

Procedures for Tenure-track Promotion and Tenure Decision-Making
College of Pharmacy, University of Iowa
January 2006

I. Introduction

- A. The procedures presented in this document ("College of Pharmacy Procedures") implement the University's "Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision -Making" (April 2005) ("University Procedures") for the College of Pharmacy.

Although these procedures incorporate significant portions of the University Procedures they do not include all their potentially relevant provisions. Accordingly candidates should also familiarize themselves with the University Procedures.

1. These Procedures rely upon several principles: (a) decisions granting or denying tenure or promotion should be based on a written record of achievement, (b) the content of the record that will be relied upon should be known by the candidate and the decision-makers, (c) except for variation related to the nature of the candidate's academic activity, the content of the record should be the same for all candidates, (d) the governing procedures should be the same for all candidates and applied consistently to all candidates.
2. These Procedures use the term "promotion" to refer to both promotion and tenure, except where they clearly distinguish between them.

- B. General Guiding Policies for the College of Pharmacy.

1. The faculty will be compliant with all University of Iowa policies, regulations and mandated procedures as appropriate and relevant to the issues of promotion and tenure.
2. The faculty recognize that all promotion recommendations will be made by persons that have achieved (at least) the rank / status sought.
3. Each faculty member will be allowed to vote only once during a specific, defined promotion cycle.
4. The academic divisions of the College of Pharmacy will operate as "departments," as defined by the University of Iowa in matters of promotion and tenure. The academic division head shall serve as Departmental Executive Officer.
5. Directions at the time of the initial appointment and/or during continued appointment to the college faculty by the Dean and/or the Division Head concerning the individual's focus of effort, time commitment to service work, and other activities should be honored and taken into consideration when the faculty member is considered for promotion.

- C. Terminology

1. Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG) is the College-wide faculty promotion committee. (See Section II.C.)
2. Division Consulting Group (DCG) is the committee from the candidate's academic division. (See Section II.A.)
3. Promotion Manager/Division Head is the individual who assists the

candidate in the promotion process, writes the division head's recommendation, and presents the promotion case to the CCG. Usually the individual is the candidate's academic division head, except in cases of conflict of interest. In cases of conflict of interest, the Dean will appoint a tenured full professor from the candidate's academic division to serve as the Promotion Manager/Division Head. In this document the term "Promotion Manager/Division Head" will be used.

- D. The qualifications of a candidate for promotion will be determined on the basis of the Promotion Record, which will include the following:
1. candidate's educational and professional history:
 2. a section on the candidate's teaching, including:
 - a. the candidate's personal statement on teaching,
 - b. documentation of peer and student evaluation of the candidate's teaching,
 - c. other materials including publications and presentations related to the candidate's teaching, and
 - d. an evaluation of the candidate's teaching prepared by the DCG subcommittee as described in III.C.
 3. a section on the candidate's scholarship, including:
 - a. the candidate's personal statement on scholarship,
 - b. internal peer evaluation of the candidate's scholarship,
 - c. other materials related to the candidate's scholars,
 - d. internal and external reviews of the candidate's scholarship compiled by the DCG as described in III.D.
 4. a section on the candidate's service including:
 - a. the candidate's personal statement on service,
 - b. documentation of peer evaluation of the candidate's service,
 - c. other materials related to the candidate's service, and
 - d. an evaluation of the candidate's service prepared by DCG as described in III.E.
 5. supplementary material added to the Promotion Record as expressly provided in these procedures (see the candidate's dossier, page 6) or the University Procedures.
 6. The "Recommendation for Faculty Promotion" cover sheet (see Appendix A);
 7. The summary of the discussion of the CCG prepared by the chair;
 8. The Dean's letter of recommendation on the promotion to the Provost; and
 9. Candidate letter(s) (if any) responding to (a) the DCG evaluations of the candidate's teaching, scholarly activity, and service, (b) external reviews of the candidate's scholarship, (c) the DCG report of the faculty peer group discussion concerning the candidate's qualifications, (d) the division head's recommendation, and (e) the Dean's letter of recommendation to the Provost.

II. Committees

A. Divisional Consulting Group (DCG)

1. Membership

All tenured faculty members from the academic division of the candidate at or above the rank being sought by the candidate are voting members of the Committee, except the Division head

and the Collegiate Consulting Committee member. The Division Head is a non-voting, ex officio member of the DCG. A faculty member from the Division who is on the Collegiate Consulting Group is excluded from all activities of the DCG. The DCG shall elect a chair from the voting membership to conduct the discussions, to write the report of the DCG assessment, and transmit the report to the Promotion Manager/Division Head.

If the DCG has less than the required four faculty members from the division, the Division Head with the approval of the Dean will appoint qualified College of Pharmacy tenured faculty from other divisions to the DCG. The DCG members from external divisions will not participate in the peer observation of teaching. In the event that the faculty member being reviewed has a joint appointment with another College or it is warranted to include a faculty member from another College, the outside faculty member will be selected with the joint approval of the DEO's of both Colleges. The Division Head is ex officio to the DCG and does not count toward the required four members.

