - iii. Governance bodies (e.g. , Senate)
 - iv. Reviewing internal and external grant proposals
 - v. Graduate student committees (not a major advisor)
 - vi. Sponsorship of student organizations
 - vii. Continuing education courses and/or lectures
 - viii. Professional consultations with other college or college colleagues in relation to teaching and research/scholarly activities
 - ix. Career Days and other recruiting activity
 - x. Any other service activity contributing to welfare of the University or College
 - xi. Recognition and Awards
- b) Professional activities associated with extra-institutional functions
 - i. Professional committees and/or Boards (including editorial or advisory boards for journals)
 - ii. Officer ships in local, state, or national societies
 - iii. Reviewing papers, grants and/or books
 - iv. Consultant activities: (a) Service in a professional capacity (non-profit); (b) Service for a set fee
 - v. Graduate student committees at other institutions
 - vi. Society memberships (a) non-elected; (b) elected
 - vii. Planning and/or hosting a regional, state, national or international meeting
 - viii. Significant community service, e.g. Pharmaceutical Care, etc.
 - ix. Any other function demanding your time and expertise which promotes the College, university or profession
- c) Patient-care responsibilities and clinical service
 - i. Description of clinical service or practice responsibilities (e.g., number of months of on-site and off-site active service, daily patient loads, or other forms of engagement in the practice of pharmacy including patient rounding, clinic days, and/or individual consultation).
- d) Non-Professional, Personal Activities (Optional)

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE – TENURE TRACK

Appendix

- a) A copy of the letter sent to the outside reviewers (to be inserted by the Department Chairman)
- b) Legible copies or reprints of selected publications (limited to 6 publications)
- c) Resumes and critiques of non-funded research proposals (optional)
- d) Any relevant correspondence between the candidate and the Chair of the P&T Committee; the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the P&T committee; or the Dean of the College and Chair of the P&T committee (to be inserted by the P&T Committee Chair)

REVIEW AND RESPONSIBILITY

Responsible Party: COP Promotion and Tenure Committee

Review: Required every five years by the University.

APPROVAL



04/10/2020

Committee/Department/Unit

Date

FACULTY

04/09/2020

Faculty approval

Date



04/13/2020

Dean

Date

REVISION LOG

Revision Number	Approved Date	Description of Changes
1	08/08/2006	Initial version – Task force members included Drs. McCormick, Bond, Gupta, Hu, Jandhyala, Williams, Tam, Lewis, Sansgiry
2	05/01/2013	Updated to meet with university regulations regarding electronic submissions – Drs. Alkadhi, Bond, Chow, Essien, Ruan
3	10/09/2015	Statement included at request of Provost's office. Typos amended.
4	11/04/2015	Format adjustment

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE – TENURE TRACK

5	03/29/2016	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Verbiage added to the foreword at direction of legal counsel. 2. Ad-hoc committee members removed from foreword and added to revision log. Committee members included Drs. Alkadhi, Bond, Chow, Essien, Ruan. 3. Foreword - Date of first version removed. Sentence changed to reflect that the policy is directed by the most current version of the UHCOP By-Laws. 4. Section A – first paragraph – additions from General Counsel re. criteria and standards in the Faculty handbook and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the University of Houston Critical policies in Faculty handbook point b) changed by General Counsel. 5. Section A – General Procedures that will apply for tenure track faculty – d) Tenure Review – Amendments by General Counsel to comply with university policies. Also included that candidates may update their portfolio before the materials are sent to the next level. Removed “In addition to the departmental review a final review will be conducted by the Promotion and Tenure committee (P&T) of the College of Pharmacy”. Removed “Recommendations of this committee will be communicated in writing to the Dean of the College”. 6. Section B – mid-August timeline. Updated to state the Departmental Chair and/or the department committee (optional) will evaluate the portfolio “along with the external reviewers’ recommendations”. 7. Section C,1, b) – word probationary removed and the following added “of Assistant Professors and Associate professors hired without tenure. Associate Professors with tenure will summarize documentation of the scores of all courses participated in since the last promotion”. 8. Section C,2,b),i – “funded” added to amount of dollars funded/requested.
6	4/8/2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ad-hoc P&T committee members who participated in the revision included Drs. Das, Bond, Alkadhi, Essien, Tam and Ruan. 2. Section B, 3 – Added clarifications on the recommendations for reviewers. 3. Section B, 3 – States that reviewers must be at or above the rank of the candidate for promotion giving specific examples. 4. Section B, 3 – States that departments from which reviewers are selected must be from similar or higher rank than the UHCOP department of the candidate for promotion. 5. Section B, 3 –“Letters from the individuals who have worked with the candidate are unacceptable” was removed from the document; however, this requirement continues to be implied in the process. 6. Section B, 3 – Addition of “A minimum of 4 letters is required for promotion to associate or full professor.” 7. Section B, 3 – States, “all letters received must be included in the candidate’s portfolio.”

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE – TENURE TRACK

		<p>8. Section B, 4 – Addition of word “all” in paragraph that defines criteria for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure.</p> <p>9. Section B, Research and scholarship – Addition of, “Department of Defense” and “other extramural peer reviewed funding sources.” Deletion of American Heart Association.</p> <p>10. Section B, Research and scholarship – Addition of, “The number and quality of publications is expected to be commensurate with peers at similar career stages and from departments ranked similar or higher in rank to the corresponding UHCOP Department.”</p> <p>11. Section B, Documentation for Excellence in Research – addition of “citations” in the list.</p>
--	--	---

Reviewed and Approved by
the Office of the Provost



Signed on May 14, 2021