2. Duties

The DCG, acting as a committee of the whole, will review the candidate's teaching, service, and scholarly activity from the information in the candidate's dossier. The DCG chair or a designee will draft each section of the DCG report. After the external review letters have been read, a discussion of the external reviews will be held. The DCG chair or a designee will draft a summary of the external reviews. Differences in the internal and external reviews of scholarly activity must be explained as part of this section of the DCG report. The DCG chair or a designee will draft each section of the DCG report noting particularly that the section on the internal review of scholarly activity must be written prior to the voting members of the DCG reading the external letters concerning scholarly activity.

Upon completion of the DCG report sections on the internal reviews of teaching, service and scholarly activity plus the external reviews of scholarly activity, a secret ballot will be taken on the motion to recommend the candidate for promotion/tenure to the rank being sought. The vote tally will be included in the report. A majority vote will constitute a positive recommendation. Finally, the justification for the vote must be presented. All voting DCG members must have the opportunity to review the DCG report/recommendation before it is finalized, signed by all members, and sent to the Division Head.

In the case of a joint appointment, the Procedures described in the University Procedures, Appendix E shall be followed. Consultation with the DEO of the other department shall begin in the spring of the academic year prior to the review year to allow sufficient time for the procedural complexities that arise in the review of candidates holding joint appointments.

B. Promotion Manager/Division Head

The Division Head serves as the promotion manager for candidates from his/her academic division except in cases of conflict of interest. The Division Head is an ex officio member of the Division Consulting Group. The division head writes a recommendation on the promotion after receipt of the DCG report.

C. Collegiate Consulting Group (CCG)

1. Membership

One tenured full professor from each academic division will be elected by the tenure track faculty of that division and approved by the Dean. The election of new members to the CCG will be held between January 1 and February 1. If in the event the elected division member is not approved by the Dean or is unable to serve, the division must conduct another election immediately. The Division Heads and the Dean are not eligible for CCG membership. The Dean will select the chair of the Collegiate Consulting Group from the elected members. Membership on this committee is for a three-year term. Committee members are not eligible for re-election and must wait at least three years before serving again on the CCG.

2. Duties

The CCG chair supervises the promotion and tenure process on behalf of the Dean of the College. The CCG reviews the candidate's dossier, the internal reviews of teaching, scholarship, and service, the external reviews of scholarship, the Division Consulting Group report and the Promotion Manager/Division Head recommendation, and responses, if present, from the candidate. After a discussion of the aforementioned items, a vote of the CCG is conducted. A majority vote will constitute a positive recommendation. The CCG chair or a designee drafts the CCG recommendation, which includes the vote tally plus an explanation of differences, if any, from the DCG recommendation and/or the Division Head recommendation. Comments on the candidate's response to either the DCG report or the Promotion Manager/ Division Head recommendation must be included. Each CCG member must have the opportunity to review the CCG recommendation before it is signed by the members and sent to the Dean of the College.

III. Creation of the Promotion Record

A. Notifications, Responsibilities and Deadlines

1. The University Procedures authorize candidates to be reviewed earlier than the time period normally required for tenure review. In the event that a College of Pharmacy tenure-track candidate seeks early review, the candidate must give written notification to the Dean on or before March 1 that she/he wishes a promotion decision to be made.
2. It is the responsibility of the Dean to inform the candidate and the candidate's academic division head in writing by March 1 that a promotion decision will be made in the academic year beginning July 1 and that she/he must submit a promotion dossier.
3. It is the responsibility of the Promotion Manager/Division Head to advise and assist the candidate in compiling the dossier in a manner that ensures, to the greatest extent possible, that it serves as a fair and accurate evaluation of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, and is not purely a record of advocacy for the candidate.
4. A summary of deadlines for the promotion process is provided below. All activities must be performed on or before these dates:

Academic year before March 1: Any candidate whose teaching assignments fall outside of the April 1 to September 15 period described below must initiate the peer observation of teaching process by informing their Promotion Manager/Division Head at a time sufficiently

early to allow the Promotion Manager/Division Head to notify the DCG Chair, for the DCG Chair to appoint two voting DCG members as observers (one of whom must be a full professor), and for the peer observation of teaching to occur.

March 1: Candidates for whom a promotion decision is required in the next academic year are notified in writing by the Dean.

March 1: Candidates seeking an early promotion decision, or those seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, must notify the Dean in writing of their intention.

March 15: All candidates for promotion/tenure on the tenure track must make an appointment to meet with their Promotion Manager/Division Head to discuss the promotion process and begin the process of selecting names of potential external reviewers.

April 1: The DCG meets and elects a voting member to be the chair. The chair appoints two voting members, one of whom must be a full professor, to observe and evaluate the candidate's teaching and to write the report. The chair also establishes the meeting schedule.

June 1: Every candidate for promotion/tenure on the tenure track must submit to the Promotion Manager/Division Head a list of potential external reviewers and a CV for use by the external reviewers. The CV will include normal biographical information plus candidate-prepared scholarly activity data for use by the external reviewers.

July 1: The Promotion Manager/Division Head writes the invited external reviewers, using as a basis the form letter in the University Procedures, seeking participation in the promotion process. The Promotion Manager/Division Head is encouraged to call potential external reviewers in advance to assess their willingness to serve.

September 1: Candidates for promotion present their dossiers to the Promotion Manager/Division Head.

September 15: The Promotion Manager/Division Head distributes the following items to the DCG Chair: the candidate's dossier, the report resulting from the DCG internal review of teaching, the external reviewer materials (a list of persons from whom letters were requested, copies of letters received by external reviewers, and CVs of letter writers).

September 20: The DCG meets to review the promotion record, including the evaluation of teaching report, and to complete its internal evaluations of teaching, scholarly activity, and service. These internal reviews are completed before the DCG members read the external reviews of scholarship.

September 25: The summary of the internal peer evaluation completed by the DCG is given to the Promotion Manager/Division Head who will immediately send a copy to the candidate.

Five business days after the receipt of the above information: The candidate will have submitted, if desired, a letter correcting factual errors in the internal peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarly activity, and service to the Promotion Manager/Division Head, who will send this to the Chair of the DCG. The Promotion Manager/Division Head will provide all letters from external reviewers to the Chair of the DCG.

October 10: The DCG members meet to evaluate the external reviews of scholarly activity, along with any factual corrections to internal review provided by the candidate. The DCG finalizes its consideration of all internal and external evaluations and votes on the promotion case. The DCG chair transmits the DCG summary report including the vote and the promotion record to the Promotion Manager/Division Head. The Promotion Manager/Division Head uses these items to write his/her recommendation. The DCG chair transmits a copy of the summary report to the candidate. This copy of the report will be redacted as needed to protect the confidentiality of any individual contributions.

Five business days after the receipt of the above information: The candidate will have submitted, if desired, a letter correcting factual errors in the DCG summary report. This letter is submitted to the Promotion Manager/Division Head and entered into the promotion record.

October 24: The Promotion Manager/Division Head hand delivers a copy of the Division Head's recommendation to the candidate if the recommendation is against promotion. If a request for Promotion Record is to be made, the candidate will inform the Promotion Manager/Division Head within five working days so that the external letters can be redacted to protect the confidentiality of the individual reviewers, and then the candidate has sufficient time to read the letters and write a response prior to November 24.

On or before one business day prior to November 24: The candidate hand delivers a written acknowledgement of the receipt of the DCG report and the Division Head's recommendation (if negative) to the Promotion Manager/Division Head. This written acknowledgement may contain responses and corrections to the Promotion Manager/Division Head's letter.

November 24: The CCG chair receives the promotion dossier prepared by the candidate, all appendices to the dossier, all internal and external reviews, the DCG report, and the Division head's recommendation plus any candidate-generated responses to the internal reviews, and/or DCG and the Promotion Manager/Division Head recommendations. The CCG makes and distributes copies of all documents to the CCG members.

December 7: The CCG meets to discuss the promotion case. The Promotion Manager/Division Head presents the case of the candidate and provides any additional information to the CCG. The CCG chair writes the CCG report including the recommendation, its basis, and a vote of the committee members. A minority report, if present, should be attached.

December 15: The CCG summary report and vote is delivered to the Dean. If the CCG issues a recommendation that is negative and contrary to that of the DCG or the Promotion Manager/Division Head for the promotion of the candidate, the CCG report will be provided to the candidate. The candidate will then have 5 working days to request a copy of the promotion record.

December 31: The candidate, having received a negative recommendation by the CCG, must provide any written response to the Dean. This written response will be placed in the Promotion Record by the Dean.

January 15: The Dean writes his/her recommendation and sends it to the Provost. If recommending against promotion, the Dean will provide the candidate with a copy of the Dean's letter to the Provost. The candidate will then have 5 working days to request a copy of the promotion record.

February 1: The candidate may write a response to the Dean's negative recommendation and any additional information to be included in the Promotion Record. This letter is sent to the Provost with a copy to the Dean on or before February 1.

B. The Candidate's Dossier

1. The dossier will contain the following, in the order listed unless otherwise noted. A current CV in the college's standard format may be used in place of the individual items listed below, provided that either all the listed elements are contained in the CV or any missing elements are supplied separately:

- (a) the "Recommendation for Faculty Promotion" cover sheet, with the section that is to be filled out by the candidate completed (see Appendix B of the University Procedures or Appendix A of this document);
- (b) a record of the candidate's educational and professional history (C.V.), including at least the following sections, preferably in the order listed:
 - (i) a list of *institutions of higher education* attended, preferably from most to least recent, indicating for each one the name of the institution, dates attended, field of study, degree obtained, and date the degree was awarded;
 - (ii) a list of *professional and academic positions* held, preferably from most to least recent, indicating for each one the title of the position, the dates of service, and the location or institution at which the position was held; and
 - (iii) a list of *honors, awards, recognitions, and outstanding achievements*, preferably from most to least recent.
- (c) a record of the candidate's teaching at The University of Iowa, including:
 - (i) the candidate's *personal statement on teaching*, consisting of a summary and explanation—normally not to exceed three pages—of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning teaching, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to teaching;
 - (ii) a list of the candidate's *teaching assignments* on a semester-by-semester basis, preferably from most to least recent;
 - (iii) a list of *graduate students, fellows, or other postdoctoral students supervised*, including each student's name, degree objective, and first post-graduate position;
 - (iv) a list of *residents for whom the faculty member has provided substantial and prolonged supervision* throughout all or most of their training program, including each student's name and first post-residency position;
 - (v) a list of *other contributions* to instructional programs;
 - (vi) copies of *course materials*, including syllabi, instructional Web pages, computer laboratory materials, and so forth (see III.(B)(2));
 - (vii) and, as an appendix to the dossier, copies of teaching evaluations by students for each course taught (the candidate will include all student teaching evaluations in her or his custody for each course taught) (see III.(B)(2));
- (d) a record of the candidate's scholarship, including:
 - (i) the candidate's *personal statement on scholarship*, consisting of a summary and explanation—normally not to exceed three pages—of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning scholarship, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to scholarship;

- (ii) a list, preferably from most to least recent, of the candidate's *publications or creative works* with, for each multi-authored work or coherent series of multi-authored works, a brief statement of the candidate's contribution to the work or series of works;
 - (iii) a list of all *published reviews of scholarship* of which the candidate has knowledge;
 - (iv) a list of *applications for support submitted and grants and contracts* received by the candidate;
 - (v) a list of *invited lectures and conference presentations*;
 - (vi) a list of *pending decisions* regarding the candidate's scholarship *that might affect the promotion deliberations*, including, for example, grant proposals, book contracts, and other publishing decisions anticipated in the near future;
 - (vii) a list of all *inventions and patents*;
 - (viii) and, as an appendix to the dossier, copies of the candidate's published work (and work that is in print or has been accepted for publication), indicating where each work has been or will be published;
- (e) a record of the candidate's service to the department, college, university, profession, community, and State of Iowa including:
- (i) the candidate's *personal statement on service*, consisting of a summary and explanation—normally not to exceed two pages—of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning service, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to service; and
 - (ii) a categorized list, preferably from most to least recent, of *offices* held in professional organizations; *editorships* of journals or other scholarly publications; *service on review panels*; service on departmental, collegiate, or university *committees*; departmental, collegiate, or university *service positions*; relevant *community involvement* and *service to the State of Iowa*; and other contributions;
- (f) within the appropriate section(s) of the dossier as listed above, other information relevant to the candidate's record in teaching, scholarship, or service that is deemed to be important in the candidate's judgment or required by the college's written Procedures governing promotion decision making.
2. Where the volume of material of a particular kind, which is required to be included in the dossier is large and potentially unmanageable, a candidate, in consultation with the Promotion Manager/Division Head, may select and identify representative portions of the required material for special attention. Only the material selected as representative will become part of the Promotion Record and will be transmitted to successive participants in the promotion decision-making process. Required materials segregated from the representative material will be available for review and will be located in a readily accessible location under the Promotion Manager/Division Head's custody. If any

participant in the promotion decision-making process relies upon initially segregated material in preparing a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications, that material should be added to the Promotion Record, the fact of that addition should be noted in the written evaluation, and the candidate should be notified in writing of the addition at the time it is made.

3. The candidate's work in progress that is not completed by the specified date but that is anticipated to be completed in the fall—early enough for full and deliberate evaluation, as determined by the Promotion Manager/Division Head—may be identified at the time the dossier is submitted and added to the dossier if and when it is completed.
4. Other materials (including updated CVs and personal statements) that could not have been available by the specified date but which are completed early enough for full and deliberate evaluation may be added to the promotion dossier by the candidate at any time through the Promotion Manager/Division Head. Materials added to the original dossier or materials in the original dossier that are amended, should be labeled as such, including the date when added or amended and with any amendments clearly marked.

C. Evaluation of Teaching

1. It is the candidate's responsibility to cooperate in obtaining peer evaluation of his or her teaching by participating in the College of Pharmacy peer review of teaching program, which is described in Appendix B of this document.
2. The DCG will not solicit additional student teaching evaluations beyond those regularly completed in each professional course each semester (the College of Pharmacy "ACE" forms and student evaluations made in graduate courses). However, section I. B. (3) (f) of the University Procedures contemplates that a candidate **may** submit additional student evaluations that he or she "deems to be important." If the candidate submits additional student evaluations, the DCG shall solicit evaluations from a broader sample of respondents as deemed appropriate to ensure a representative sample of opinions.
3. The peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching will be prepared by the DCG-appointed reviewers and appended to the dossier. The committee's evaluation will be based on (a) the record established in the peer review of teaching program, as provided by College of Pharmacy policy, (b) a teaching evaluation solicited from each of the teaching reviewers and (c) the student teaching evaluations.

D. Evaluation of Scholarship

1. External Reviews
 - a. Final selection of potential external evaluators of scholarship will be made by the Promotion Manager/Division Head no later than July 1 of the academic year in which the promotion decision will be made (see section III A. Notification and Deadlines).
 - b. The candidate for promotion/tenure will submit the names of potential external reviewers (maximum of eight with addresses, phone/fax numbers and professional positions). The candidate will provide a CV for use by the external reviewers,

which will include normal biographical information plus candidate-prepared scholarly activity data. At least two persons on the list must be internationally recognized experts in the focus area of the candidate's scholarly activity and all reviewers must be persons who the DCG faculty would consider independent reviewers. The candidate may seek advice from other faculty members in generating the list.

- c. The Promotion Manager/Division Head will discuss the names with the candidate and will add additional names after consultation with Division Consulting Group members.
- d. The Promotion Manager/Division Head will make the final selection of external reviewers and will share the completed list of external reviewers with the candidate. If the candidate feels that any potential external reviewer on the list might be unfair or otherwise biased, the candidate **may** prepare a written objection and give it to the Promotion Manager/Division Head with a copy to the CGG chair. All reasonable efforts must be made to generate a list of reviewers acceptable to both the candidate and the Promotion Manager/Division Head.
- e. In identifying potential external reviewers, all participants in the selection process will take into account the standing of the prospective reviewer in the discipline, the likely knowledge of the reviewer of the material to be reviewed, the apparent impartiality of the reviewer, and the contribution of the reviewer to achieving an overall "balanced" review among the reviewers on any criterion for which there might be a range of perspectives. It is critical to avoid a situation in which a personal and/or professional relationship (including advising, mentoring, co-authoring, etc.) between the candidate and a prospective reviewer could undermine the reviewer's apparent impartiality.
- f. The Promotion Manager/Division Head, using a form letter that substantially conforms to the sample letter contained in Appendix C, will ask the external reviewers to provide an assessment of the quality and quantity of the candidate's scholarship.
 - i. After or in anticipation of an invitation to an external reviewer to evaluate the candidate's published work, neither the candidate nor any other faculty member other than the Promotion Manager/Division Head will communicate with the reviewer concerning the subject of the review or the review process.
 - ii. Each external reviewer will receive the candidate's C.V., reprints of the most significant publications, a copy of the collegiate promotion policies, and any other materials decided upon by mutual agreement of the candidate and the Promotion Manager/Division Head.
- g. The Promotion Manager/Division Head will keep a record of:
 - i. the list of suggested reviewers,
 - ii. the names of persons invited to review,
 - iii. the names of actual reviewers from whom letters were received,
 - iv. comments submitted by the candidate, the members of the Division Consulting Group, and the internal faculty reviewers,
 - v. correspondence and other communications between the Division Head and invited reviewers and actual reviewers.
- h. All letters received from external reviewers will be entered by the Promotion Manager/Division Head into the Promotion Record in the section dedicated to the history and evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, along with:

- i. a list of all invited reviewers—indicating whether the reviewer was suggested by the candidate, the Promotion Manager/Division Head, or the DCG—and a brief explanation of why any invited reviewer declined the invitation;
 - ii. the candidate’s written objection to any potential external reviewer on the basis of unfairness or bias, and if a letter was solicited from that reviewer over the candidate’s written objection, the reasons why the candidate’s objections were disregarded;
 - iii. a copy of the letter or letters of solicitation to each external reviewer;
 - iv. a brief description of each external reviewer’s qualifications or a copy of the reviewer’s C.V.;
 - v. a statement of how the reviewer knows the candidate’s work, if it is not obvious from the reviewer’s letter, and;
 - vi. if the reviewer is not from a peer institution, but from an institution where the corresponding institution or individual evaluator is of peer quality, an explanation of why the reviewer was chosen.
- i. The external reviewer letters are given to the DCG Chair by the Promotion Manager/Division Head only after the internal review of scholarly activity portion of the DCG report has been written. The DCG members read the external review letters and draft a summary of the external review for the DCG report. Finally, the DCG members discuss and draft a section resolving the conflicts between the internal and external review of scholarly activities.

2. Internal Review

- a. The DCG will write an evaluation based upon those relevant items from the dossier (see page 7, section B.1.d.), considering the following points in relation to the usual collegiate standards for promotion at the particular rank:
 - i. the quality and quantity of peer-reviewed scholarly publications;
 - ii. the continuity of scholarly output;
 - iii. the development of a research focus area (in promotion to Associate Professor) or the clear evidence of a recognized research focus area (in promotion to Professor);
 - iv. the significance of the candidate’s scholarly contributions to the research area;
 - v. the role of the candidate in the scholarly publications with independent contribution and primary input being demonstrated;
 - vi. the level of activity and success in applications for extramural funding of the candidate’s research;
 - vii. successful direction of research by graduate and postdoctoral students;
 - viii. the results of external peer-evaluation of the candidate's scholarship; and
 - ix. an explanation of any disagreement between the internal and external reviews.
- b. For promotion/tenure to the rank of Associate Professor, scholarship during the candidate’s appointment as an Associate (non-tenure track), or Assistant Professor (tenure track), or Associate Professor (non-tenured) will be fully considered. For promotion to Professor, scholarship since promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is the primary factor for evaluation.

E. Evaluation of Professional and Community Service

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate to prepare a record of his or her service to the division, college, university, profession, community, and State of Iowa including:
 - a. the candidate's personal statement on service [consisting of a summary and explanation -- normally not to exceed two pages -- of the candidate's accomplishments and future plans concerning service, and comments on these accomplishments and plans and on other items included in the dossier related to service]; and
 - b. a list, preferably from most to least recent, of offices held in professional organizations; editorships and reviewerships of journals or other scholarly publications; service on review panels; service on academic divisional, collegiate, or university committees; academic divisional, collegiate, or university service publications; relevant community involvement and service to the State of Iowa; and other contributions.
2. The DCG or the designee will write an evaluation of the candidate's professional and community service based on the relevant section from the dossier and the materials provided by the candidate.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTS

Please see Procedures for Tenure-track Promotion and Tenure Decision-Making - Appendix A, B and C.

Appendix A: Faculty Promotion Cover Sheet

Appendix B: Peer Review of Teaching by the Division Consulting Group, including instructions and Decision Year Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching form (Evaluation of Teaching)

Appendix C: Sample Letter from Promotion Manager to External Reviewers

Appendix A. Faculty Promotion Cover Sheet(fill out and print online form at <http://www.uiowa.edu/%7Eprovost/docs/appendixb.pdf>)

**The University of Iowa
Recommendation for Faculty Promotion**

Distribution
Payroll
Provost's Office
Dean
Department

To be completed by the candidate:

Name: _____ Employee ID: _____

Primary Appointment: _____
College DepartmentSecondary Appointment: _____
College Department

Date of Initial Appointment (Assistant Professor or above at The University of Iowa): _____

Present Rank: _____ With Tenure Date attained: _____
 Without Tenure**To be completed by the Departmental Executive Officer:**Proposed Rank: _____ With Tenure Date effective: _____
 Without Tenure

If proposed rank is without tenure, indicate term of appointment.

This is a _____ year appointment beginning _____ and ending _____
(mo. day yr.) (mo. day yr.)

Vote of Departmental Consulting Group:

Primary Appointment: For promotion: _____ Against promotion: _____ Abstained: _____

Secondary Appointment: For promotion: _____ Against promotion: _____ Abstained: _____

To be completed by the Dean:Is there a summary report from the Collegiate Consulting Group? Yes No

Vote of Collegiate Consulting Group:

Primary Appointment: For promotion: _____ Against promotion: _____ Abstained: _____

Secondary Appointment: For promotion: _____ Against promotion: _____ Abstained: _____

Recommendations:

Primary Department:

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Do not recommend Executive Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not recommend Dean

Secondary Department:

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Do not recommend Executive Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Do not recommend Dean

Provost:

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend _____	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Do not recommend Provost	Provost Date

Appendix B.

Peer Review of Teaching by the Division Consulting Group.

The candidate and Division head will agree on two division consulting group members who will provide observational data on teaching. The Dean will mediate any lack of agreement on the selection of two individuals. These two individuals will constitute the peer review of teaching subcommittee.

The candidate will select two teaching activities to be reviewed by each peer reviewer. Where applicable one should be a review of professional student teaching and one graduate student teaching.

The candidate and the teaching reviewers shall agree on the dates and times of review. This will allow the candidate to provide observation of their "best teaching" practices.

Each reviewer will use the observation document prepared by the College of Pharmacy Curriculum Committee. They **may** add additional observations and comments as appropriate.

An evaluative summary of the observations of teaching shall be submitted by the peer review of teaching subcommittee to the Division head to be included in the dossier of the candidate.

The University of Iowa

College of Pharmacy

Procedures for Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching

Successful candidates for promotion and tenure at The University of Iowa must demonstrate an acknowledged record of teaching success, as described in University and College of Pharmacy procedural guidelines.^{1,2}

Peer observation is a required element of the evaluation of teaching. This document explains the College of Pharmacy procedures proposed to satisfy this requirement and illustrates a form created to report the results of peer observation of classroom teaching during the promotion and tenure decision year. Classroom teaching was selected as the type of teaching for observation because it is the one type of teaching shared by all tenure-track faculty members in the College.

Documentation of the results of peer observation during the decision year can be accomplished with the aid of the attached form, "Decision Year Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching," which would become part of a candidate's dossier. This form is designed to assist an observer to evaluate a peer's live classroom teaching. The form is NOT designed for formative evaluation of teaching or for observations of teaching behaviors during laboratory sessions, discussion groups, collaborative learning sessions, clinical teaching, and tutoring or mentoring individual students.

The College of Pharmacy recognizes, as stated in the University *Procedures*¹, that "the minimal procedures specified here for evaluation of teaching are not assumed to be adequate for purposes of mentoring and teaching-improvement." For this reason, the attached form is intended to be used *only* to document that peers in the College of Pharmacy judge a candidate's classroom teaching behaviors to be "Acceptable" or "Not Acceptable" at the time of observation during the decision year.

In the College of Pharmacy, a faculty member may teach as a member of a team during a portion of a single academic term. Furthermore, most courses in the College are offered only once during the academic year. To allow adequate opportunities for fair and thorough peer observation of classroom teaching, the candidate may initiate the peer observation process during the July 1st through June 30th time period immediately preceding the academic year during which a promotion decision will be made. This provision is hereafter referred to as "early peer observation" and is limited to the July 1st through June 30th time period immediately preceding the academic year in which a promotion decision will be made. Early peer observation is not intended to alter any other part of the decision year timetable or any other requirement for preparation of the promotion dossier.

Early peer observation is recommended when the candidate's teaching responsibilities occur primarily outside of the April 1 to September 15 time period specified in the College of Pharmacy *Procedures for Tenure-Track Promotion and Tenure Decision-Making*.

When the candidate initiates the process, he or she must inform the Promotion Manager/Division Head (*i.e.* the Division Head) in writing that peer observation is desired. The DCG chair must appoint two voting members, one of whom must be a full professor, to observe the candidate's teaching and to report the observation evaluation with the attached form. The DCG chair must inform the candidate of the observers' appointments to this task in writing. The elapsed time period between the candidate's request for early peer observation and the appointment of observers should not exceed 30 days.

Responsibility for selection of specific class periods for observation rests entirely with the candidate and may be in any course taught by the candidate, regardless of program. The candidate must select two class periods to be observed and must notify observers of the specific dates and times. Both observers must be present during each of these class sessions. In the event that one observer is unable to be present, the candidate may arrange for videotaping of the class session for later evaluation by one or both observers.

¹ *Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Decision-Making at The University of Iowa* [Office of the Provost website: <http://www.uiowa.edu/~provost/docs/pandt.htm>]

² *Procedures for Tenure-Track Promotion and Tenure Decision-Making*. College of Pharmacy Procedure Manual, Available, Office of the Dean.

However, evaluation of a videotaped class session should occur only after attempts have been made to arrange observation of a live class session at which both observers can be present simultaneously.

The observers must meet with the candidate prior to the first observation. Ideally, this visit should occur within 1 week of the observation. The purposes of the pre-conference meeting are to allow the observers to :

- Discern the context of the teaching that will be observed.
- Become acquainted with the candidate's philosophy of teaching.
- Learn the candidate's instructional goals for the class session.
- Learn how the candidate plans to conduct the class.
- Ask questions to facilitate a thorough observation and a fair report.

The following questions are suggested to guide the observers during the pre-observation conference³.

1. What will be happening in the class to be observed?
2. How will this class relate to previous classes in this course?
3. What is the goal for this class? How is it related to the goals for the course?
4. What will students do during class?
5. How will students reach your goals?
6. How will you connect material in this class to pharmacy practice?
7. What must students do to prepare for class?
8. How would you describe your style of teaching?
9. Will your class presentation be typical of your style of teaching? If not, how will it be different?
10. How would you describe your philosophy of teaching?
11. How will this class exemplify your philosophy?

Prior to the pre-observation conference, the candidate *must* supply the observers with a copy of the course syllabus and any handouts for the class. The candidate may supply other materials, such as slides or overhead transparencies, at his or her discretion or as requested by the observer. If a second class session will be observed within 2 weeks of the first observation, the second pre-observation conference may be omitted by mutual agreement between the candidate and both observers. In any case, observers must conduct at least one pre-observation conference.

Each observer must complete the attached form independently, observing carefully and rating each area, A through D, as "Acceptable" or "Not Acceptable," according to the observer's judgment. The bulleted items listed in each section provide examples of desirable teaching behaviors. Each observer's overall rating and any narrative must be produced independently, without consultation with the other observer. Both forms will be placed in the promotion dossier.

³ Adapted from Sorcinelli MD. An approach to colleague evaluation of classroom instruction. *Journal of Instructional Development*. 7(4):14, 1984 as reprinted in Keig L and Waggoner MD. *Collaborative peer review: The role of faculty in improving college teaching*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development, 1994. p. 45.

The University of Iowa College of Pharmacy

Decision Year Peer Observation of Classroom Teaching

Use this form only for observation of classroom teaching behaviors. Carefully observe the candidate's teaching. Rate each of the four areas as "Acceptable" or "Not Acceptable," referring to the bulleted items for examples of desirable teaching behavior in each category.

Candidate _____

Date of observation _____

A. General Teacher Classroom Behaviors

The candidate

- Began class on time in an orderly, organized manner.
- Was prepared with all materials needed for class.
- Effectively gained students' attention to begin the class.
- Was able to use classroom equipment needed for the presentation

B. Content

The candidate

- Chose content of appropriate breadth and depth for the level of the course and the group of students.
- Related the material covered to the syllabus and the goals of the course.
- Explicitly stated how the content is related to pharmacy practice, as appropriate.
- Presented materials in a way that links theory to problem-solving.
- Defined new terms or concepts.
- Used illustrations or examples to clarify ideas.
- Explicitly stated relationships among topics.
- Explained terms, concepts, or problems in more than one way, when appropriate
- Provided a balance between up-to-date and background content.
- Emphasized a conceptual grasp of material when appropriate.

C. Presentation

The candidate

- Followed a well-organized handout or outline.
- Used clear and easy to read presentation materials.
- Spoke clearly and with sufficient volume for all students.
- Spoke at a rate that permitted note-taking at a comfortable pace.
- Established and maintained eye contact with the audience.
- Presented content in a logical sequence.
- Varied vocal rate and tone.
- Used smooth transitions within the presentation.
- Periodically summarized important ideas.
- Insured that demonstrations, if included, were visible to all students.

D. Rapport and Interaction with Students

The candidate

- Used humor positively and appropriately.
- Encouraged students' questions or debate, as appropriate.
- Responded to students in a respectful manner.
- Answered questions clearly and directly.
- Treated class members equitably, in accord with University policy.¹
- Responded to distractions constructively.
- Asked questions to stimulate thought, gain attention, and/or encourage participation.
- Allowed ample time for students to respond to questions.
- Refrained from belittling student ignorance or misunderstanding of content.
- Provided opportunities for or encouraged class discussion.
- Recognized when students did not understand.
- Solicited student feedback.
- Used authority in the classroom to create an environment conducive to learning

A.

 Acceptable Not Acceptable

B.

 Acceptable Not Acceptable

C.

 Acceptable Not Acceptable

D.

 Acceptable Not Acceptable

See reverse side

The result of the observation must be an overall assessment of a peer's classroom teaching as either "Acceptable," or "Not Acceptable." Each observer's overall rating and any narrative must be produced independently, without consultation with the other observer.

COMPLETED OBSERVATION FORMS SHOULD BE FORWARDED DIRECTLY TO THE CHAIR OF THE DIVISION CONSULTING GROUP.

Use this space to describe the strengths and weaknesses observed during the candidate's teaching.

I find this candidate's classroom teaching behaviors to be

- Acceptable.
- Not acceptable. See above narrative.

Observer (Print name.): _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

¹ The University of Iowa prohibits discrimination in employment and in educational programs and activities on the basis of race, national origin, color, creed, religion, sex, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or associational preference.

Appendix C. Sample Letter from Promotion Manager to External Reviewers

The letter of the Promotion Manager to solicit an external evaluation will:

- be neutral in tone;
- indicate the rank for which the candidate is being considered and whether the promotion includes an award of tenure;
- explicitly state what portion of the candidate's work the reviewer is being asked to assess;
- request that the reviewer not communicate with the candidate or with faculty other than the Promotion Manager/Division Head;
- state that the reviewer's response will be protected as confidential as described in the Sample Letter; and
- request a resume or brief biographical sketch if one has not been obtained through another source.

The following is a sample letter:

Dear _____:

As I mentioned to you on the telephone on [date], [candidate's name] will be considered for tenure and promotion to ["proposed rank"] in University of Iowa College of Pharmacy during this academic year. I am grateful to you for agreeing to serve as an external evaluator.

Enclosed with this letter is Professor _____'s curriculum vitae.

We would like you to critique the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity and, if possible, to assess its quality in comparison to the work of others in this discipline at comparable stages in their careers. We would particularly appreciate your evaluation of the contribution that the candidate's scholarship has made to the field.

If you feel competent to do so, we would additionally appreciate your judgment concerning the quantity of the candidate's scholarly output, given her/his years in the academy, on the basis of the scholarly work, completed or in progress, as listed on the candidate's C.V. For a candidate being reviewed after an extension of the probationary period has been granted, the quantity of scholarly output should be judged assuming a standard probationary period regardless of the actual number of years in the academy.

For a candidate seeking promotion/tenure early, the quantity of scholarship should also be judged "assuming a standard probationary period" regardless of the actual number of years in the academy.

Finally, we would also be interested in any other insights you might have about Professor's scholarly accomplishments.

If you have any questions about Professor _____'s scholarship or experience, please contact me directly. In accordance with our governing procedures, we must ask you not to communicate with either the candidate whose work you are reviewing or other members of the University of Iowa College of Pharmacy faculty concerning your evaluation or the review process.

Your letter will be available to the Division Consulting Group and the Collegiate Consulting Group members as well as to the Dean and Provost, who makes the final promotion recommendation to the Board of Regents within the University of Iowa. Beyond that, we will regard your letter as a confidential document. Your evaluation would be made available to the candidate only upon his/her explicit request and then only after your name and other identifying information have been removed and only in the case of a negative recommendation.

Finally, it would help us if you could send with your review a copy of your C.V. Although some faculty colleagues know you and your work well, the Provost would find your biographical sketch helpful when considering your letter.

Again, thank you for your willingness to help us with this important review process.

Sincerely yours,